

## Examining the Imperative Clauses in Manggarai

Salahuddin

*Magister Linguistik, Universitas Gadjah Mada*  
salahuddin1998@mail.ugm.ac.id

### Abstract

This study aims to formulate case markings in imperative clauses in the Manggarai language. This study examines several formulas of imperative clause rules in previous research, which distinguished the use of *gi* and *ga* in positive imperative clauses, and *neka* and *asi* markers in negative imperative clauses. An intense interview was conducted with native speakers of the Kempo dialect and compared other examples used in previous studies to build a thorough conclusion. Some critical findings in this research are, firstly, the particles *gi* and *ga* are not an enclitic attached to the word they follow; secondly, the particles *gi* and *ga* are not specific markers for imperative clauses because they can also appear in other clause forms (e.g., declarative clauses); and thirdly, the words *neka* and *asi* in the negative imperative clauses of the Manggarai language can be used interchangeably and do not change the meaning. Thus, this study proves that there are no unique markers in the imperative clauses of the Manggarai language because the form varies relatively depending on the context with whom one is talking.

**Keywords:** Manggarai language, Kempo dialect, imperative clauses

### Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk merumuskan penanda kasus pada klausa imperatif bahasa Manggarai secara komprehensif. Penelitian ini juga menguji beberapa rumusan kaidah klausa imperatif pada penelitian sebelumnya yang membedakan penggunaan penanda *gi* dan *ga* pada klausa imperatif positif, serta penanda *neka* dan *asi* pada klausa imperatif negatif. Penelitian dilaksanakan dengan cara melakukan wawancara secara intens kepada penutur asli bahasa Manggarai dialek Kempo dan membandingkan contoh-contoh lain yang digunakan pada penelitian-penelitian sebelumnya untuk membangun simpulan yang rinci. Adapun beberapa temuan penting dalam penelitian ini yaitu pertama, penanda *gi* dan *ga* bukanlah sebuah enklitik yang dilekatkan pada kata yang diikutinya; kedua, partikel *gi* dan *ga* bukanlah sebuah penanda khusus untuk klausa imperatif karena dapat juga muncul pada bentuk klausa lainnya (misalnya, klausa deklaratif); dan ketiga, kata *neka* dan *asi* pada klausa imperatif negatif bahasa Manggarai dapat digunakan secara bergantian sehingga tidak mengubah makna. Dengan demikian, penelitian ini membuktikan bahwa tidak ada penanda khusus yang digunakan dalam klausa imperatif bahasa Manggarai karena bentuknya yang relatif bervariasi bergantung pada konteks dengan siapa seseorang berbicara.

**Kata Kunci:** bahasa Manggarai, dialek Kempo, klausa imperatif

## INTRODUCTION

A number of minority languages in Indonesia are under pressure from language extinction (Arka, 2013), including the regional languages spoken in East Nusa Tenggara. These languages experienced rapid development due to the occurrence of language contact with other most dominantly used languages such

as Indonesian. According to Kantor Bahasa NTT (2021), four regional languages in East Nusa Tenggara are endangered, namely, Beilel, Sar, Kafoa, and Nedebang languages in the Alor Regency (<https://kantorbahasantt.kemdikbud.go.id>). Furthermore, the Ministry of Education and Culture (2022) has reported that several other languages in East Nusa Tenggara are currently in the stage of language revitalization, including the Manggarai language. Many of Manggarai's younger generations scarcely use the Manggarai language in their daily communication. Parents prefer to encourage their children to speak Indonesian due to modernization demands. As a result, many minority languages gradually became extinct due to the lack of interest of the native speakers to speak the local languages.

One form of language maintenance is documenting the language through massive and ongoing research. Manggarai language is one of the well-documented languages since the Dutch colonial period. Many missionaries who were also linguists researched and documented language in various aspects (*e.g.*, Verheijen, 1938-1994), starting from phonological aspects to grammatical aspects of the Manggarai language. Besides Verheijen (1938), there were many other missionary researchers who did not only document the Manggarai language but also classified the Manggarai language of cognate languages, such as Esser (1938), who included the Manggarai language into the Bima-Sumba group, Fernandez (1996) who grouped the Manggarai language into the Central Flores language group, and Blust (2008) who included the Manggarai language into the group. The grouping of languages was carried out diachronically by observing languages from one period to another (Mahsun, 2017).

Language documentation was also carried out internally in the Manggarai language. In the phonological aspect, several researchers have specifically observed the inventory of vocal and consonant phonemes in the Manggarai language (Verheijen & Grimes, 1995; Burgers, 1946; Mustika, 2002; Karjo, 2021). Verheijen and Grimes (in Blust, 2008, p. 83) were the first to conduct phoneme inventory research in the Manggarai language, especially Central Manggarai. Both found that the Manggarai language has 18 consonant phonemes, nine prenasal stop phonemes that can appear in initial and final positions, and six vowel phonemes. The distinctive features of the Manggarai language are prenasal stops (Klamer, 2002), fricative sounds (Verheijen & Grimes, 1995), and implosive sounds *b*, *d*, and *g* (Walker, 1977).

The phoneme inventory of the Manggarai language conducted by Burgers (1946) and Mustika (2002) showed different results. Burgers found six vowels and 26 consonants, while Mustika found six vowels and 25 consonants. These two studies differ not only in the inventory of phonemes but more importantly, in the description of phoneme composition. According to Eduard et al. (2011), these two studies need more information about the segmentation and classification of consonant phonemes and consonant clusters. He concluded that it has 18 consonants, and its phonetic realization consists of 22 consonant sounds (p. 5). Following Maddieson's calculations (in Song, 2018, p. 204), thus, Manggarai language can be grouped into languages with a relatively small consonant inventory size.

Manggarai language is a language with an SVO structure. Manggarai and other languages in Flores are isolated (Verheijen, 1977; Kosmas, 2000; Arka & Kosmas, 2005). It is called that because this language has no affixes at all. According to Arka (2017: 128), the Manggarai language is one of the languages that does not experience changes in verb forms even though it is passive constructive, as in Indonesian. Passive constructions in the Manggarai language are not marked by markers on passive verbs but are analytically marked by agent phrases and changes in the order of the constituents (Mangga, 2015, p. 144). However, the Manggarai language has several proclitics (Arka, 2014; Verheijen, 1977), including *de*, *le*, *ge*, *te*, and *be*. These entities are common in some dialects of Manggarai (*i.e.*, Rahong and Kolang) and also rarely found in particular dialects (*i.e.*, Kempo and Tangge). Before getting into the main discussion, it is necessary to assess whether what is so-called proclitics above are actually clitics or some other entities that do not fit into the category. A clitic is defined as affix-like; it resembles an

inflectional affix (Zwicky, 1985, p. 287). Bowden (in Blust, 2009, p. 361) distinguishes clitics from affixes in that clitics are morphosyntactically independent, while affixes are not. Even though they happen to attach to the constituents they follow, clitics are differentiated from affixes. A clitic, in terms of meaning, has a lexical definition, while an affix has a grammatical sense. In terms of function, clitics cannot/do not change the type of word or word class, while affixes can change the meaning and word class. The main objective of this research is related to markers in imperative clauses, so it is necessary to find the safest term to avoid confusion because it is clear that the six entities are not affixes. However, it is still required to wonder whether all of them can be categorized as clitics like previously mentioned, *gi* and *ga/ge* are entities that are not attached to the phrase they follow.

Blust (2009) mentions that many scholars try to distinguish three categories of morphemes, namely clitic, particle, and affix. The distinction between words and affixes is not problematic, but disagreements exist in distinguishing clitics from affixes and particles. Particles, on the other hand, fall on the level of grammatical unit words. Zwicky (1985) continues that every word must fit into a syntactic category; therefore, language does not have a particle, meaning a particle is a word that falls into a syntactic category, either clitics or affixes. That is why, in some instances, Blust (2009) categorizes particles the same as clitic, which means particles, in this sense, are simply a function word. Zwicky (1985) mentions that in several other world languages, extraordinary word collections have been assigned to the particle category, such as mood and sentence type markers, topic and focus indicators, case markers, form/aspect morphemes, emphasis markers, and so on. The researcher believes that the markers examined in this study are the types of mood and sentence-type features. Therefore, the terms clitic and particle will be used interchangeably because, in certain circumstances, the term clitic is not appropriate to define the shape and characteristics of the tested entity.

The proclitic *de* occurs as a marker of possessive adjectives and pronouns, that is, *daku* in the clause *hitu buku daku* (It is my book) is a possessive adjective and can become a possessive pronoun *daku* (mine), for example, to answer the question, 'Whose book is this?'. In many cases, the particle *de* is attached to the pronoun followed, as seen in *de aku/daku* (mine), *de hia/diha* (his/hers), *de hami/dami* (ours), and *de hemi/demi* (theirs). The proclitic *le* is the most commonly described of the many studies on the voice system in the Manggarai language. Proclitic *le* is a preposition that introduces actors or agents to passive constructions in the Manggarai language. Agents behind a clause are marked with *le* and are called oblique syntactically, so their appearance must be passive (Arka & Kosmas, 2005). Thus, the Manggarai language can be categorized as a language with two voices, active and passive (Arka, 2005). The particle *be*, however, is rarely found today, and no specific literature explains its use. But it is worth knowing that in the Kolang dialect (S-H dialect), it is considered a particle that appears in a sentence and has no special meaning. This particle normally occurs in the middle or at the end of a sentence. For example, the particle *be* that appears in the middle, '*eng be, asi nggitu pande*' (Whatever, don't do like that!), or appears at the end of a clause, for example, '*Neka nggitu pande be nana*' (Don't do like that, boys!). Thus, the appearance of the particle *be* is not shared and is only familiar to a few dialects. The last one is the particle *ge* which in this case corresponds to one of the focuses of this research study, the particle *ga*. Both of them refer to the same meaning. The difference is the dialect difference factor, in which *ge* is generally used by most speakers of the Kolang and Rahong dialects. In contrast, *ga* can be found in the Manggarai language with the Kempo and Tangge dialects.

The description of the voice system in the Manggarai language has been thoroughly carried out by Arka and Dimas (2005). Even so, there are still many linguistic aspects in the Manggarai language that must be adequately described to formulate a comprehensive Manggarai grammar. Analysis of voice systems in Austronesian languages is mainly done on relative clauses. However, Blust (2013, p. 499)

also states that the voice system can also be found in imperative clauses, which are indicated by the many imperative markers in several Austronesian languages.

It is the same as in the Manggarai language; imperative clauses still need to be thoroughly explained. An imperative is a speech act intended to influence the interlocutor to take action (Velupillai, 2012). The imperative usually aims to give orders (commands), requests, entreaties, suggestions (advice), warnings, instructions, and hopes. Aikhenvald (2010) distinguishes between imperatives and commands. He likens imperatives and commands to the use of 'time' and 'tense'. The time used in the real world is expressed in the tense when it is expressed in language. Time is what the watch shows, while tense is a set of grammatical forms used in a particular language. Likewise, an 'imperative' is a category in the language, while a 'command' is a phenomenon of the real world, just like the way time and tense work. The world's languages have limited grammatical means of expressing imperatives. Commands are utterances whose function is to make someone do something according to an imperative mood.

Furthermore, imperative clauses can be positive or negative. Positive imperative directs the recipient to an action that must be performed, while negative imperative prohibits the recipient from an action (Velupillai, 2012). Aikhenvald (2010) distinguishes two types of imperatives, imperatives addressed to the recipient or second person (canonical), and imperatives addressed to the first and third person (non-canonical).

In one of his research studies, Arka (2017) also explores imperative structures in Austronesian languages in Indonesia, such as Balinese. The research "The many faces of Austronesian voice systems: some new empirical studies" also contains the writings of Clayre (2005), which alludes to imperative forms in the Lun Dayeh and Sa'ban languages in Kalimantan. Arka (2017) further explained that the constituent parts eliminated in the imperative structure were actor arguments but only partially for Goal, Patient, and Theme. The actor's argument in the Balinese imperative clause is eliminated when it becomes an undergoer voice and an active voice. Imperative clauses in Balinese cannot appear in passive forms, so passive actors cannot be eliminated.

Meanwhile, Goal, Patient, and Theme can only be eliminated if they occupy the undergoer voice position. On the other hand, Clayre (2005, p. 21) mentions the use of suffixes attached to basic verbs in the Lun Dayeh language in Kalimantan. Meanwhile, no suffixes were found in the Sa'ban language. Actor periphrastic constructions or verbs marked for actor voices are used as imperatives (Clayre, 2005).

Other research that alludes explicitly to imperative clauses in the Manggarai language was done by Akoli (2021) and Barung (2018). Akoli (2021, p. 211), who researched negative markings, found that in the Manggarai language, there is a negative marking *neka* (do not) for imperative clauses. Akoli also formulates the rules for negative imperative clauses, namely Neg. Imper + Verb + Obj. In another study, Barung (2021, p. 264) distinguished *gi* and *ga* markers. Akoli explained that a phrase being attached to the particle *gi*, as in the phrase *tokogi* (He/She has been sleeping), is a declarative clause, while *ga* in the form of the *tokoga* phrase (You/You all sleep!) is an imperative clause. Thus, based on that example, he concluded that *gi* is a declarative clause marker, and *ga* is an imperative clause marker in the Manggarai language.

Taking into account the little information regarding research on imperative clauses in the Manggarai language, this research aims to provide a more comprehensive analysis of case markers of imperative clauses in the Manggarai language. In addition, this study also aims to test the findings about the imperative clause in previous studies. This is based on the fact that Manggarai has two lexical variations that can express the meaning of warnings or prohibitions, namely *neka* and *asi*. The words *neka* and *asi* in the Manggarai language can be compared with the words '*jangan*' in Indonesian or 'do

not' in English. Thus, can the word *asi* be used, or can it substitute the *neka* function in negative imperative clauses? Then, the researcher also examines Akoli's findings, distinguishing *gi* for declarative clauses and *ga* for imperative clauses. According to the researcher's assumption, they are two entities that should not be attached after the primary verb, as in the examples of *tokogi* and *tokoga* above. The researcher in this present study argues that the particle *gi* occurs in the clauses to indicate the aspect of the present perfect. The particle *ga*, however, happens to be a constant marker in both imperative and declarative clauses. Therefore, both *gi* and *ga* are not considered as the compulsory marker to indicate imperative clauses, because they can also occur in other types of clauses, such as declarative clauses. Besides, it is worth knowing that *ga* is a dialect variation of *ge* in the Rahong and Kolang dialects. Consider the three clauses below.

**Clause 1:** (Barung, 2018, p. 264)

*Toko gi.*  
sleep  $\Theta$   
'He/she has been sleeping'

**Clause 2:**

*Toko hia ga.*  
sleep he  $\Theta$   
'He/she has been sleeping'

**Clause 3:** (Barung, 2018, p. 264)

*Toko ga!*  
sleep  $\Theta$   
'You/You all go to sleep!'

Clauses 1 and 2 above are declarative clauses that say something about the third person being discussed as falling asleep. The particle *gi* in the clause above indicates that a third person singular is being talked about doing a particular activity 'sleeping'. However, in clause 2, the third person singular '*hia*' is directly mentioned in the speech, thus changing the use of the particle *gi* to *ga*. If the particle *gi* is maintained in clause two as *\*toko hia gi*, then that clause becomes unacceptable because such use of speech is not common in daily use. In other dialects, such as the Kolang or the Rahong dialect, the particle *ga* in clause two can correspond to the particle *ge* so that it can turn into *toko hia ge* (He has been sleeping).

Meanwhile, clause 3 above is an example of an imperative clause that is used, for example, when a father orders his children to go to bed immediately. Like in clauses 1 and 2, the target or the person asked to do something is implicated in the particle *ga*, which is addressed to the second person singular 'you' and the second person plural 'all of you'. However, in this example of an imperative clause, the particle *ga* cannot be used interchangeably with the particle *gi*, as found in clauses 1 and 2. In some instances, particle *gi* can also be used in an imperative clause, as seen in Clause 4 below.

**Clause 4:**

*Ala gi ko!*  
take  $\Theta$   
'Take it!'

Clause 4 above is said when someone urges someone else to 'take' something. This kind of speech occurs when the interlocutor feels annoyed because the partner has not realized the request to

carry out the activity of 'taking' something. By looking at this explanation, thus, particles *gi* and *ga* appear to be a flurry in both imperative and declarative clauses. Through this evidence, it is necessary to doubt Akoli's statement (2018), which distinguishes the use of *gi* for declarative clause markers and *ga* for imperative clause markers. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct further research on using particles *gi* and *ga* by providing more examples. This study aims to test whether *gi* and *ga* are unique markers in imperative clauses and examine the use of *neka* and *asi* in negative imperative clauses.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study aims to examine the internal structure of the Manggarai language at a synchronous time, that is, how several speakers use the Manggarai language functions at a particular time (Alwasilah, 1985, p. 110). Linguistic research that does this is called descriptive linguistics, which aims to describe language as it is (Sudaryanto, 1992).

The data used in this study are imperative clauses in the Manggarai language. The data reflects the object and research context. The object of research on syntax is the relationship between linguistic units that form the building blocks of sentences, which are known as constituents (Alwi et al., 2014, p. 320). Thus, the constituents of a clause are phrases. The research context in this present study focused on the Manggarai dialect of Kempo. The researcher listed some imperative and declarative clauses that contain markers discussed in this study. Furthermore, the researcher interviewed native speakers of the Kempo dialect with YS initial (62) to validate whether the recorded data is commonly used in everyday life. In addition, the example clauses shown in Akoli's (2021) and Barung's (2020) research are also used to determine an acceptable principle.

The first technique that needs to be applied in syntactic data analysis is to parse the elements directly, forming clauses or the technique for dividing natural elements (Sudaryanto, 1993). By applying this technique, another question arises regarding the authenticity or identity of each constituent. This identity is closely related to the syntactic role of each constituent. The vanishing technique determines whether a constituency is mandatory or absolute in a clause (Sudaryanto, 1993). Particles *gi* and *ga* need to test whether the two constituents must appear in the imperative clauses of the Manggarai language.

Furthermore, alternating the *neka* and *asi* markers in the negative imperative clauses of the Manggarai language is applied to determine whether they have the same meaning and can be used interchangeably or not. The replacement technique is considered very useful for recognizing the similarity of types between substitute and replaced constituents (Sudaryanto, 1993). Finally, the data analysis results are presented by directly describing the findings using words, specific symbols, and abbreviations.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research more or less adopts procedures carried out by Clayre (2005), which investigates imperatives in Lun Dayeh and Sa'ban languages in Kalimantan, as well as imperative analysis techniques by Arka (2018) in Balinese. Both use semantic role terms such as actor (A), patient (P), goal (G), and theme (T) arguments. The symbol  $\Theta$  indicates the omission of one of the arguments (e.g.,  $\Theta A$  = actor argument is omitted). Meanwhile, imperative clauses will be analyzed according to the division of imperative types by Velupillai (2012) and Aikhenvald (2010).

### Positive Imperative

As previously mentioned, positive imperatives direct the recipient to an action that must be performed (Velupillai, 2012). The categories expressed in the positive imperative tend to be neutralized under the negation. Aikhenvald (2010) states that many positive imperative verbs appear in the bare stem form of the verb. In the Manggarai language, variations of clauses for positive imperatives can be used using intransitive and transitive imperatives. Examples of intransitive imperative clauses can be found in the example below.

- |                         |              |
|-------------------------|--------------|
| (1) <i>Lonto!</i>       | (Sit!)       |
| (2) <i>Hema ga!</i>     | (Shut up!)   |
| (3) <i>Mai!</i>         | (Come!)      |
| (4) <i>Mai ce'e ga!</i> | (Come here!) |

In clause (1) above, the imperative can be expressed by the presence of a verb alone without being followed by an argument such as a patient actor, goal, or theme. Clause (1) uses the intransitive verb *lonto* (to sit). This type of verb can be followed by a locative agent, such as *lonto nditu* (sit there!), but in Manggarai imperative clauses it can be omitted or eliminated. Removing this locative agent shows firmness, and the person speaking is furious with the person being spoken to (addressee). The examples of clauses (2) and (3) above compare how *gi* and *ga* come after the same verb. Clause (2) is an imperative clause marked by the presence of *ga* as in other clause forms *toko ga* (go to sleep!), *hang ga* (go eat!), and so on. The presence of *ga* does not change the meaning, but there is a level (degree) when using *ga* or without them. The *ga* marker as in the example clause (2) above is used to indicate that someone is trying to negotiate something.

In contrast, removing *ga* shows that the person speaking is already furious with the other person, for example, between a mother and a child who tells their child to be silent when crying. Furthermore, adding *gi* after the verb *hema* becomes *\*Hema gi* (he has been silent), is not acceptable because it can change the type of clause (mood) into a declarative clause. With the addition of *gi*, this type of clause tries to inform the other person that "something/someone" in question is silent, for example, to stop crying or doing something.

Furthermore, clauses (3) - (4) are also instructive imperative clauses with different moods. Generally, clause 3 is said by an older person ordering someone younger or (two people of the same age) to 'come over'. Clause (4) is not much different; the difference is the role of the locative *ce'e* (here). The addition of *ga* after the clause *mai ce'e!* (Come here!) does not change the mood of the clause because, without the marker *ga*, the clause is still considered an imperative clause. If the clause *mai ce'e* happens to appear without the particle *ga*, it gives an instructive impression like an order from a person with a higher status to a lower one. Furthermore, if what comes after *mai* is *gi* becomes *mai gi* (He/she has come), then the clause turns into a declarative clause which emphasizes that the person referred to has arrived or is at the location. Meanwhile, examples of transitive imperative clauses can be found below.

- |                                    |
|------------------------------------|
| (5) <i>Ala haju hiak!</i>          |
| take stick that                    |
| 'Take that stick!'                 |
| (6) <i>Ala mang haju hiak lau!</i> |
| take try stick that by you         |
| 'Please try to take the stick!'    |

In the two examples above, the verb *ala* 'take' in the imperative clause must have a theme role that follows it. The absence of a theme role results in the loss of important information to which the act of 'taking' refers. However, in everyday speech, clause (5) is more commonly used, which is complemented by an actor role *lau/le hau* (by you), which appears at the end of the clause (backgrounded). In other words, the imperative can be targeted to the second person singular (non-canonical). The word *mang* (try) indicates that the person speaking is asking politely by saying it in the form of a request sentence. Like clause (2), adding *ga* at the end of the clause will turn the sentence into a form of affirmation to the addressee to do something as soon as possible.

Meanwhile, the addition of *gi* to clause (4) becoming *ala haju hiak gi* (He already took the stick) is a statement that the person in question has taken the stick in question. Adding *gi* changes the form to a declarative clause. However, adding *gi* to clause (5) becomes \**Ala mang haju hiak lau gi* is not acceptable because *mang* in that clause is a polite request marker for someone to do something.

(7) *Ba ce'e!*  
bring here  
'Bring here!'

(8) *Ba ce'e hang de ema gau!*  
bring here food POSS father yours  
'Bring your father's food here!'

In clause (6), the transitive verb *ba* must be followed by a locative argument. It is different from the mood in clause (4) above. In imperative clauses, the transitive verb *ba* is at least followed by a locative argument, as in clause (6). Three arguments can also follow the verb *ba* in an imperative clause at once, the locative argument *ce'e* (here), the theme argument *hang* (food), and the beneficiary argument *ema* (father). Omitting these arguments will cause ambiguity and cannot be categorized as an imperative clause. If the verb *ba* is only followed by a theme *hang* (rice) becomes *ba hang*, then the mood of the clause changes to a declarative clause. However, if the declarative clause *ba hang* is followed by *ga* at the end (*ba hang ga*), the clause becomes an imperative clause.

(9) *Taing hang acu hitu.*  
give food dog that  
'Give the dog food!'

Similar to the cases of clauses (6) and (7) above, *taing* (give) requires an argument to avoid ambiguity. If the transitive verb *taing* is only followed by a theme argument *hang* becomes *taing hang* (to feed), then the clause is considered a declarative sentence. Imagine a context where someone asks, "What did X do to Y?" The answer given is a statement *taing hang* (feed). However, if the transitive verb *taing* followed by the beneficiary argument becomes *taing acu hitu/anak hitu* (give it to the dog/that child), the mood of the clause is considered an imperative clause. Furthermore, the *hang* and refer *hitu* arguments in clause (8) can be exchanged into *taing acu hitu hang* (give the dog food) and still be considered an imperative clause.



- (10) *Pande nakeng situ ga!*  
 make fish those  $\Theta$   
 'Make/cook the fish!'

- (11) *Pande gi!*  
 make  $\Theta$   
 'Do/make it!'

In clause (9) above, *pande* 'to make' is a type of transitive verb, so it requires an argument that follows it. *Pande* can have different meanings. In clause (9), the meaning of *pande* is cooking, which can also be replaced with the transitive verb *teneng* 'cook'. If the verb *pande* is only followed by an argument patient *nakeng* 'fish' becomes *pande nakeng*, then the clause turns into a declarative clause. However, suppose there is an addition of the *situ* modifier to *pande nakeng situ*. In that case, the mood of the clause is more likely to be an imperative sentence or categorized into an imperative clause. The *situ* modifier in the Manggarai language is a combination of *ise* and *hitu*. The clitic *s* refers to the third person plural, 'they'. *Situ* (*ise hitu*) indicates that the fish being cooked is in large quantities. Meanwhile, the addition of *ga* at the end of the clause indicates an imperative sentence to act cooking as soon as possible because the person being told could have procrastinated cooking the fish in question.

The imperative clause (10) shows that the transitive verb *pande* does not always have to be followed by a patient but can be expressed by adding *gi* in certain situations. This type of speech is acceptable in the Manggarai language. The particle *gi* here represents the patient argument omitted in speech, with the assumption that the person invited or the person asked to perform a particular action knows what referent is being discussed.

- (12) *Gelang tadu para hitu.*  
 quick close door that  
 'Close that door quickly!'

To express an imperative sentence, *tadu* 'close' can be used without adding the arguments that follow it, like clauses (1) to (3) above. In clause (11) above, *tadu* is a transitive verb. The verb *tadu* can also be followed by two arguments at once, as in the clause *tadu para hitu lau* (you close the door), where *hitu* is the theme and *lau* (*le hau*) is an actor. These two constituents can be exchanged to become *tadu lau para hitu* (you close the door).

- (13) *Tadu gi para hitu ko!*  
 close  $\Theta$  door that  $\Theta$   
 'Close that door!'
- (14) *Tadu para hitu ga!*  
 close door that  $\Theta$   
 'Close that door!'

In some cases, *gi* can also be a marker of an imperative clause if its presence is accompanied by the article *ko*, as seen in the example clause (12) above. Meanwhile, clause (13) can have two moods at once, an imperative or a declarative clause. Clause (13) *Tadu para hitu ga* becomes a declarative clause when someone informs that 'the door is closed'. This clause can also be imperative when, for example, a mother and child are going out of the house, and the mother utters this to her child. This means that the mother orders her child to close the door immediately.

Thus, imperative clauses in the Manggarai language can take various forms depending on the context of the utterance. This is under what was conveyed by Aikhenvald (2010) that imperatives can be rich in meaning. Imperatives can include expressions of requests, advice, and instructions (in the form of orders); orders can also express invitations, principles, and life mottos. If Indonesian or Javanese have a passive imperative marked with a *di-* prefix, Manggarai does not have such a construction. The expressions described above can be both active and passive. Thus, the Manggarai language only has one voice form for imperative clauses, namely the active voice.

### ***Negative Imperative***

A negative imperative (prohibition) makes someone not do something, which prohibits, prevents, or limits it (Aikhenvald, 2010; Velupillai, 2012). In many languages, the imperative appears with a particular negative marker used for this purpose only. A previous study by Akoli (2018) stated that negative marking in imperative clauses in the Manggarai language generally begins with the word *neka* (p. 211), which can be equated with the word 'do not' in English as a form of prohibition. Of the 495 languages in van der Auwera & Lejeune's database (in Velupillai, 2012: 364) regarding prohibitives, 113 (or 22.8%) form prohibitions through usual positive and negative imperatives; that is, there is no specific form for prohibitions. In other words, negative imperative clauses are formed by negating positive imperative sentences. The following discusses some examples of negative imperative clauses.

- (15) *Neka rewo!*  
 don't be noisy  
 'Be quiet!'

- (16) *Neka retang!*  
 don't cry  
 'Don't cry!'

Clauses (14) and (15) are simple examples of negative imperative forms in the Manggarai language. *neka* in both clauses is placed before the verb *rewo* 'noisy' and *retang* 'to cry'. This type of verb is an intransitive verb because it does not need an argument to follow it.

- (17) *Neka hemong aku!*  
 don't forget me  
 'Do not forget me!'

- (18) *Neka. kiung nakeng situ!*  
 don't touch fishes those  
 'Don't touch those fishes!'

However, there are also negative imperatives in the Manggarai language, in which an argument can follow or without being followed by an argument (elided), as in clauses (16) to (18). Clause (16) can be pronounced without an argument patient *Aku*. Thus, the *neka hemong* clause is acceptable, provided both parties know the context of the matter that needs to be reminded. Likewise, clause (17) can eliminate the theme argument for *nakeng situ* (the fishes).

- (19) *Neka ondang ala liha!*  
 don't let taken by him  
 'Don't let it be taken by him!'

In clause (18) above, *\*neka ondang* (don't let it) cannot stand alone and is therefore unacceptable. The omission of *ala liha* (taken by him) phrases can lead to a blurring of meaning. For a *\*neka ondang* clause to become an imperative clause, the phrase needs to be replaced with the particle *na*, which is spelled at the end of the clause, so that it becomes *neka ondang na* (do not let him). The particle *na* is usually used in declarative clauses, such as in the clause *toe manga na* (absence), which is a third-person singular marking.

- (20) *Neka manga calang ase agu kae.*  
 don't have wrong younger brother with older brother  
 'There should be no commotion between brothers and sisters'
- (21) *Neka toe mai.* (Akoli, 2021, p. 212)  
 don't not come  
 'Come!'
- (22) *Neka wale toe.*  
 don't answer no  
 'Do not answer no!'

Suppose the previous statement stated that forming a negative imperative clause is enough to negate the positive imperative clause with the word *neka* in the Manggarai language. The problem is that if the *neka* in clauses (19) to (20) is omitted, then the mood of the sentence changes to a declarative clause. For example, in clause (19), if *neka* is eliminated, then the *manga calang ase agu kae* clause (There is commotion between brothers and sisters) is a declarative clause. Furthermore, the same applies to clause (20); if *neka* is omitted, the sentence changes to a declarative clause *toe mai* (not coming). This kind of declarative clause is usually an answer to a question about the presence of someone referred to and known by the members of the two parties. Unlike the two clauses above, the omission of the word *neka* in clause (21) does not change the mood of the clause. *Wale toe* clauses (answer no) can be considered declarative and imperative clauses depending on the context of the conversation. The *wale toe* clause can become declarative if it becomes the answer to the question "What is X's answer to Y?" and becomes imperative if someone provokes the interlocutor to answer '*wale toe*' to the third speech partner.

Furthermore, the question of whether the marker *neka* has the same function as the word *asi* (do not) in the Manggarai language needs to be tested for truth. The word *asi* in the Manggarai language can have two different meanings. The word *asi* can mean 'stop' as in the clause *neka asi nditu* (do not stop there!), and it can also mean 'do not' as in the clause *asi hejol bail lako* (do not walk too slowly). In certain situations, the words *asi* and *neka* can be used interchangeably and do not change the meaning of the negative imperative clause in the form of a prohibition. *Neka* in clause (14) *neka rewo* above can be replaced with the word *asi* and does not change the meaning of the clause. By paying attention to this explanation, it can be concluded that the markers of *neka* and *asi* have the same function, namely as markers of negative imperative clauses in the Manggarai language.

### *Negotiating Positive Imperative Clauses*

Quoting Aikhenvald's statement (2010, p. 3) above, imperatives can be rich in meaning. Imperatives can include expressions of requests, advice, and instructions (in the form of orders); orders can also express invitations, principles, and life mottos. Imperative clauses can take many forms. Positive imperative clauses can be expressed in the form of interrogative sentences and also in declarative forms, while

negative imperative clauses can be used to satirize the other person. Thus, the study of imperative clauses can also be linked to pragmatic studies, which prioritize the principle of cooperation between speech partners. Brown & Levinson (in Velupillai, 2012, p. 367) say that the central concept in pragmatics is the concept of face, namely the public self-image that the speech partner wants to maintain. In order to maintain communication, the speech partner must consider other speech partners, be it the level of intimacy seen from age, profession, and social status. Therefore, to convey a prohibition or order, someone will modify his speech according to whom he is talking to.

- (23) *Toe nganceng hema hemi?*  
 not can shut up 2<sup>nd</sup>=you  
 'Can't you guys shut up?'
- (24) *Andi, Mai ce'e. Hau mo ala paku musi dapur.*  
 Andi come here. You go take nails back kitchen  
 'Andi, come here. You get nails in the back kitchen.'

In the three examples of clauses above, it can be seen that expressing a prohibition and order is not always stated in the imperative clause formula but can be stated in a question sentence, as in clause (22), or a declarative sentence, as in clause (23). These two types of utterances are generally uttered by people with a higher social status (*e.g.*, parents to younger ones).

- (25) *Calak ome nganceng ite, neka koe ala lite haju situ.*  
 maybe if able you don't please take by you woods those  
 'If possible, please do not take the sticks.'

The utterances above can be categorized as imperative clauses, which have a level of politeness marked by the use of the word *ite*, which is spoken to older people or people with a higher social status. In order to avoid the face of threats and accommodate the principle of cooperation well, the said partner will consider the possible answers given by softening his speech as seen in clause (24), that is, by adding the word *ite* to respect the other person he is talking to. In addition, the emergence of the word *calak* emphasizes that a person does not legitimize the addressee and gives the option not to do things that are not wanted by the person speaking. Thus, to summarize the purpose of this explanation, the researcher cites Velupillai (2012, p. 368) that "if we act or behave in a way that lessens a possible threat to another person's face, we engage in a face-saving act". The speaker must pay attention to the actions or words conveyed by considering whom he is talking to in order to avoid the face of threats.

## CONCLUSION

Enfield and Clark (in Aikhenvald, 2010, p. 4) explain that the set of means to get other people to do something is unlimited. Different languages and societies use conventional strategies to carry out commands, requests, and other directions. After analyzing several examples in the discussion section, the following important conclusions can be underlined. First, imperative clauses in the Manggarai language only have one voice form, active voice. Manggarai language does not have specific markers on verb morphology that distinguishes imperative clauses from other clause moods. Second, based on the tests above, the morphemes *gi* and *ga* are not imperative clause markers because these two morphemes also appear in other clause forms, such as declarative clauses. In particular dialects, such as the Kempo dialect, the use of morphemes *gi* and *ga* in imperative clauses can be used interchangeably. It will not change the meaning of the utterance. Third, the marker *neka* in negative imperative clauses

can be used interchangeably with the marker *asi* because both have the same meaning (*i.e.*, do not). The marker *asi* in everyday use has two kinds of meaning, namely 'stop' and 'do not'. The marker *asi* can also be used in negative imperative clauses in the Manggarai language in particular contextual situations. Fourth, the study of imperative clauses can be supported by a pragmatic theory of the principle of cooperation. Each speaker of a particular language has a different way of conveying orders or prohibitions by considering the speech partner being involved in the conversation. Therefore, the table below helps to summarize the general point of imperative case markings in the Manggarai language.

Types of Imperative Clauses	Markers	Status	Their Appearance in the Imperative Clause
Positive Imperative	<i>gi</i>	Not particular	Exchanging the use of markers in clauses can change the meaning to the mood of other clauses
	<i>ga</i>	Not particular	
Negative Imperative	<i>Neka</i>	Obligated	Interchangeable in the clause
	<i>asi</i>	Obligated	

With the implementation of the research, it is hoped that it can contribute to documenting and maintaining language, especially the Manggarai language. For future research, the researcher suggests exploring more deeply the imperative clause grammar rules from the point of view of different dialects or analyzing the same scope in order to validate or criticize the findings in this present study. All data used as analysis examples in this study are entirely based on the researcher's intuition as a native speaker of the Kempo dialect. Something may have been overlooked; that is, data that should have been used as an example needs to be addressed.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Dr. Suhandano, M.A. for his constructive comments on the earlier draft of this paper.

#### REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1515/LITY.2011.039>
- Akoli, M. Y. F. (2021). Negative Markers in Manggarai Language: The Case of Toe Subdialect. *Deepublish Publisher. Issues in Applied Linguistics: Research and Practice*.
- Alwasilah, C. (1985). *Beberapa Madhab dan Dikotomi Teori Linguistik*. Bandung: Angkasa.
- Arka, I W., & Ross, M. (2005). The Many Faces of Austronesian Voice Systems: Some New Empirical Studies. *Australia: Pacific Linguistics*.
- Arka, I W., & Kosmas, J. (2005). Passive without passive morphology? Evidence from Manggarai. *Canberra: Pacific Linguistics*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3517.4007>
- Arka, I W. (2013). Language management and minority language maintenance in (eastern) Indonesia: strategic issues. *Language Documentation and Conservation*. Vol. 7 (2013), pp. 74–105.  
<http://hdl.handle.net/1885/54107>
- Arka, I Wayan. (2017). The Core-Oblique Distinction in Some Austronesian Languages of Indonesia and Beyond. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 35(2). <https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v35i2.66>

- Barung, K. (2018). Atonic Forms in The Perspective of Deixis in Manggarai Vernacular. *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya* 16.
- Blust, R. (2008). *Oceanic Linguistics. Is There a Bima-Sumba Subgroup?* University of Hawai'i Press. Vol. 47, No. 1 (Jun. 2008), pp. 45–113. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.0.0006>
- Burgers, P. S. (1946). *Voorlopige Manggaraische Spraak Kunst*. Nederlandsch: Unit de Bijdragen Tot Detaal Land-Envolkenkunde.
- Eduard, Y. & Mirahayuni, NK. (2011). A Study on Manggarainese Consonant Phonemes. *Parafrase Vol.11*. <https://doi.org/10.30996/parafrase.v11i02.191>
- Karjo, C. H. (2021). Phonetic and Phonotactic Analysis of Manggarai Language. *Atlantis Press: Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 622*. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211226.018>
- Klamer, M. (2002). Typical Features of Austronesian Languages in Central/Eastern Indonesia. *Oceanic Linguistics*. Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 363-383. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2002.0007>
- Mahsun. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Bahasa (Tahapan, Strategis, Metode, dan Tekniknya)*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.
- Mangga, S. (2015). *Konstruksi Pasif dalam Bahasa Manggarai: Pasif tanpa Pemarkah Verba Pasif*. Ranah Volume 4. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rmh.v4i2.29>
- Mustika, I. W. (2002). Fonologi Bahasa Manggarai Dialek Manggarai Tengah: Sebuah Kajian Transformasi Generatif. *Denpasar: University of Udayana*. <https://doi.org/10.36928/jpro.v3i1.460>
- Sudaryanto. (1992). *Metode Linguistik: Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Sudaryanto. (1993). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.
- Song, J. J. (2018). *Linguistic Typology*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Velupillai, V. (2012). *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia. John Benjamins: Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.09.002>
- Verheijen, J. A. J. (1967-1970). *Kamus Manggarai*. 2 vols. 1. *Manggarai-Indonesia*, 2. *Indonesia-Manggarai*. KITLV. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Verheijen, J. A. J., & Grimes, C. E. (1995). *Manggarai in Comparative Austronesian dictionary: An introduction to Austronesian studies*, part 1, fase. 1, ed. by D. T. Tryon, 585-92. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110884012>
- Walker, A. T. (1977). *Reviewed Work(s): Kamus Manggarai by Jilis A. J. Verheijen*. *Anthropos*, pp. 648-649. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40459170>
- Zwicky, A. M. (1985). *Clitics and Particles*. *Language*, Jun. 1985, Vol. 61, No. 2, pp. 283-305. Linguistic Society of America. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/414146>
- Lubis, S. B. (2021). *Faktor Eksternal juga Memengaruhi Bahasa Daerah Terancam Punah*. <https://kantorbahasantt.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/id/berita/46-syaiful-bahri-lubis-faktor-eksternal-juga-memengaruhi-bahasa-daerah-terancam-punah>. Kantor Bahasa Provinsi Nusa Tenggara Timur. Accessed on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Indonesia. (2022). *Lima Bahasa Daerah dari 11 kabupaten Kota di NTT Jadi Fokus Revitalisasi*. <https://www.kemdikbud.go.id/main/blog/2022/06/lima-bahasa-daerah-dari-11-kabupaten-kota-di-ntt-jadi-fokus-revitalisasi>. Accessed on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022.