THE ANALYSIS OF SENTENCE CONSTRUCTION AND MEANING INTERPRETATION OF ENGLISH BREAK VERBS AND THEIR VERBS EQUIVALENCE IN BUGINESE LANGUAGE

Herlina Anwar [1,2], Hamzah A. Machmoed [1], Sukmawaty [1]
[1]Hasanuddin University
[2]Email: herlinaanwar.ha@gmail.com

Abstract: The purpose of this research is to compare the sentence form and meaning interpretation of 'Break' Verbs in English and Buginese. The sentence construction and the meaning interpretation of verbs confined to Break Verb from English and Buginese language were compared with regards to Dixon's Affect Verbs Construction and Halliday's Functional Grammar Construction. The data of this research were collected from two sources. The English data were collected from British National Corpus (BNC) while the Buginese Data was collected from field observation and interview on Soppeng Buginese speaking community. The data were collected and analyzed using Descriptive Qualitative Methods. According to the findings of this study, it was found eighteen Break Verbs in the English language and nineteen in the Buginese language; 2) The 'Break' Verbs in both languages are realized into sentences through a number of selections of constructions set up in the two theories that were examined in this research and some additional constructions where each construction plays some contribution to the meaning interpretation; 3) The Break Verbs found in both languages have some similarities and differences regarding their sentence construction and meaning interpretation.

Keywords: *'Break' Verb, Construction, Meaning Dixon's theory*

INTRODUCTION

Language is a set of sign governed by some sets of rules. The use of English is used for the acceleration model of English as a second language for the foreign learners (Aswad, et al., 2020). Phonetics and phonology exist at the level of letters and sounds, morphology exists at the level of words and their forms, and syntax exists at the level larger than a word. Syntax is the study of the rules that control how words are combined to form a sentence. "Syntax is agnostic about 'correct' and 'incorrect' English," Miller says (2002). It is a part of grammar together with morphology. Grammar is the study of the rules of well-formed sentences in particular language. When people express their ideas, proper grammar will help them avoid misunderstandings Weda, et al.,

72

(2021). The term 'well-formed' here refers to what is called as 'grammatically correct' sentence.

In the traditional grammar, it is acceptable to consider e.g. the table plants a tree in the kitchen as a sentence for it fulfills all the 'grammatically correct' principle. However, some upcoming studies toward language began questioning this statement. Is it really acceptable to call a stretch of language as a sentence simply because they follow the grammatical rules? Does it make sense even if it, by the native speakers of the language, is regarded as nonsensical sentence? From these questions, some theories towards grammar appear. One of them is what has been introduced by Dixon (1991) 'Semantic Approach to Grammar'.

The study of meaning is known as semantics. It is the study of how linguistic codes are understood by language users. Kreidler (2002) stated that:

> "It is impossible to explore semantics without also dealing with syntax (and vice versa) because the two are closely interrelated: the meaning of a sentence is more than the meanings of the words it contains, and the meaning of a word often depends partly on the company it keeps— what other words occur in the same sentence."

Semantic-Syntactic Theory refers to the study of grammar in the semantic point of view. Dixon, by this theory, explained how the meanings of some particular words varying the grammatical rules that can be employed in a sentence containing those words and how grammar can specify the meaning of a particular stretch of language.

Dixon pointed out the verbs as the center of a sentence and divided them into some divisions based on their semantic roles. One of those divisions is Affect Verb, the verb that has three basic semantic roles: the Agent, Manip, and Target. Its basic feature is the Agent brings the Manip to come into contact with the Target Dixon (2005). Affect Verb is divided into eight subtypes and one of them is the Break Subtype. The Break Subtypes is explained by Dixon as the group of words that at least employ two semantic roles. Those are the Agent and the Breaking role.

The theory is by no doubt is accepted as a potential method to examine grammar and semantic. However, the fact that meaning as a very cultural-base-term should not be put out of concern. Meaning will mostly vary from culture to culture. As a result, one linguistic theory that has been proposed in a particular language may not be surprisingly unacceptable or at least 'not fully' acceptable in some other languages. Language is a device for interacting with others Idris et al., (2020). Moreover, language as the part of human life is evolved from time to time and may cause a disobedient to some previous rules or even the alteration of a new theory. Hence, it is normal for the linguists to continuously examine every linguistics theory to analyze its relevance to the utilization of language in the present day.

Buginese language is one of local language in Indonesia. In relation to Bachriani, et al., (2018), Buginese is one of South Sulawesi's four major linguistic groups. Furthermore, Bugis is defined as an Austronesian language spoken by people from Bugis, South Sulawesi Tahir, et al., (2018). Just like English, Buginese language also has verbs that can be categorized as Break Verbs. Nevertheless,

as this language comes from a different language family, these languages may have some differences in the grammatical construction and semantic interpretation. From the preliminary research, the researcher found that there are some sentences in Buginese language disobey the rules that is proposed in Dixon's theory. One example of this is that some Buginese Break Verbs may have a specific Breaking role that allows them to normally be constructed in the sentence with the breaking role leaved unstated. In this case, the sentence will disobey the requirement of the presence of the Breaking role.

The result, the researcher was interested to conduct a research entitled "Grammar and Semantic Analysis of English Break Verbs and Their Verbs Equivalence in Buginese Language". This research aims to compare the grammatical construction and the semantics interpretation of English and Buginese sentence especially on the sentence containing the verbs regarded as Break Verbs. It is conducted to reveal the similarities and the differences between English and Buginese use of Break Verbs considering their grammatical construction and semantic interpretation.

METHOD

Procedure

The data of this research were collected from Online Corpus Linguistics and Field Observation. On the other hand, the data from Buginese language were gathered from field observation and interview in Buginese community especially the one that is spoken in Soppeng district.

Participants

The data from English language were gathered from British National Corpus (BNC) to provide the examples of everyday use of the English Break Verbs. To make the two data balance, the researcher took only the spoken data from both English and Buginese language.

Data Analysis

The gathered data were analyzed using Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's (2014) model in qualitative data analysis, which consisted of three steps: data condensation, data display, and conclusion and verification. The first is data condensation to select, simplify, and transform the data. In this step, the researcher converted and reduced raw data by selecting and sorting the collected data from the Online Corpus Linguistics and Field Observation. The second data analysis step is data display, aiming to make the data arranged into available and attainable form. The data which have been reduced and sorted were displayed in this step. The last step is conclusion and verification. In this step, the findings of the study were drawn from the accumulated and formulated data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Break Verbs found in English and Buginese Language

Affect's Break subtype Dixon's verbs, which he introduced in 2005, are divided into eighteen verbs. These are destroying, damage, wreck, collapse, tear, split, chip, crack, smash, crash, burst, explode, blow up, let off, and erupt. All these verbs except for erupt

-- that only occur in intransitive sense - are explained by Dixon as having transitive construction. Some of them also occur intransitively. Break, tear, split, chip, crack, smash, burst, explode, and blow up are some of them.

In Soppeng Buginese language, the researcher found nineteen Buginese Verbs that can be consider as equivalence to the English Break verbs. Those are: *makkasolang; makkareppa, mafu; maddecca', maddecco'; makkafe, makkenne'; folo, massarang; malleppoang, maggeppuang; mappalleppo, mappabbettu, mappaccedo; mappassau; maruttung; mabbuno; mappenynya,* and *mappappenjang.*

Based on the data collected from Buginese native speakers, Break Verbs in Soppeng Buginese language can be specified through the selection of their available Breaking roles. The following table shows some object that can play as the Breaking roles for Buginese Break Verbs and the definition suffice for those verbs considering the effect that may be caused by the activity towards the Breaking roles:

Table 1
Breaking roles and Definition Suffice for The Buginese Break Verbs

Buginese Break Verbs	Possible Breaking Roles	Definition Suffice to the Verbs
makkasolang	furniture, electronic, toy, vehicle	to cause damage towards the physical of the object
		to cause the objet become malfunction or inoperable (electronic, toy, vehicle)

Buginese Break Verbs	Possible Breaking Roles	Definition Suffice to the Verbs
makkareppa', mafu	object made from: glass, marble, plastic; ceramic	to cause the physical of the object separate into pieces
maddecca', mappaddecco	egg, person's head/forehead	to cause a crack to the physical of the object
		to open the object by cracking it (egg)
makkafe', makkenne'	leaf, paper, cloth	to separate one object into parts mostly by pulling some part of the object
massarang, folo	furniture, some body parts of human (the bone)	to cause the object/part of the object separate into two or more pieces
		to fracture (a bone)
malleppoang, maggeppuang	vehicle, thng that can be hold in the agent's hand (confined to Manip)	to bring the object as to come to hit (with force) the other object
mappalleppo, mappabbettu, mappaccedo'	bomb, tire, balloon, gas, volcano, bubble gum, weapon (more sufficient to 'shoot', member of hit)	to explode the object (mostly by a loud noise)
mappassau	balloon, tyre, gas	to let off the air of the object
madduttung	Buildings	to cause the object collapse
mabbuno	plants, animals	to kill the object, to bring the object into inexistence
mappenynya, mappappenjang	animal, product of cooking(cake and the like),ball	to direct a press towards the object as to cause the physical of the object become flat or squashed

Break Verbs found in English and Buginese Language

1. English Break Verbs

Dixon in his theory explained that there are three basic constructions that may apply in the sentence containing the verbs from Break Subtype as the head of the verb phrase. First of all is the one that is considered as unmark construction for Affect Verb, that is construction I (the Agent break the Target (with/using the Manip)). The second is construction II (the Agent Break the Manip (upon/against the Target), which is used when the Manip is considered weaker than the Target. The third one, used with agent unstated and Manip taking the position of the one that is responsible to the succession of the activity, is construction III (the Manip Break the Target).

Construction I as what has been mentioned, is the unmark construction and for that reason, this construction can apply for all the verbs of the Break Subtype. One exception is the verb erupt that in English only confined to the intransitive construction for it is considered as the verb that explained the phenomenon that no one (at least no living creature) can considered as being able to manage an active attempt of erupting a volcano. Construction II can be used in sentences with the verbs break, damage, wreck, tear, split, chip, crack, smash, and burst, whereas Construction III can be used in sentences with all of the verbs mentioned in Construction II plus crush, squash, and destroy. All Break Verbs except crush, squash, destroy, damage, and wreck may also appear in intransitive construction.

After analyzing the data collected from the British National Corpus (BNC), the researcher found that all the break verbs except for erupt are all appear in construction I (The Agent + Break + The Target) with mostly Manip unstated. Construction II is found in crack, smash, and (as the contrary data of the theory) in crush while Construction III in squash, smash, crash, and (as contrary data) in blow up. The verbs break, crush, damage, collapse, tear, split, chip, crack, smash, burst, explode, blow up, and erupt (crush and damage are also contrary data) are found in intransitive construction.

In the data, it can be seen that in construction I the Agent role are mostly filled up by Subjective Pronoun and take the Subject slot. There are two examples in the data collection that shows another possibility of the Agent where the objective pronouns used instead of subjective one. Those are: "why didn't you let us crack the egg" and "let them blow the balloons up". These two examples represent the sentence that consist of main clause + complement clause. 'Us' and 'them' in these sentences played two roles. They are both the Object of the main clause and the Subject of the complement clause. It still filled the Transitive Subject (A) slot in construction I.

Construction I take the Target as the Breaking roles while the Manip (if stated) will be marked with preposition. In Mood and Residue construction, the target filled up the complement slot while the Manip will be put in the Adjunct Slot. For example in the data there is the sentence "Thou shalt break them with the rod of iron" (Table 1, Data No. 8). In this sentence, 'them' is the Target marked as Complement

Herlina Anwar, Hamzah A. Machmoed, Sukmawaty
The Analysis of Sentence Construction and Meaning Interpretation of English Break Verbs and Their Verbs Equivalence in Buginese Language

and 'with the rod of iron' is the Manip marked as Adjunct.

It is explained in Dixon's that the Manip role in construction I refers to the tools held by the Agent or some body parts of the agent that can always be supplied in the sentence even if it can be leaved unstated Dixon (2005: 110). However, some data found in this research, shows a little reverse example to this definition.

To begin with, "Get down! Before you break your neck". In this data, it seems that the extract of the sentence "you break your neck" fulfilled the construction I with no Manip being stated. The other examples are: "I mean you try that with our soil, you'll damage your finger" and "when they listen to that they'll burst their bloody ear drums". All these data, showed the example of English sentence that occur in construction I and there is no Manip being stated in the sentence. When see the explanation in Dixon's theory, it is suggested that all these data actually have potential Manip but the Manip is leave to be unstated in the sentence. Nevertheless, when considering the meaning of the sentence, "get down! before you break your neck" is likely said by a mother to her son who sat on a high place. "Before you break your neck" may be expanded into "before you fell down and break your neck" (caused your neck to be break). For that reason, is seems that the Manip roles for this sentence is being absence at the first place.

The other two examples show a different interpretation. Sentence "I mean you try that with our soil, you'll damage your finger" and "when they listen to that they'll burst their bloody ear drums" are, not like the first sentence, have a possible Manip to be supplied (the soil and a sound/music). However, if rephrasing the sentence, "you will damage your finger by using our soil" and "they will burst their ear drums by listening to that" are closer in meaning to the previous sentence rather than "you will damage your finger with our soil" and "they will damage their ear drums with that (music)".

By analyzing the characteristics of the participants and the meaning interpretation of these data, it can be identified that the extract of those sentences "you'll damage your finger" and "they'll burst their bloody ear drums" have a common characteristic. That is, the agent did something that will affect their own body part. Adding a Manip to the sentence will draw the assumption that the agent do the activity in active manner which will sounds like the agents with a sole intention wanted to direct damage towards their own body part. One conclusion can be drawn from this analysis that the presence of the Manip role in Construction I reflect the condition where the Agent intentionally did the activity in aim to cause damage to the Target.

Construction II (Agent + Break + Manip + to the Target) in this research is presented in: "I'm crushing the ball against the hoop"; "he could have cracked his head against the side of the lift shaft"; "you smashed that bat against the wall"; and "it blew her up right against that bloody wall". Agent in Construction II are like the Agent in Construction I is put in the Subject slot in Mood and Residue Construction. Manip and Target in Construction II is on the reverse position to Manip and Target in Construction I. That is, Manip it the Complement slot and Target in the Adjunct slot.

Construction III (Manip + Break + Target) in this research is presented in "three, motorbike crashed the car". In this construction the Manip take the Subject slot in Mood and Residue Construction while the Target takes the Complement slot. In construction three as has been mentioned by Dixon, has the implication that it is the Manip that is pointed as salient to the effect caused by the activity. From the definition of Manip (something being manipulated by the agent), it can be interpreted that there must be an Agent that manipulate the Manip (the motorbike) but it is not being mentioned in the sentence.

Intransitive construction in the data of this research is presented in: Table "their walkie talkies break down"; "it crushes very easily"; "that bloody floor didn't collapse", "the wall collapse on top of her", "he just collapsed and died at my feet"; "if you pull it off it'll tear"; "the car split in two", "It just split down like a banana"; "they're chip"; "it would crack", "the skin cracks open"; "it would burst out", "the big plastic bottle will burst open", "a car tyre burst", "it burst into a ball of flame", "pipe had burst"; "the glass will explode from internal pressure", "this my explode into a thousand fragments", " the petrol explode", "the fucking cow exploded", "the vehicle exploded into a ball of flame", "the computer just explodes"; "the car blow up on a dual carriage way", "the bus has been blow up"; and "the sun will erupt".

The construction of Intransitive break verbs in if marked in Dixon's theory is The Breaking Role + Break. The breaking roles in this sentence construction cannot be marked as neither of Agent, Manip, and Target. Agent cannot mark the breaking roles because the term agent is the one who bring about the activity. It is the one who manipulate the Manip to cause the break effect to the target. Manip cannot mark the breaking role because it must be something that is manipulated to cause the breaking effect to the target. Target cannot mark the breaking roles because the Target must be the one in which the activity is directed to. As seen in the intransitive construction, the Breaking role is only appearing to be the one that experience the damage. Hence the three-term used in the transitive construction are unavailable to mark the breaking role in the intransitive construction.

It is found in the analysis of the data by the researcher that there some data in this research that are not suffice to any of the construction I, II, and III. Those are: "to wear them break your little finger", "the little bit I shall crush", "I reckon that plastic bag squashed them all", and "someone's naughty's smashed a seat".

In "to wear them break you finger", the Subject slot is filled up by a clause rather than a noun phrase. Therefore, it does not suffice the Agent and neither the Manip. Due to the definition of Primary verbs as lexical verb (the verb that refer directly to some activity or state with the semantic roles filled up by NP, this sentence cannot be included in primary Verb. However, when considering the effect of the activity ('breaking the finger'), it seems that this sentence still explains the literal meaning of the verb even though it must be considered as the effect of 'wearing a thing'.

In "the little bits I shall crush", the Target as breaking role is mentioned before the Agent + Break. The sentence is still in the active construction but

the complement is mention before the subject and the predicator. When using only Dixon's theory, it is may be concluded that this sentence actually confined to construction I with only the breaking role mentioned first and that the sentence may be rephrase with "I shall crush the little bits". However, it must be considered that such promotion of the role may have a semantic motivation.

For the last two data, "I reckon that plastic bag squashed them all" and "someone's naughty's smashed a seat", it seems that these two sentence belonging to construction III with 'plastic bag' and 'someone's naughty' as the Manip. Nevertheless, this data has little differences with the nature of construction III and the definition of Manip roles explained by Dixon. In "I reckon that plastic bag squashed them all" the interpretation of the meaning will be 'someone put something on the plastic bag so that it is being squashed in there' and 'someone use the plastic bag to squash the thing". The other data "someone's naughty's smashed a seat", 'naughty' is an abstract noun and cannot be interpreted as 'the thing that is being manipulated to come into connect with the target'. Yet the function of the noun is still similar with the Manip role for construction III in the context of 'hiding the agent'.

2. Buginese Break Verbs

There are nineteen verbs found in Buginese language which by their characteristics is equivalence to the English Break Verbs listed in Dixon's Theory. From the data, it can be seen that the Break Verbs in Buginese also fulfill the construction I (Agent-Break-Target) from Dixon Theory with Manip mostly unstated.

In Buginese Language, from formal grammar construction, the subject and the object are bound with the verb and act like a single verb. It can then be preceded by a Proper name or independent pronoun that have the same reference with the Agent, and followed by a common noun that confined the Breaking role's reference. For example *"Iko, mu-solang-i remo'e"* (you, you break the remote control). In this example, subjective pronoun *'mu'* + the verb stem *'solang'* + enclitic *'i'* are bound together. From this example it can be noted that in Buginese language, in addition, many strategies are used by Buginese speakers to express their feelings to their interlocutor Zulkhaeriyah, et al., (2021). the Agent, the Break Verbs, and the reference of the Breaking roles are bound in one word.

From the interview with the native speaker, the researcher found that there is a clear implication of the presence of the Manip role in construction I. That is, when it is stated, it will mostly be interpreted by the listener that the Agent did the activity intentionally. For example, when one says *"musolangi remo'e fake falu-falu"* (you break the remote control with a hammer), that will imply that the Agent intentionally move the hammer to the remote control to cause a physical damage on it. Nonetheless, when one says *"musolangi remo'e",* it is unclear whether the activity is intentional or unintentional.

Construction II from this research is found in two data. Those are *"narecca'i tello'e ku ulunna"* (he cracks the egg upon his head) and *"nalleppoangngi otona ku jembatangnge"* (he smashes his car upon the bridge". From the interview, the researcher found that the first sentence has the implication of

meaning that the Agent moves the Manip (in this case the 'egg') towards the Target (in this case the 'head') to affect both the Manip and the Target. The native speaker of Buginese has a clear intuition that the activity explained by this sentence is intentionally done by the Agent with the awareness that both the egg and the head will receive the effect of the activity. The same meaning can be implied for the second sentence. However, in the second sentence, the intention of the speaker cannot be realized through the construction. It is only available through the context.

The characteristic of Target and Manip in Construction II in Buginese language have a very significant contribution to determine the Breaking role. The one that is considered as less strong will take the Breaking role. In other words, the construction only confined to the realization of the fact that both Manip and Target role are potentially affected physically by the activity. However, to determine the Breaking role (the one which receive more damage from the activity) the comprehension about the characteristics of Manip and Target will be fully needed.

Manip in construction I and Target in construction II are realized through a prepositional phrase and introduced a peripheral noun phrase. Manip in construction I marks the instrument used by the Agent, while Target in construction II specifies the location where the activity is directed.

The researcher found, in the Buginese data, that there is one possibility where the Target role can be realized through the 'with' instrumental phrase. If one says *"nareppa'i tello'e fake ulu"* (he cracks the

egg using head), Buginese native speaker may freely implement the sentence either 'the Agent move the egg to approach the head' (the 'head' is Target) or 'the agent move his head to approach the egg' (the 'head is Manip).

From the interview with the informants, the researcher found that there are indeed some sentences in Buginese language that used the Construction III from Dixon. The example given by the informant are *"yatongeng je' jarikku, naranrangsi lifa'e"* (oh bloody my hand, it tears the sarong again) and *"awi bekka siagani naranrang wajukku iyye assappiangeng wajue"* (ow, how many times has this hook tears my dress".

These two sentences are realized in rather different way. The informant explained that the first sentence implied that the real Agent is actually the one whose hand is tearing the sarong. In this sentence, in the normal speech event, the fact that the 'hand' is put in the position of the one which is responsible for the effect of the activity rather than just refer to the real Agent implies that the activity is done unintentionally by the Agent to tear the sarong. On the other hand, the second sentence is realized when the speaker's dress is snagged on the hook and the dress torn. In this sense the hook is more confined to the Target rather than the Manip. But similarly, it is pointed out by the speaker as the one who is responsible to the success of the Break effect.

The intransitive construction in Buginese language is found in: *"masolangngi renring'e nataro anging"* (the wall breaks because of the wind) ; *"reppa' manengngi ise'na lamarie"* (all the contents of the cupboard break), *"mafui falesedw"* (the topless breaks); *"marecca manengngi tello'e"* (all the eggs cracks); *"kafe'i*

matu" (it will tear off); *"foloi ajena rosbangnge"* (the bed's leg wrecks), *"Foloi La Mamma'"* ((La Mamma's body part) breaks), *"massarangngi ajena kaderae"* (the chair's leg splits); *"talleppoi otona ku tugude"* (his car crashes towards the monument); *"malleppoi bulue"* (the volcano erupt), *"mabbettui bang motoro'na"* (his motocycle's tyre burts), *"engka gas malleppo"* (there is a gas exploded); *"massaui gas'e"* (the gas bursts); and *"maruttugngi lanrang ajue"* (the firewood storage collapses). It can be seen from the data that the most common intransitive construction in Buginese break verb is the Break Verbs that is bound with the suffix -i followed by the Breaking (marked as 'Subject' in Mood-Residue construction) or else with the plural marker *'maneng'* inserted between the break verb and the -i.

From the construction above, it can be seen that the -i is more sufficient to refer to as a marker to marked a verb as ergative rather than as the objective pronoun. The reason is that this suffix can refer to either the subject or the complement of the sentence. Therefore, it is more reasonable to put it as the bound unit of the Break Verb rather than the Breaking Role together with the complement.

Some additional constructions are found in Buginese Break Verbs. Some sentences found in the observation showed that some Buginese Break Verbs are not confined to any of construction I, II, or III. Some of them are those whose 'Breaking' role being normally leave unstated. Those data are *"makkasolangnna' tu"* (Perhaps I have broken (thing unspecified)), *"makkareppa'ka'"* (I break (thing unspecified)) and *"makkareppa'ko"* (you break (thing unspecified), *"kafe'I matu"* (it will tear off), and *"mappalleppoi"* (they let off (firecracker)). From the

interview to the native speaker, the researcher found that *"makkareppa'"* and *"mappallepo"* are included as the verb which potentially has meaning inherent to a specific breaking role and for that reason it is normally unstated in the sentence. On the other hand, *"makkasolang"* and *"kafe'i"* state the agent through the context. Mostly, the Breaking roles in these two kinds of sentences refer to something held by the Agent. Instead of stating it in the sentence, they point out the thing contextually.

Some other data in Buginese Break Verbs put the Break Verb at the beginning of the sentence. It is either before the Breaking followed by the Agent as in *"makkasolang tange' iyye kaderae"* (this chair breaks the door), *"maddecca' tello'i I Sitti"* (I Sitti cracks the egg) and *"Makkenne' daungngi tauede ku ilaleng"* (people inside (the house) are tearing banana leafs) or before the ergative marker that refer to the Agent followed by the Breaking as in *"leppoi or leppoka' asu"* (he smash a dog).

The Similarities and the Differences between English and Buginese Break Verbs

After analyzing the data, the researcher found that English and Buginese break verbs have some similarities and differences regarding their construction and meaning interpretation.

To begin with, both languages may construct the sentence containing Break Verbs in either of the construction I, II, III and Intransitively. The presence and the absence of the Manip in construction I are in both languages imply the Agent intention towards the effect of the activity. Construction II may be applied in both languages. However, there is one case

of Buginese sentence where the target can be marked by a 'with' adverbial phrase and create the confusion about which of the elements can be considered as Manip or Target. It can only be determined through the context.

As it is explained in English that the construction III implies the meaning that the Agent is not pointed out as the one who is responsible to the effect caused by the activity. There are two constructions in Buginese language that may imply the same meaning. The first construction is just like the English construction but the second one put the Target instead of the Manip as the one who is responsible to the damage.

Both English and Buginese have some Break Verbs which confined the intransitive construction. However, the Buginese construction rather put the Break Verbs before the Subject in intransitive construction. Moreover, both languages may also have the intransitive construction of Break Verbs that stand as the effect of the other verb type like Throw or Hit.

The main differences in both languages due to the formal grammatical construction are that English separate its role in the syntactical elements, while Buginese in morphological one. It is also allowed some different constructions in Buginese Break Verbs that are unlikely found in English Break Verbs Construction.

CONCLUSION

The researcher concluded from this research that: Both English and Buginese language have some verbs that confined the Break Verbs. In English, it was found eighteen Break verbs (break,

crush, squash, destroy, damage, wreck, collapse, tear, split, chip, crack, smash, crash, burst, explode, blow up, let off, and Erupt) while nineteen in Buginese *(makkasolang; makkareppa', mafu; maddecca', maddecco; makkafe', makkenne'; folo, massarang; malleppoang, maggeppuang; mappalleppo, mappabbettu, mappacceddo; mappassau; maruttung; mabbuno; mappenynya,* and *mappappenjang).* Both languages realized the Break verbs into sentences through the selection of construction set up in Dixon's and Halliday's theory and some additional constructions. Each of the construction plays some contribution to the meaning interpretation of the sentence. English and Buginese Break verbs found in this research have some similarities and differences regarding their sentence construction and meaning interpretation.

REFERENCES

Aswad, M., Rahman, F., Said, I. M., Hamuddin, B., & Nurchalis, N. F. (2019). Software to Increase English Learning Outcomes: An acceleration model of English as the second language. *The Asian EFL Journal, 26*(62), 157.

Bachriani, B., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2018). A Comparative Study of Euphemism in English and Buginese: Pragmatic Stylistics Contexts. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 1*(4), 429-440.

Dixon, R. M. (1991). A Changing Language Situation: The decline of Dyirbal 1963–1989. *Language in Society, 20*(2), 183-200.

Dixon, R. M. (2005). *A semantic approach to English grammar.* OUP Oxford.

Idris, A. M. S., Adliah, A., & Alfina, S. (2020). Multilingual Interaction in Classroom Context. *ETERNAL (English, Teaching, Learning, and Research Journal), 6*(2), 381-393.

Kreidler, C. W. (2002). *Introducing English semantics*. New York: Routledge

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis*: *A methods sourcebook*. 3rd. USA: Sage Publications.

Miller, J. (2002). *An introduction to English syntax*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Tahir, D., Rahman, F., & Rahman, A. (2018). The Study of Buginese Reciprocal Verb in the Boegineesche Chrestomathies Manuscript. *Am. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Res, 2*(08), 48-54.

Weda, S., Atmowardoyo, H., Rahman, F., Said, M. M., & Sakti, A. E. F. (2021). Factors Affecting Students' Willingness to Communicate in EFL Classroom at Higher Institution in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(2), 719-734.

Zulkhaeriyah, Saleh, N. J., Yassi, A. H., & Rahman, F. (2021). Strategy of Apology in Buginese: A Sociolinguistic Study. *ELS Journal on Interdisciplinary Studies in Humanities, 4*(2), 188-196.