

THE VERB “HIT” IN PALEMBANG LANGUAGE: NATURAL SEMANTIC METALANGUAGE STUDY

Jeni Arasyita Tazami, Agus Subiyanto

Universitas Diponegoro (UNDIP), Semarang, Indonesia

E-mail: jeniarysitatazami@students.undip.ac.id

Received: 2021-10-25

Accepted: 2022-06-02

Published: 2022-06-28

Abstract

Verb is one of the major lexical classes in language. There are three types of verbs, one of which is action verb, as found in the verb ‘hit’. The verb “hit” is a verb which has two meanings namely DO and HAPPEN forming the universal syntactic meaning: ‘X does something to Y because that something happens to Y’. This paper aims to get a clear description of the verb “hit” categorization in Palembang language using Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) theory. This research uses a qualitative approach to understand the forms of the verb “hit” in Palembang language and their explications within the NSM theory. The data used in this study are taken from native speakers of Palembang language. The results show that the categorization of the verb “hit” in Palembang language can be classified based on the body parts (hand, fingers) or the tools used to hit and based on the objects hit (head, face, or any body’s part).

Keywords: *Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM); DO; HAPPEN; Action verb; Palembang language*

1. Introduction

Verb is one of the major lexical classes in language. Verbs are words that express deeds, actions, processes, motions, circumstances and the occurrence of things (Keraf, 1991: 72). There are three types of verbs, one of which is action verb, as found in the verb ‘hit’.

According to Givon (1984: 87) verb is divided into three different types, based on its scale of time stability: state, event, and action. The third type of verbs proposed by Givon is the verb to be analyzed in this study. Action verb is the verb that shows the relationship between cause and effect. Action verb also needs an agent as the subject and patient for the direct object, as stated by Wierzbicka (1996: 421) “the prototypical transitive verb has an agent as subject and patient as direct object”. The verb reflects an action where X (subject) causes Y (object) to experience change. The verb “hit” is a verb which has two meanings namely DO and HAPPEN forming the universal syntactic meaning: ‘X does something to Y because that something happens to Y’.

This research is analyzing action verb “hit” in Palembang language. The writers chose this topic since one definition of “hit” could be translated into many kinds of the verb “hit” in Palembang language, such as *goco* ‘punch’, *tabok* ‘slap’, *sebat* ‘smash’, *gebok* ‘hit someone could be with or without something’, *tujah* ‘stab’, *kekek* ‘hit with knuckle on someone’s head’, *santok* ‘push someone’s head and bang it to the wall’, *tangani* ‘hit someone with empty hand’, *cobet* ‘pinch’, *sentel* ‘flick’, *jewer* ‘tweak someone’s ear’ and *cekek* ‘choke’.

Those action verbs influenced by the instrument use. This should be studied deeply to get a clear description of the verb "hit" categorization in Palembang language. Based on the background of choosing the subject, this research analyzes the categorization and description of the verb "hit" in Palembang language by using Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) theory.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Previous Studies

There have been some studies on action verbs across languages using a natural semantic metalanguage theory. (Subiyanto, 2008) did research on Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM). The purpose of the study was to explain the semantic components and structure of non-agentive motion verbs (NAMVs) in Javanese by using the theory of natural semantic metalanguage. The result shows that NAMVs can be classified based on the direction and quality of motion. Based on the direction of motion, NAMVs are composed of two semantic primes, which are MOVE and DO, whereas based on the quality of motion, NAMVs are composed of the semantic primes of HAPPEN and DO.

Another study on Natural Semantic Metalanguage by (Subiyanto, 2011) (NSM) was about Event process verbs (EPVs). The purpose of the study was to explore the semantic components and structure of Event process verbs (EPVs) in Javanese by using the theory of natural semantic metalanguage (NSM). The result shows that EPVs can be identified from their semantic components, which are [+dynamic], [-intention], [+/- punctual], [+/-telic], [-kinetic], and [-motion]. The result also shows that EPVs are composed of two semantic primes, which are HAPPEN and DO.

The next study on NSM was conducted by (Sudipa, 2012). The purpose of the study was to get a clear configuration of meaning verb 'to tie' in Balinese language through Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) approach. The result shows that the first three Balinese lexicons have slight differences although they are belonging to the similar semantic field, the rest, however carry the semantic differences.

Another study on NSM was conducted by (Sari, 2020). The purpose of the study was to analyze the lexicons of the verb 'happen' which have the representative meaning of 'falling' within Balinese language. The result shows that there are several process verb lexicons 'falling' in Balinese language: 'mageledag', 'ngetel', 'aas', and 'macemplung'. The findings indicate that lexicons 'falling' in the Balinese language has several different lexicons based on the entity and the process within them.

The next study on NSM was carried out by (Nasution et al., 2022). The purpose of the study was to investigate market names in Medan. The result shows that Medan people named their markets based on the markets' location, time and environmental conditions. Market names in Medan contain denotative or connotative meaning. The difference in the market name's meaning reflects thoughts underlying the word. The paraphrase of the market name's meaning can provide an understanding of the use of market names in Medan.

Previous researches provide insight for the writers to study the verb "hit" in Palembang language, since the writer has not found any of Palembang language used as object of the study in NSM research. Previous researches also provide references about the application of the Natural Semantic Metalanguage theory in assessing categorization of the verb "hit" in Palembang language.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

This study is done by the theory of Natural semantic Metalanguage, which relies on a decompositional system of meaning representation based on empirically established universal semantic primes. These semantic primes are indefinable meanings which appear to be present as word-meanings in all languages (Wierzbicka, 1996), (Goddard, 1998), (Goddard and Wierzbicka 2002b) (Peeters, 2006), (Goddard, 2010). As stated by (Wierzbicka, 1996:12) and (Goddard, 1996:2) “It is impossible to define all words. In defining, we employ a definition to express the idea which we want to join the defined words; and if we then want to define “the definition” still other words would be needed, and so on to infinity. Hence, it is necessary to stop at some primitive words which are not defined.”

Natural Semantic Metalanguage (NSM) developed by Wierzbicka (1996) has been approved in giving enough analysis of meaning result. This theory is designed to explicate every meaning, such as lexical, grammatical and illocutionary meanings.

Semantic similarity component includes a combination of meaning devices like 'someone', 'something', 'say', 'do', 'happens', 'this', and 'good' (Mulyadi 2000:40). The natural condition of language is to maintain one form for one meaning and one meaning for one form. This theory can express meaning framed in a metalanguage sourced from natural language (Goddard and Wierzbicka, 1994: 22).

The formal mode of meaning representation in the NSM approach is the semantic explication. An explication is a definition phrase using very simple words. This is a reductive paraphrase—an attempt to say in other words (in the metalanguage of semantic primes) what a speaker says when he or she utters the expression being explicated. To create the explication, we need semantic primes grouped into related categories:

I, YOU, SOMEONE, SOMETHING/THING, PEOPLE, BODY	substantives
KIND, PART	relational substantives
THIS, THE SAME, OTHER/ELSE	determiners
ONE, TWO, SOME, ALL, MUCH/MANY	quantifiers
GOOD, BAD	evaluators
BIG, SMALL	descriptors
KNOW, THINK, WANT, FEEL, SEE, HEAR	mental predicates
SAY, WORDS, TRUE	speech
DO, HAPPEN, MOVE, TOUCH	actions,events, movement, contact
BE (SOMEWHERE), THERE IS, HAVE, BE (SOMEONE/SOMETHING)	location, existence, possession, specification
LIVE, DIE	life and death
WHEN/TIME, NOW, BEFORE, AFTER, A LONG TIME, A SHORT TIME, FOR SOME TIME, MOMENT	
WHERE/PLACE, HERE, ABOVE, BELOW, FAR, NEAR, SIDE, INSIDE	time space
NOT, MAYBE, CAN, BECAUSE, IF	logical
VERY, MORE	concepts
LIKE/WAY	intensifier, augmentor similarity

Notes: (i) Primes exist as the meanings of lexical units (not at the level of lexemes) (ii) Exponents of primes may be words, bound morphemes, or phrasemes (iii) They can be formally complex (iv) They can have combinatorial variants (alloloxes) (v) Each prime has well-specified syntactic (combinatorial) properties. (Goddard, 2010: 462. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach)

Semantic primes appear to be lexical universals in the sense of having an exact translation in every human language. Beside semantic primes, in NSM we have to know the polysemy as another basic concept. Polysemy is understood as a form of single lexicon to express two original meanings which are different. Between the two original meanings there is no compositional relationship (noncomposition), because each of them has a different grammatical frame. Some common polysemies involving exponents of semantic primes are as follows:

SAY	'speak', 'make sounds' Thai, Mandarin, Yankunytjatjara, Kalam
THINK	'worry', 'long for', 'intend' Mandarin, Swedish
WANT	'like', 'love' Spanish, Ewe, Bunuba
HAPPEN	'arrive', 'appear' French, Ewe, Mangaaba-Mbula
DO	'make' Spanish, Malay, Arrernte, Samoan, Kalam, Amharic
BEFORE	'first', 'go ahead', 'front' Lao, Samoan, Kayardild, Ewe, Mangaaba-Mbula
FEEL	'taste', 'smell', 'hold an opinion' Malay, Acehnese, Ewe, French, Mandarin
WORDS	'what is said, message', 'speech, language' Yankunytjatjara, Korean, Mangaaba Mbula, Malay (Goddard and Wierzbicka, 1994; 2002b; Goddard, 2008: 464)

As example, we use verbs 'kill' and break. The causative verbs kill and break are frequently analyzed in the general linguistic literature as CAUSE TO DIE (or, CAUSE TO BECOME NOT ALIVE) and CAUSE TO BECOME BROKEN, respectively. To classify it, we need semantic primes. NSM explications are given below.

[A] Someone X killed someone Y:

someone X did something to someone else Y

because of this, something happened to Y at the same time

because of this, something happened to Y's body

because of this, after this Y was not living anymore

(Goddard, 2010: 465. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach)

In both cases, the explications depict an action by the agent X with an immediate effect on the patient Y, and, consequently the cessation of a prior state otherwise would have continued. In the case of kill, an intermediate event is also involved, namely, something happening to Y's body.

Break is both more complex than kill, and more polysemous. The explication below applies only to one sense of the word, as found in examples like to break a stick, an egg, a lightbulb, a vase, or a model plane.

[B] Someone X broke something Y:

someone X did something to something Y

because of this, something happened to Y at the same time

it happened in one moment

because of this, after this Y was not one thing anymore

people can think about it like this: "it can't be one thing anymore"

(Goddard, 2010: 465. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach)

There is an aspectual component, namely, that the immediate effect on thing Y 'happened in one moment', and a final "subjective" component indicating that the result (i.e., 'Y was not one thing anymore') is seen as irrevocable or irreversible. It is an interesting fact, and one consistent with the somewhat schematic nature of this explication, that many

languages lack any comparably broad term which would subsume many different manners of “breaking” (Majid and Bowerman, 2007).

Despite the central theoretical role of semantic primes in the NSM theory, not all meanings can be resolved simply or directly into semantic primes. According to NSM research, there are some kinds of concept (emotions, values, speech acts, and interpersonal relations); they are semantically simpler than others (artifacts, animals and plants, and human activities), because the simpler one can be explicated directly in terms of semantic primes, while the more complex one can only be explicated in stages using intermediate-level called semantic molecules.

For example, the concept of ‘animal’ is necessary in the explications of cat, mouse, dog, horse, etc. Body-part concepts are required in verbs like eat, punch, and run; and almost all concrete vocabulary items require concepts such as ‘long’, ‘round’, ‘flat’, ‘hard’, among others.

Below are the examples of body-part words (Wierzbicka ,2007a). The notation [M] indicates a semantic molecule. The claim is that head (in the sense of a human person’s head) requires the shape descriptor ‘round [M]’, and that words like legs, arms, and tail require ‘long [M]’.

head (someone’s head):

one part of someone’s body

this part is above all the other parts of the body

this part is like something round [M]

when someone thinks about something, something happens in this part of this someone’s body

legs (someone’s legs):

two parts of someone’s body

these two parts are below all the other parts of the body

these two parts are long [M]

these two parts of someone’s body can move as this someone wants

because people’s bodies have these parts, people can move in many places as they want

(Goddard, 2010: 467. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach)

It is clear that semantic molecules are language-specific. This applies to concepts which are foundational for many other concepts and/or for large lexical classes. Here are examples of semantic molecules:

(a) parts of the body: ‘hands’, ‘mouth’, ‘legs’;

(b) physical descriptors: ‘long’, ‘round’, ‘flat’, ‘hard’, ‘sharp’, ‘straight’;

(c) physical activities: ‘eat’, ‘drink’, ‘sit’;

(d) physical acts: ‘kill’, ‘pick up’, ‘catch’;

(e) expressive/communicative actions: ‘laugh’, ‘sing’, ‘write’, ‘read’;

(f) ethnogeometrical terms: ‘edges’, ‘ends’;

(g) life-form words: ‘animal’, ‘bird’, ‘fish’, ‘tree’;

(h) natural environment: ‘the ground’, ‘the sky’, ‘the sun’, ‘water’, ‘fire’, ‘day’, ‘night’;

(i) materials: ‘wood’, ‘stone’, ‘metal’, ‘glass’, ‘paper’;

(j) mechanical parts: ‘wheel’, ‘pipe’, ‘wire’, ‘engine’, ‘electricity’, ‘machine’;

(k) basic social categories and kin roles: 'men', 'women', 'children', 'mother', 'father';
(l) important cultural concepts: 'money', 'book', 'color', 'number'.

(Goddard, 2010: 468. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach)

3. Research Method

The data in this study were taken from native speakers of the Palembang language. The writers took the data by interviewing some native speakers of Palembang language. In addition, the writers also used the data by using introspection method.

The analysis in this research raises two important issues: "How to categorize the verb hit" and the semantic structure of the verb "hit" in Palembang language. This research is using a qualitative approach to understand the forms of the verb "hit" in Palembang language and their explications within the NSM theory.

4. Results and Discussion

The meaning of the verb 'hit' in Palembang language can be classified based on the body parts or the tools we use to hit and based on the objects that we hit.

4.1 Based on the instrument (body parts / tools) we use to hit

4.1.1 Body Parts

Based on the body parts that we use to hit, we have the verbs derived from the actions conducted by hands and fingers, such as *goco* 'punch', *tabok* 'slap', *kekek* 'hit with knuckle on someone's head', *santok* 'push someone's head and bang it to the wall', *tangani* 'hit someone with empty hand', *cekek* 'choke', *cobet* 'pinch', *sentel* 'flick, and *jewer* 'tweak someone's ear'.

4.1.2 Tools

Based on the tools we use to hit, we have the verbs derived from the actions conducted using dull or sharp tools. Dull tools can be made from wood such as rattan, wood stick or made from plastic like big ruler, while sharp tool like a knife. The verbs derived from the actions are conducted by tools such as *sebat* 'smash' (using tool like big ruler or rattan or belt), *gebok* 'hit someone with or without something' (using tool like wood or with nothing / by hand) and *tujah* 'stab'.

4.2 Based on the objects that we hit

Based on the objects that we hit, we have the verbs derived from the actions conducted to the different body's target such as head (*kekek* 'hit with knuckle on someone's head, *santok* 'push someone's head and bang it to the wall'), face (*tabok* 'slap'), hand (*cobet* 'pinch', *sentel* 'flick', ear (*jewer* 'tweak someone's ear'), neck (*cekek* 'choke'), upper part of body such as face, stomach etc. (*goco* 'punch').

- **Data 1 & 2**

The different meanings of action verb "hit" in Palembang language between word *goco* and *tabok* are justified in syntax below.

a. *Keno goco siapa kau?*

Kena pukul siapa kamu?

Who's the one that hit you?

- b. *Gek ku **tabok** amen nakal.*
*Nanti saya **pukul** kalau nakal.*
I will **hit** you if you are naughty.

In example (a), the word “hit” in Palembang language used the word “*goco*”. The word “*goco*” means hit someone with hand by a fist like a punch. While in example (b), the word hit in Palembang language used word “*tabok*”. The word “*tabok*” means “hit” someone usually on the face like a slap. The similarities are, both are using hands, although the body’s part target are different. *Goco*’s target could be any part of body usually the upper part, while *tabok* usually to the face of the target. The effect of the word “hit” for *goco*, hurts more than *tabok*. *Goco* might cause the target battered, while *tabok* only causes a slight sore for a while. Therefore, the effect for *goco* is heavier than *tabok*.

The Explications can be described like this:

Goco

X does something to Y with hand [M]
X does something to Y’s upper part of body
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

Tabok

X does something to Y with hand [M]
X does something to Y’s face [M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

In example (a):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body in this case, hand.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) to any part of body, usually the upper part. This is not using semantic molecules because, the upper part of body is not specific. It could be stomach, face and etc.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

In example (b):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of the body in this case, hand, same like in example (a).
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) to the face. Contrast with example (a), in here using semantic molecules, represented with [M], which has specific target, namely face.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y), same like in example (a).

- **Data 3 & 4**

The different meanings of action verb “hit” in Palembang language between word **kekek** and **santok** are justified in syntax in sentences below.

- a. *Keno kekek kau men bohong.*
Kena jitak kamu kalau bohong.
You will get a **hit** if you're lying.

- b. *Ku santoki palak kau ke dinding.*
Saya jedoti kepalamu ke dinding.
I will **hit** your head to the wall.

In example (a), the word hit in Palembang language used word "kekek". The word "kekek" means to hit someone usually with knuckles on the head. While in example (b), the word hit in Palembang language used word "santok". The word "santok" means to hit someone's head, to something like a wall. The similarities are, both targets are the head. The differences are, on how to do the hit, *kekek* using only hand in knuckle, while *in santok* using another instrument especially something hard like a wall. So, the hand only pushes the head to that hard thing. The effect of the hurt, *kekek* only causes a light hurt for a while, compared to *santok* that might hurt more like swollen.

The explication can be described like this:

Kekek

X does something to Y with hand [M]
X does something to Y's head [M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

Santok

X does something to Y with hand to something hard [M]
X does something to Y's head [M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

In example (a):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body, in this case, hand with knuckles.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with knuckles on the head, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body in this case, head.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

In example (b):

- Someone (X) doing something to (Y)'s head with hand with something hard like a wall and bangs the head toward it. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, specifically referring to the part of body in this case, hand and also to a material thing which is described as something hard.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with knuckles to the head. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it refers specifically to the part of body in this case, head same like in example (a).

- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

- **Data 5, 6 & 7**

The different meanings of action verb “hit” in Palembang language between word **tangani**, **cekek** and **tujah** are justified in syntax.

- a. *Belom **kutangani** belom jero.*
*Belum saya **habisi** belum jera.*
If you haven’t been **hit** you won’t stop.
- b. *Wong itu minta **cekek** nian ye.*
*Orang itu benar-benar minta **cekik** ya.*
That person really wanted to get a **choke**.
- c. *Maling itu keno **tujah** semalem.*
*Maling itu kena **tusuk** semalam.*
That thief has been **stabbed** last night.

In example (a), the word hit in Palembang language used word “*tangani*”. The word “*tangani*” means to hit someone usually with hand and might cause the person dying; while in example (b), the word hit in Palembang language used word “*cekek*”. The word “*cekek*” means to hit someone with hand on the specific part of the upper body (neck) and cause the person dying or dead. And in example (c), the word hit in Palembang language used word “*tujah*”. The word “*tujah*” means to hit someone with something sharp like a knife and cause the person dying or dead too. The similarities are both *tangani* and *cekek* are using hand, while *tujah* is using another instrument, something sharp like a knife. The differences are, the target of body part for *tangani* tends to be the upper part of body, while for *cekek*’s target is the neck and target for *tujah* is usually the upper part of body, be front or back like stomach or back. The effect of the hit, *tangani* might cause the target injured, dying or even dead while *cekek*, the target could be dying or dead, the same like *tujah*.

That explication can be described as follows:

Tangani

X does something to Y with hand [M]
X does something to Y’s any body’s part
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y could be living or dead

Cekek

X does something to Y with hand [M]
X does something to Y’s neck [M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y could be living or dead

Tujah

X does something to Y with something sharp [M]
X does something to Y’s upper part of body[M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y could be living or dead

In example (a):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body in this case, hand.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) to any part of body. This is not using semantic molecules because, any part of body is still not specific. It could be back, leg, stomach, neck, face, head, etc.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y). (Y) could be living or dead

In example (b):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body, in this case, hand, the same like in example (a).
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) hits someone with hand, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body in this case, neck.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y), (Y) could be living or dead.

In example (c):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with something sharp, represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated to a specific material thing described as sharp, in this case a knife.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) usually to the upper part of body, be front or back like stomach or back.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (X) doing something to (Y), (Y) could be living or dead.

- **Data 8, 9 & 10**

The different meanings of action verb "hit" in Palembang language between word *sentel*, *jewer* and *cobet* are justified in syntax in a sentence like this.

- a. *Nak keno **sentel** budak itu.*
*Mau minta **sentil** anak itu.*
That kid clearly wants to get **flicked**?
- b. *Minta **cobet** nian kau ye.*
*Benar-benar minta **cubit** kamu ya.*
Do you really want to get **pinched**?
- c. *Budak kecil itu keno **jewer** lbunyo.*
*Anak kecil itu kena **jewer** lbunya.*
That kid is being **tweaked** by his mother.

In example (a), the word hit in Palembang language used word "sentel". The word "sentel" here means to hit someone usually with fingers (flicked); while In example (b), the word hit in Palembang language used the word "cobet". The word "cobet" means to hit someone usually with fingers (pinch) and in example (c), the word hit in Palembang language

used word “*jewer*”. The word “*jewer*” means to hit someone on the ear like a tweak. The similarities are all of them use fingers only, without any instruments and the effect for all the hit only gives a light hurt for a while. The differences are, on the target, *sentel* could be to any part of the body the same like *cobet* while *jewer* only to the ear.

The explication can be described as follows:

Sentel

X does something to Y with fingers [M]
X does something to Y’s upper part of body
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

Cobet

X does something to Y with fingers [M]
X does something to Y’s upper part of body
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

Jewer

X does something to Y with fingers [M]
X does something to Y’s ear [M]
X doing this because Y did something bad
Y does not want this

In example (a):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers in such a sudden and sharp movement. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body, in this case fingers.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers to upper part of body, could be hand, arm, ear and etc.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

In example (b):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers tightly and sharply between finger and thumb. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the body part, which are fingers.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers to upper part of body, could be hand, arm, cheek, etc.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

In example (c):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers to the ear by twisting it. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it refers specifically to the part of body, in this case fingers.

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with fingers specifically to the ear only. It is represented again with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated specifically to the part of body, in this case ear.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and do that to (Y).

- **Data 11 & 12**

The different meaning of action verb "hit" in Palembang there are *sebat* and *gebok* are justified in syntax in a sentence like this.

a. *Budak-budak itu disebat oleh gurunya karno idak ngerjoi pr.*

Anak-anak itu dipukul oleh gurunya karena tidak mengerjakan pr.

Those kids were **hit** by the teacher because they did not do the homework.

b. *Aku abes geboki budak itu make kayu.*

Saya habis pukuli anak itu dengan kayu.

I just **hit** that kid with a wood stick.

In example (a), the word hit in Palembang language used word "sebat". The word "sebat" here means to hit someone usually with something long and thin like a big ruler, a belt or a rattan. While in example (b), the word hit in Palembang language used word "gebok". The word "gebok" means to hit someone, can be with something big and hard like wood or with nothing (by hand). The similarities are, the target of hitting could be any part of the body or whole body (hand, back, leg etc.) The differences are, *sebat* uses other instruments or tools while *gebok* might use hand sometimes. The effect of the hit *sebat* only causes a light hurt for some time, while *gebok* giving a sore.

The explication can be described like this:

Sebat

X does something to Y with something thin and long [M]

X does something to Y's any part of body

X doing this because Y did something bad

Y does not want this

Gebok

X does something to Y with something hard and big or just with empty hand [M]

X does something to Y's any part of body

X doing this because Y did something bad

Y does not want this

In example (a):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with something long and thin like big ruler or rattan, but it does not have to be something hard, it could be something soft / flexible too like belt. It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it refers to a specific material thing which is described as long and thin or soft / flexible too.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) to any part of body or the whole body, such as hand, back, leg etc.
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and does that to (Y).

In example (b):

- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) with something big and hard like wood or with nothing (by hand). It is represented with [M] which is semantic molecules because, it is indicated to a specific material thing which is described as big and hard.
- Someone (X) hits someone (Y) to any part of body or the whole body such as face, head, hand, back, butt, leg etc).
- Someone (X) does the hit to someone (Y) because, (Y) did something bad to (X).
- Someone (Y) does not want this, but someone (X) wants this and does that to (Y).

5. Conclusion

Based on the analysis of the data, it can be concluded that:

The categorization of the verb "hit" in Palembang language is based on **instrument** used and this could be divided into:

1. Using body's part:

Hand: *goco* 'punch', *tabok* 'slap', *kekek* 'to hit with knuckle on someone's head', *santok* to 'push someone's head and bang it to the wall', *tangani* to 'hit someone with empty hand' and *cekek* to 'choke', *gebok* to 'hit someone with or without something'.

Fingers: *cobet* 'pinch', *sentel* 'flick', *jewer* 'tweak someone's ear'.

2. Using tool:

Dull tools: (hard, long, thin /elastic tools like belt, big ruler, rattan) *sebat* to 'smash', **(hard, big tools like wood or with nothing / empty hand)** *gebok* to 'hit someone with or without something'.

Sharp tools: *tujah* 'stab'.

The categorization of the verb "hit" in Palembang language is based on **the object that we hit** divided into body's part such as:

1. **Head:** *kekek* to 'hit with knuckle on someone's head, *santok* to 'push someone's head, and bang it to the wall'.
2. **Face:** *tabok* to 'slap'.
3. **Ear:** *jewer* to 'tweak someone's ear'
4. **Neck:** 'cekek to 'choke'
5. **Upper body part (cheek, hand, stomach,):** *cobet* to 'pinch', *sentel* to to 'flick, *goco* to 'punch', 'tujah to 'stab'.
6. **Any body's part:** *sebat* to 'smash', *gebok* to 'hit someone with or without something', *tangani* to 'hit someone with empty hand.

The semantic structure of the verb "hit" in Palembang language can be expressed from several lexicons. The lexicon usages of the verb "hit" in Palembang language are adapted to 2 categorizations, first the instrument we use to hit (body's part or tool), and second, the object that we hit (someone's body part).

Theoretically, this analysis is expected to give a contribution to the development of natural semantics, especially on the analysis of the verb "hit" in local language, in this case Palembang language. The result of this study is expected to become a good research in the development of language for similar research, or as a comparison for further study. Apart

from that, practically, this research can provide insight for people regarding the verb “hit” in Palembang language.

References

- Dewi, A. A. A. N., Sudipa. N., & Putra, I. B. R. (2016). Struktur dan Peran Semantik Verba Menyentuh Bahasa Bali Subtipe Melakukan-Terjadi: Kajian Metabahasa Semantik Alami (MSA). Bali: *OJS Unud. Vol 2 No 1*.
- Givón, T. (1984). *Syntax: a Functional-typological Introduction 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goddard, C. (1996). *Semantic Theory and Seantic Universal* (Cliff Goddard Converner) Cross Linguistic Syntax from Semantic Point of View (NSM Approach) 1-5 Austratia.
- Goddard, C. (1998). *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goddard, C. (2010). *The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach: In Bernd Heine and Heiko Narrog (eds.) the Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 459-484.
- Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (1994). *Semantic and Lexical Universals – Theory and Empirical Findings*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (2002). Semantic primes and universal grammar. In Meaning and Universal Grammar – Amsterdam: John Benjamins. *Theory and Empirical Findings, Vol. I*, Cliff Goddard and Anna Wierzbicka (eds), 41–85.
- Goddard, C. & Wierzbicka, A. (2014). *Words & Meaning: Lexical Semantics across Domains, Languages and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keraf, G. (1991). *Tatabahasa Rujukan Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.
- Majid, A., et al. (2007). *The semantic categories of cutting and breaking events: A crosslinguistic perspective. Cognitive Linguistics 18(2), 133–152. DOI 10.1515/COG.2007.005*
- Mulyadi & Siregar, R. K. (2016). Aplikasi Teori Metabahasa Makna Alami dalam Kajian Makna. Medan: *Jurnal Ilmiah Bahasa dan Sastra Volume II No. 2*.
- Nasution, L. Y. & Mulyadi. (2022). Market Names in Medan: A Natural Semantic Metalanguage Study. Makassar. *RETORIKA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya, Vol. 13 No. 2*.
- Peeters, B. (2006). *Semantic Primes and Universal Grammar*. Empirical Findings from the Romance Languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sari, L. G. I. P. (2020). The Meaning of Verb Falling Within Balinese Language Subtype Happen-Move: An Approach of Natural Semantic Metalanguage. Yogyakarta: *LITERA: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra dan Pengajarannya. Vol. 6 No. 1*.
- Subiyanto, A. (2008). Verba Gerakan Bukan Agentif Bahasa Jawa : Tinjauan Metabahasa Semantic Alami. Semarang: *Fakultas Sastra Universitas Diponegoro, Vol. 52 No. 5*
- Subiyanto, A. (2011). Struktur Semantik Verba Proses Tipe Kejadian Bahasa Jawa : Kajian Metabahasa Semantik Alami. Semarang: *Kajian Linguistik dan Sastra, Vol. 23, No.: 165-176*.
- Sudipa, I. N. (2012). Makna “Mengikat” Bahasa Bali: Pendekatan Metabahasa Semantik Alami: Bali: *Jurnal Kajian Bali, Volume 02, Nomor 02*.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: primes and universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2007a). *Bodies and their parts: An NSM approach to semantic typology. Language Sciences 29(1): 14–65*.