Speech Act Verb in Old Javanese: Natural Semantics Metalanguage Analysis

Ni Ketut Ratna Erawati & I Ketut Ngurah Sulibra
Faculty of Arts
Udayana University
Denpasar-Bali-Indonesia

Abstract

Universally, every language has a lexicon that grouped into categories of verbs. However, this category could be classified into specific sub. Based on the semantics component, verbs in Old Javanese are classified into a state verb, process verb, and action verbs. Speech verb is one of the action verbs. Based on morphological typology, Old Javanese belongs to the agglutination type. Therefore, it is definitely that the Old Javanese has various morphemes in the forming the verb. Verbs belonging to the speech verbs in Old Javanese are various. Therefore, this topic is analyzed with the theory of natural semantic metalanguage (NSM). The theory is packed with a number of relevant concepts applied in discussing the topic. Based on the analysis of each speech verb lexicon of Old Javanese, then every lexicon reflects two important components of semantics, namely: dictum and illocutionary purposes which reveal subtle meaning features that have a field of similar meaning. By way of explication, each lexicon can be analyzed thoroughly without any bias. Therefore, the postulate in semantic i.e. one form-one meaning and one meaning to a form highly relevant.

Keywords: semantic structure, semantic prime, canonical sentence,

1. Introduction

Old Javanese (abbreviated OJ) is one of the local languages in the Nusantara. Historically, this language estimated evolve since 9th century and reached its peak in 15th century AD. The language is used as a communication tool actively by Javanese at that time. While other experts, namely Uhlenbeck (1964: 108) stated that OJ growing rapidly before the arrival of Moslem. Thus, the OJ native speakers were no longer found and it categorized as a dead language. Although it is categorized as a dead language, however the language has a literary tradition is quite old as those found in the form of inscriptions or texts of literary works. These results of document are invaluable cultural heritage. (Zoetmulder and Robson, 1995: ix) Saussure (1916) states if dead languages still has/bequeath its langue then the language are suitable for the linguistic study materials. Langue is concrete since it is the language sign that agreed collectively and is a social fact that can be understood even though the language it has been categorized as a dead language (Hidayat, 1996: 9). Related to langue, OJ has very complex linguistic structures. The hassle can be seen from its typology of word formation. In the morphological typology, Old Javanese is a language belonging to the agglutination typology. The most universal characteristic in that typology is the one word is composed of many morphemes (see Comrie, 1989). If seen from its linguistic structure, especially in the formation of words, lexicon of verbs OJ very varied and has a number of alternation morpheme / word in referring to a linguistic concept with a number of distinguishing features. The distinguishing features are used as the basis of discussing the semantic structure of the verb lexicons. These studies formulate two problems as follows: First, how are the classification of the speech act verbs in OJ? Second, how the semantic structure of verbs of speech acts in OJ? Both problems are analyzed with the theories and concepts that are relevant below.

2. Theory and Concepts

Related to the issue, the relevant theory to assess the problem is the theory of natural semantic metalanguage (NSM). This theory was developed by Anna Wierzbicka and friends, like Cliff Goddard started in eighties. The theory combines the tradition of philosophy, logic in the study of the semantic with typology approach to the study of language based on empirical research across languages. Theory of NSM is expected to provide an overview of the semantic structure of a language. NSM theory has the superiority, namely:

(1) the theory of NSM is designed for explicating all meaning, either lexical meaning, grammatical meaning, and illocutionary meaning; (2) Supporting of the theory NSM believes in the principle that natural conditions of a language is to maintain a form of one meaning and one meaning for one form; (3) in NSM theory explication of meaning is framed in a metalanguage sourced from natural language (Wierzbicka, 1996: 23). The basic assumption of the NSM theory concerned with the principles of semiotics, as stated in the quote " *a sign cannot be reduced to or analyzed into any combination of things which are not themselves signs; consequently, it is impossible to reduce meanings to any combination of things which are not themselves meanings"*. The principle states that the analysis of meaning will be discrete and complete, meaning as complex as anything can be explained without to be bias and no residues in other discrete meaning combination. (Goddard, 1996: 24; Wierzbicka, 1996: 10; Sutjiati, 1997: 110 ; Mulyadi, 1998: 35; Sudipa, 2005).

NSM theory contains some of important theoretical concepts, namely, the semantic prime, polysemy, aloleksi, choice valence and syntactic NSM. From those concepts, the most relevant concepts in analyzing the semantic structure of speech acts verbs in OJ are the semantic prime, polysemy, and syntax NSM. Semantic prime is a set of meanings that cannot be changed since it is inherited since human birth. This meaning is a reflection of the human mind fundamental (Goddard, 1996: 2). Semantic prime meanings have been investigated include the sphere of languages, both typological and genetically. A very important development that to be noted in 2002 Goddard and Wierzbicka has recorded 61 item original meaning in English. Polysemy no composition is the form of a single lexicon to express two different semantic. It means there is no correlation among one exponent to other exponents since the exponents have different grammatical framework. NSM syntactical by Wierzbicka is an extension of the original meaning. She said that the meaning has a very complex structure and not formed of simple elements, such as a person, wants, and to know, but also of complex structure components. Syntactically NSM consists of grains lexicon of universal semantic meaning which forms a simple proposition according to its morphosyntax device. For example: WANT will have certain universal rules in context: I WANT to do this (Wierzbicka, 1996: 19).

Related to the concept, the meaning explication would be analyzed by paraphrasing. According Wierzbicka (1996: 23; Sutjiati, 2000: 248; Sudipa, 2004: 147) NSM analysis technique using a paraphrase follows the rules, namely: (1) the paraphrase must use a combination of a number of original meanings that have been proposed by Wierzbicka. The combination of a number of meanings associated with the required original claims of the theory of NSM, a form cannot be deciphered only using one original meaning. (2) Paraphrased can also be done by using elements that constitute the distinctiveness of a language. This can be done by combining elements that constitute the uniqueness of the language itself to decipher the meaning. (3) The paraphrased sentence must follow the rules of syntax used for paraphrasing. (4) Paraphrased always use simple language. (5) The paraphrased sentence sometimes requires special indents and spacing. Associated with the theory and concepts that are referenced in assessing the semantic structure of speech act of verbs in OJ speech, then the application of the theory is very adequate because it can indicate a verb-forms of speech of OJ which has fine features that distinguish among one form to another

3. Methodology

An article would systematical if it is done with the appropriate application of methods and techniques. Therefore, this article is based on the three stages of methods and techniques, namely the methods and techniques providing data, methods and data analysis techniques, and the methods and techniques of presenting analysis. Related to the method used in providing data, the observation was used. The observation was not only related to the use of spoken language, but also written language. Tapping written language occurred if investigators are dealing with the use of text language, for example: the ancient texts, narrative texts, the languages in the mass media, and others (Mahsun, 2005; see also Bungin, 2001: 57; Moleong, 2000; Creswell, 2009). Text was the primary data source since it was related observation and tapping technique in written language. Note taking, record, translation also used to assist data improvement. Furthermore, it was the methods and techniques of analyzing data. The analysis used two kinds of methods, namely intralingua extra lingual the methods. The concept of comparing is to compare something or something to be compared such implies the existence connectedness while intralingua refers to elements that are in a language (character lingual). Intralingua method is a way of analysis applied by attributing compare the elements that are lingual, both contained in one language or in several different languages. While extra lingual method is to compare the elements that are outside language.

As a concrete step this study is completed by connect-compare equate (HBS) and connect-compare differentiate technique (HBB), and connect-connect equate the principal (Mahsun, 2005: 111-113; bd Djajasudarma (1993); Sudaryanto (1993). At this stage the rules that regulate the existence of the object of research should be formulated. At the final stage used methods and techniques of presenting analysis. The results of the analysis were described in two ways, namely (a) the formulation or description using words including the use of terminology that is technical and (b) the formulation by using the signs, tables or certain symbols that became a research convention. Both methods are commonly known by the method of informal and formal methods. This method was equipped with inductive-deductive techniques.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Classification of OJ Verbs

Verbs in OJL are classified according to Givon (1984: 51-52). Based on stability scale, Givon classified verbs semantically into three, namely (1) state verb that has most stable timing scale, (2) process verb, verbs are the timing less stable, and (3) action verbs, verbs unstable time. Action verbs are classified into three types, namely; (i) the type of movement, (ii) the type of speech, and (iii) the type of conduct. Verbs such as *Aminta* 'request', *makon* 'tell', *masamaya* 'promise', *sumapa* 'condemned', *angujar* 'say', and others are belonging to the types of verbs of speech / speech acts. Speech verb is what will be the subject of this paper. Verbs are classified into speech act verb are not only concerned about the proposition of an entity, but also fulfill the function of particular speech. Term of speech act stated by John Searle (1969) is to represent the meaning of verbs like this (Goddard, 1997: 109). According Wierzbicka (1987: 18) description of the meaning of speech verbs using two types of components that appear repeatedly, i.e. dictum- embodiment of the content of speech is clear, and illocutionary purpose that represents the intent of the speaker and giving reasons why the speech was done. The first component "I say termed to dictum, the second component is mapped "I say this because called illocutionary goal. Both of these components, the interaction between the speakers (P1) and the opponent he says (P2). As an illustrative for deeper understanding the data, it would be presented as the following sample data. *Mami añ-jaluk pehannya.*1PL   PREF-request milk-POSS 'we request its milk' The example above has dictum "I said ......" X (I) will ask for Z (milk) while the illocutionary goal is "X (I) say this because X (I) want Y to know the intention". The next stage is the explication that uses canonical sentence to identify the characteristics of semantic distinction that is sometimes very subtle and are often termed *slight semantic features* (Goddard, 2002: 22). Further, the verb meaning of speech acts in OJ analyzed based on Anna Wierzbicka classification who has analyzed 37 types of speech act verbs group of English. The classification would be relevant to examine the meaning of speech act verbs in OJ.

4.2 Speech Act Verb in OJ

Based on observations in OJ was found a number of verbs that include speech act. The verbs can be classified into: (1) **ask**: *mataña, tumaña, matakwan*; (2) **reply**: *masahur, sumahur, añeta*; (3) **request**: *aminta, maminta, añjaluk, angĕdö*; (4) **command**: *makon, akon, kumon*; (5) **promise**: *masamaya, sumapa, apunagi*; (6): **call**: *atag, ajêmur, anghundang*; (7) **scold**: *cumala, amrahasana*; (8) **persuade**: *ambada, amañcana, amrahasa, amarimisi*; (9) **advise**: *amitêkêti, atutur, matutur*; (10) **talk**: *dumĕlingakĕn* 'explain', *mangalasa* 'report', *agosthi* 'discuss', *adaya* 'talk'; (11) **complaint**: *asasambat*; (12) **accused**: *angdalih, dumalih*; (13) **entertain**: *amalĕh*; (14) **mocked**: *amid*; and (15) **berate**: *amisuh, añodya*. Furthermore, the verb will be mapped and paraphrased one by one to identify the slight meaning based on the distinguishing characteristics as follows.

4.2.1 Lexicon Mean 'ask'

The concept of 'ask' in OJ represented by lexicon *matanya, tumanya, matakwan, ajêmur*. The illocutionary purpose of *mataña*, *tumaña*, and *matakwan* are formed by the element to say something since this lexicon focuses on the response (I want you to say something '). The idea is emerged in the 'ask' starts from P1. In asking the speaker (P1) ask a question without implying that he do not know the answer, because people ask, not necessarily because he does not know, but he wants to know what will be said by the interlocutor (P2). As the teacher asked his students, it does not mean a teacher does not know about the questions asked, but a teacher wants to know what his students would say (there is an element of testing). Furthermore lexicon *mataña*, *tumaña*, *matakwan*, and *ajêmur* in OJ can be paraphrased as follows.

>   *Mataña, tumaña, matakwan* 'ask'
>   At that time, X says something to Y

> X says Y because X wants to say something
> X do not know what Y would say
> X says something like this.

4.2.2 Lexicon Mean 'reply'

The concept of 'reply' in OJ is expressed by three lexicons, namely; *masahur*, *sumahur*, *añeta*. Those lexicons have a correlation with the concept of 'asking' above, which want information.

> Examples in the text.
> *Sumahur sang prabhu*. 'The king answered '

In *masahur*, *sumahur*, *anêta* have different semantic specifications when compared to the concept of 'ask' that is the desire comes from (P2) therefore verbal response is required. In this concept the verbal response is required toward a question. Therefore requiring verbal responses then (P2) commits a question that (P1) must attempt to make an answer to what the (P2) want. The lexicons of verbs that have answered such a concept can be paraphrased like the following. *masahur, sumahur, añeta* 'answer'

> At that time, X says something to Y
> X says this because X thinks that Y wants X to say something
> X thinks that Y wants to know something
> X says something like this.

4.2.3 Lexicon Mean 'request'

The concept of 'request' in OJ is expressed by a number of lexicons, namely: *aminta*, *maminta*, *añjaluk*, *angĕdö*. These lexicons have little difference that used between speakers which is denoted by (P1) and (P2). Those lexicons have the same meaning, but it is necessary to be considered since it has been formed by the speakers of the languages concerned. Lexicon *aminta*, *maminta*, *añjaluk* 'ask' has the same field. Prefixes *ang-* and *mang-* in OJ has the same meaning of 'doing things, in accordance with the essential morpheme as exemplified in the following data.

(Datum-1) *Sira   am-(p)inta   kasih   maring   swami-nira*
      2SG   PREF-asked   love   PREP   husband-POSS3SG
    'He asked for the love of her husband'.

(Datum-2) *Mami   añ-jaluk   pêhan-ya*
      1PL   PREF-ask   milk-POSS3SG
    'I asked her milk'

At the time of the *aminta*, *maminta*, *añjaluk*, (P1) wants someone to do something that would be pleased (P1). The concepts of *aminta*, *maminta*, *añjaluk* almost parallel with the concept ask in English therefore it has a mapping component "I think of it as something will be good for me" (Wierzbicka, 1987: 49). People who involved as (P2) seem does not have done that, as in the English language component is mapped as "I assume that you do not have to do it". The concept is seen that P1 does not know for sure if (P2) will want do that. Thus, the subtype lexicon of *aminta*, *maminta*, *añjaluk* can be paraphrased like the following. *aminta, maminta, añjaluk 'meminta '*

> At that time, X says something to Y
> X says this is because the X wants Y do Z
> X thinks that Y does not have to do Z because of this
> X does not know whether the Y will do Z
> X says something like this.

The other concept of 'asking' is expressed with a lexicon angĕdö 'request by force'. The use of the lexicon in the sentence can be seen in the following data.

(Datum-3) *Naga Takshaka   ang-(k)ĕdö   ikang   kundala*
      name PREF-ask   DEF   pendant
    'Taksaka ask those pendant'.

The concept of *angĕdö* 'demand the' is somewhat different from the concept of requested above. In this case between (P1) and (P2) there may be something that should be owned by (P1) so that (P1) do it, (P2) not willingly give what (P1) want, therefore the lexicon angĕdö can be paraphrased like this ,
angĕdö 'requested by force'

74

At that time, X says something to Y
X says this is because the X wants Y do Z
X thinks that Y should do Z because this
X does not know whether the Y will do Z
X says something like this.

4.2.4 Lexicon Mean 'Tell'

The concept of 'tell' in OJL is expressed with three lexicons, namely: *kumon, makon, akon*, these lexicons do not have subtle differences in meaning since the three lexicons when aligned with the prefix Men- in Indonesian. The use of the lexicon in a single sentence compared to other sentences remains for meaning of an activity uttered as in the following sentences.

(Datum -4) *Sira   k-um-on Uttangka ma-gawaya putrotpadana*
　　　　 2SG INF-ask name PREF-make born ceremony
　　　　 'He asked Uttangka make born ceremony'.

 (Datum-5) *Bhagawan Bhisma Arjuna sang ma-kon mang-ajya dhanursastra*
　　　　 ART name name   ARTPREF-order   PREF-learn archery
　　　　 'Bhagwan Bhisma told Arjuna learn archery'

(Datum-6) *Prabhu Dasaratha a-kon   putra-nira   a-tilar maring kadatwan*.
　　　　 King   name PREF-told son-POSS   PREF-leave PREP the palace
　　　　 'King Dasaratha told his son to leave the palace'

People have assumed that (P1) has the power to (P2), (P2) should do what has said. Therefore this speech verb implies that (P1) wanted someone (P2) to do something. (P2) have to do it. Therefore, it would affect the (P2) so that the lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.
makon, tumon and akon 'tell'

At that time, X says something to Y
X says this is because the X wants Y do Z
X thinks that Y should do Z because this
X says something like this

4.2.5 Lexicon Mean 'Promise'

The concept of 'promise' in OJ is expressed with three lexicons, namely; *masamaya*, *apunagi*, *sumapa*. Those lexicons are formed by polysemy say / think. The lexicons have subtle distinguishing features. In concept promised between (P1) and (P2) believe that he will do something because I (P1) want you (P2) think that I should do something. In promising the speaker has a moral obligation to do what has been agreed that should be implemented. Otherwise, the speaker would assume that the speaker is a person who cannot be trusted, a liar, and so forth. Agreement between (P1) and (P2) has pledged to hold something. Example: *I Lutung masamaya ajak I kakua* 'the monkey promised Tortoise'. In the story the monkey broke the promise. Lexicon *masamaya* can be paraphrased like the following. *masamaya* 'promise'

At that time, X says something to Y
X says this because the X wants Y do Z
X thinks that Y will perform Z because this
X knows that Y is not going to do Z, Y would have thought that X is a bad person
X says something like this.

Lexicon '*apunagi*' 'swear'. In concept of swearing between (P1) and (P2) declare an agreement of something, for example: between (P1 and P2) vowed not to repeat their bad actions again. If one of them violates the vow, something will happen in the future. The oath usually occurs in quite a long time and can be adjusted to the concept of *karmaphala* as the result of an act which has violated. Lexicon *apunagi* can be paraphrased as follows. *apunagi* 'swear'

At that time, X says something to Y
X says this because X wants something Y
X thinks that Y would do this
X agrees that the Y will do Z
X says something like this.

In the lexicon *sumapa* 'condemned'. The concept of condemn requires something will happen in the future, if between (P1) and (P2) have made a promise. (P1) want (P2) to do something, and if something is not done by (P2), then (P1) will say something to (P2) so it would happen to (P2). Here there is a moral value that must be obeyed. Lexicon *sumapa* can be paraphrased like the following. *sumapa* 'condemned'

> At that time, X says something to Y
> X says this is because the X wants Y do Z
> X thinks that Y will perform Z because this
> X does not know why Y did Z
> X says something like this.

4.2.6 Lexicon Mean 'Call'

The concept of 'calling' in OJ is expressed with three lexicons, namely *atag, angundang, umaradhana*. Among the three lexicons there are subtle meaning is implied. In the lexicon *atag* 'call' is usually used to call something that is commonly used in ceremonies such as *atag* gods of plants. People *atag* doing means something that said by the speaker (P1) in order to (P2) approve of what (P1) want. (P1)'s hope for something that is owned in order to be better, by saying something to the speaker (P2) which is not explicitly stated. Finally, the speaker expresses *atag* like the following.

> *Atag* 'invite'
> At the time, X says something good on Y
> X says this because X wants something good happen to Y
> X thinks that something good was going to happen at the Y
> X says something like this.

Lexicon *angundang* 'invite' requires that a person wants someone would go to such a place. Someone said *angundang* that the speaker has something that needs to be approached by someone. (P1) tells about something to (P2) that there will be important events that should be known. For that (P1) said this to (P2), (P2) realized that he had come to that place. Furthermore lexicon *angundang* can be paraphrased like the following.

> *Angundang* 'invite'
> At the time, X says something good on Y
> X said this; because the X wants Y comes at a good event
> Y feels something good for this
> X says something like this.

Lexicon *umaradhana* 'adore (gods that came)' states that a person wants someone (gods) come in the place of worship. The semantic component contained in the lexicon *umaradhana*, namely the type of movement. Someone said *umaradhana* that the speaker has something to be approached by someone. (P1) wants many times (P2) in order to arrive at a cult that (P1) want. Therefore, the seriousness of (P1) in adore (P2) confers (P1)'s desire, that is (P2) coming to a place of worship (P1). Thus, (P1) said this to (P2) and (P2) realizes that he must come to a place of worship. Furthermore, *umaradhana* lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.

> At the time, X says something good on Y
> X says this; because the X wants Y comes at a good event
> X feel something bad for this
> X says something like this.

Those lexicons mean 'call' have moving semantic components. Likely, the lexicon atag, angundang, and umaradhana are formed by polysemy 'say' and 'move'.

4.2.7 Lexicon Mean 'Scold'

The concept of "scold" in OJ is expressed with two lexicons, namely *cumala* 'blame' and lexicon *amrahasana* 'joke / fight'. People doing 'cumala' say that there is other person (P2) who has done something that is not desirable because it can be detrimental to other (P1). Thus, someone was saying this. Furthermore lexicon can *cumala* be paraphrased like the following.

> At that time, X says something bad on Y
> X says this because the Y does something undesirable by X
> X wants Y does not do something similar in future

Y feel something bad because this

X says something like this.

Contrast to the lexicon *amrahasana* 'joking'. The lexicon has slight meaning as distinguishing characteristics, namely people who joked is backed by something that is not good between (P1) and (P2). Something bad has been said by the speaker, but it was promptly rejected by the speaker (P2) since of something that has been said it is not necessarily true, until (P1) and (P2) are in argument this case is expressed by *amrahasana*. This lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.

At that time, X says something bad on Y

X says this is because the X feels something bad on Y

Y never doing anything about Z

Y being offended of the action

X and Y each joke

X and Y are both said like this.

4.2.8 Lexicon Mean 'Persuade'

The concept of persuading is expressed with three lexicons namely: *ambada*, *amarimisi*, and *amañcana*. Lexicons *ambada* and *amarimisi* have the same meaning terrain is persuaded by way of flirting. People said *ambada* and *amarimisi* in OJ, which are between (P1) and (P2) there is an element of knowing each other. (P1) have something to say to (P2) therefore (P1) wants (P2) to fulfill his desire, (P2) do not want to fulfill (P1)'s desire until (P1) repeatedly saying something with a little gestures shades evoke a sense of love. Lexicons *ambada* and *amarimisi* can be paraphrased like following.

At that time, X says something to Y

X says this is because the X wants Y do Z

X thinks that Y may not necessarily meet the desires X

X says something like this.

In contrast to the lexicon *ambada* and *amarisini* above, lexicon *amañcana* has a subtle meaning as the distinguishing feature among those lexicons. Lexicon *amañcana* has the impression a bit pushy and flirting with the intention to harm. People doing *amañcana* that the speakers (P1) wants something happen to someone in a way somewhat tempting, but (P2) do not know that something is going to do. Here there is the impression of a little tease and harm from afar. If the lexicon is paraphrased it would look like the following.

At that time, X says something to Y

X wants this because X wants something happen to Y

X thinks that X should implement Z

X says something like this.

4.2.9 Lexicon Mean 'Advise'

The concept of **advise** in OJL is expressed by lexicons, *amitĕkĕti*, *atutur*, *matutur* '. These lexicons give information between S and H. Those lexicons do not have the different subtle meaning, but precisely the same meaning. The concept of 'advising' indicates someone (P1) more experienced to know something first and finally can give an advice to someone. Person doing *amitĕkĕti*, *atutur*, and *matutur* is that person will say something nice to someone in order to not fall into the cavil. (P1) knows what should be done by (P2) and he is sure that what is said to be good if (P2) followed his advice, (P1) believes in something that said to be followed by (P2). The lexicons can be paraphrased like the following.

Amitĕkĕti, atutur, and matutur 'advise'

For some time, X says something to Y

X says this because X want Y to know what he can do

X thinks that X may cause Y do Z

If Y executes Z,

X thinks that Y would be good in the future

X says something like this.

4.2.10 Lexicon Mean 'Discuss'

Speech verb talking in OJ is expressed with six lexicons, namely: *dumĕlingakĕn*, *adoya*, *agosthi*, *adaya*, *cumarita*, *mawreta*. These lexicons are formed of polysemy say / think. The six lexicons have subtle distinguishing features. People doing *dumĕlingakĕn* 'explain' indicates that (P1) want to say something important that needs to be considered by (P2) in order to become clearer. (P1) thinks that things will be better so (P2) listen carefully. *Dumĕlingakĕn* lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.

> At that time, X says about something on Y
> X says this, X wants Y can understand it
> X thinks that Y will be able to do something better
> X says like this.

Speech types such as *adoya*, *adaya* and *agosthi* 'discuss' have the same field that is discussing something. The purpose of these illocutionary verbs is between (P1) and (P2) become more informed, for example, there is one topic to be discussed. People say *Adaya*, *adoya* and *agosthi* that (I want to say something) about something to (P2) so they both got a good result. In this case there is nuances rather serious response. Lexicon *adaya, adoya, agosthi* can be paraphrased like the following.

> At that time, X says about something to Y
> X says this is because X wants Y do this
> X thinks that Y would do it
> X know something good would happen between them
> X says like this.

Types of speech verb 'discuss' can also be expressed with a lexicon *cumarita* 'tells', *mawrĕta* 'inform'. The purpose of this is illocutionary verb is to convey information. People doing *cumarita*, *mawrĕta* (I want to say something of this, about something the participants. There is a possibility (P2) is not too serious about what (P1) to say. In this case there is an impression that someone is willing or not to listen to something. In *cumarita* typically used to convey something that has historical value (can be good or bad), the information submitted in *mawrĕta* usually is good. Finally lexicon *cumarita* and *mawrĕta* can be paraphrased like the following.

> At that time, X says something to Y
> X says this because X wants to know something about the Z (good or bad)
> X thinks that Y would do this
> X says something like this.

4.2.11 Llexicon Mean 'Complain'

The concept of 'complain' in OJ is expressed with lexicon *masasambat*. The use of the lexicon *masambat* in the clause can be seen the following text.

(Datum-7) *Sang   Puloma   ma-sambat   i   sang jalu*
　　　　ART   name   PREF-complain PREP ART   husband
　　'The Puloma complained to her husband'.

On the data contained a dialogue between Puloma with her husband. Between (P1) delivers something to her husband (P2) about something bad has happened to her. In terms of *masasambat*, the illocution meaning is to tell people that something bad had happened to (P1) so that (P1) say something since being irritation. Lexicon *masasambat* can be paraphrased as follows.

> At that time, X says something to Y
> X says this because X was irritated about something that happened X
> X feel something bad had happened because of this
> X says something like this.

4.2.12 Lexicon Mean 'Accuse'

The concept of "accuse" in OJL is expressed by the lexicon *angdalih*, *dumalih*. These lexicons express the meaning of primal say and think. Someone accused based on the assumption that the other person did something bad, like stealing, cheating, and so forth that the truth is uncertain. Therefore, the accused means a person to act or behave in a bad thing repeatedly.

Someone accused feel bad as a result of the allegations (Y feel something bad because of this). Lexicon *angdalih* and *dumalih* that expressing the concept of accused in OJL has the same meaning field therefore the lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.

At that time, X says something to Y
X says this is because the X thinks that Y does something bad (Z) thinks never done this
X thinks that something bad should happen to Y
X wants that Y will feel something bad because this
X says something like this.

4.2.13 Lexicon Mean 'Entertain'

Speech verb 'entertain' in OJ is expressed by *amalĕh* lexicon. Lexicon *amalĕh* has a illocutionary goal 'I do not want you to do something'. In *amalĕh* (P1) can be said want to make someone (P2) feel better. For example, (P2) feels sad for too long. (P1) is trying to do something in order to P2 does not do something that is not good. (X thinks that Y can do something that is not good so he need to be entertained. Therefore, lexicon *amalĕh* can be paraphrase like the following.
At that time, X said something to Y
X says this because X does not want Y to do Z
X thinks that something can occur at Y
X says something like this.

4.2.14 Lexicon Mean 'Mock'

The concept of 'mock' in OJ is expressed by lexicon *amid* 'mock'. The illocutionary purpose of this lexicon is someone has done something improper than usual. The speaker's actions could be interpreted *amid* 'something bad' happens to someone. Someone mocked is a negative expression. Someone who mocks can actually affect a person's emotions to behave better than what has been done so far ('X thinks that Y can do something better). Therefore, the lexicon can be paraphrased like the following.
At that time, X says something to Y
X says this because X does not want Y to do Z
X thinks that Y can do something better than this
X says something to Y like this.

4.2.15 Lexicon Mean 'berate'

Type the verb 'berate' in OJ is expressed with *amisuh* lexicon and *añodya* 'berate' field of meaning contained in both is the same verb that is to revile. These types of verbs louder than verbs types scolding above. Therefore people who *amisuh* and *añodya* usually are very angry people. It caused P1 says a scathing words, even to denounce, degrading, and others. Even with rage sometimes people say things without thinking. The temporal property is faster i.e 'for some time' when compared verb types scolding above. These types of verbs can be paraphrased as follows.

For some time, X says something that is bad at Y
X thinks like this,
Someone has done something very bad to me I really do not want to be treated like this Sometimes because of this, X said something without thinking
Y feel something bad because this
X says something like this.

5. *Conclusion*

Based on the analysis above, in OJL is found 15 groups of verbs of speech. The lexicon groups generally have two to five forms lexicon. Besides, there is the notion of lexicon represented by one lexicon and some are represented by six lexicons. Different in the semantic form and semantic structure those lexicons can be seen from the semantic features that have same meaning field. By way of explication, each lexicon reflected two important components of semantics, namely dictum and illocutionary purposes, which reveal subtle meaning in each lexicon. Thus, in the science of semantic postulates, one form one meaning and one meaning for one form is adequate in each lexicon could be analyzed thoroughly without any bias.

6. Suggestion

This article is far from perfect. Therefore all critics and constructive suggestions that is very expected. In addition, it also for enthusiasts to OJL in order to conduct better research to increase the treasures of linguistic research is conducted on both of OJL or other languages. Reminding in Indonesia saves many old manuscripts that many have not investigation by the researchers.

Reference

Givon, Talmy. 1984. "Syntax: A Functional Typological Introduction". Vol 1. Amsterdam John Benjamins

Goddard,Cliff. 1996. Semantic Theory and Semantic Universal (Cliff. Goddard Convenor) Cross Linguistic Syntax from Semantic Point of view (NSM Aprroach) 1-5 Australia.

Goddard, Cliff. 1997. Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction. Australia: The University of New England.

Goddard, Cliff. 2002. The Search for the Shared Semantic Core of All Language. Australia: University of New England.

Mardiwarsito, L. dan Harimurti Kridalaksana. 1984. Struktur Bahasa Jawa Kuna. Jakarta: Nusa Indah.

Mulyadi, 1998."Struktur Semantis Verba Bahasa Indonesia".(Tesis S2 Linguistik Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana).

Searle, John. 1969. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: CUP

Sudipa, I Nengah. 2004. "Verba Bahasa Bali, Sebuah Kajian Metabahasa Semantik Alami". (Disertasi Doktor Linguistik Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana Denpasar).

Sudipa, I Nengah.2006. "Verba Tindak Tutur Bahasa Bali: Suatu Kajian MSA". (Makalah disampaikan pada Kongres Bahasa Bali VI pada tahun 2006. Pemerintah Daerah Tingkat I Bali).

Sutjiati, Beratha. 1997. "Basic Concepts of a Universal Semantic Metalanguage". Linguistika.110-115. Denpasar. Program Magister Linguistik Unud.

Sutjiati, Beratha. 2000. "Struktur dan Peran Semantis Verba Ujaran Bahasa Bali" dalam Kajian Serba Linguistik. Halaman 247-251). Kaswanti Purwo (Penyunting). Jakarta: BPK Gunung Mulia.

Uhlenbeek, E. M. 1964. A Critical Survey of Studies on the Languages of Jawa and Madura. Martinus Nijhoff: 's-Gravenhage.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1987. English Speech Act Verb: A Semantic Dioctionary. New York: Academic Press.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1996. Semantics: Primes and Universal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wojowasito, S. 1982. Kawisastra. Jakarta: Djambatan.

Zoetmulder, P. J.dan S. O. Robson (edisi terjemahan). 1995. Kamus Bahasa Jawa Kuna-Indonesia. Oleh Darusuprapta dan Sumarti Suprayitna. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Zoetmulder, P.J. 1983. Kalangwan: Sastra Jawa Kuno Selayang Pandang. (edisi terjemahan oleh Dick Hartoko S. J.). Jakarta: Djambatan.

Zoetmulder, P.J. 2006. Adiparva Bahasa Jawa Kuna dan Indonesia. Surabaya: Paramita.