

E-journal

**EMOTION VERBS IN BAHASA INDONESIA AND ASAHAN MALAY
LANGUAGE: CROSS-LANGUAGE SEMANTICS ANALYSIS**

Mulyadi

Indonesian Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences
University of North Sumatera
Email: drsmulyadi_mhum@yahoo.com

Ni Luh Sutjiati Beratha

English Department Faculty of Letters, Udayana University
Oktavianus

English Department Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Andalas University
I Nengah Sudipa

English Department Faculty of Letters, Udayana University

Abstract

This research aims to compare the semantics of emotion verbs in Indonesian (EVI) and that in Asahan Malay (EVAM). The problems under study cover (1) the parameters of emotion verbs, (2) the construction of emotion verbs, (3) the categorization of emotion verbs, (4) the meaning of emotion verbs, and (5) the semantic roles of arguments for emotion verbs. With formal parameters, emotion verbs were tested by using (1) transitive, (2) interrogative, (3) progressive, (4) adverbial *dengan sengaja* 'deliberately', and (5) reflexive. The semantic test was employed by using the component 'X merasakan sesuatu karena X memikirkan sesuatu' (X felt something because X thought something). In the causative construction, EVI form dative-experiencer pattern marked with a preposition. EVI and EVAM can be subcategorized into stative-active emotion verbs. The difference of their components covers (1) *sedih* vs *sodih*, (2) *khawatir* vs *gopoh*, (3) *terpukau* vs *tabodoh*, (4) *lega* vs *tonang*, dan (5) *frustrasi* vs *suntuk*.

The meaning of EVI and EVAM are different in terms of their element or (sub-) component. For SEV, the difference in meaning was found in the verbs (1) *sedih* vs *sodih*, (2) *susah* vs *susah*, (3) *takut* vs *cuak*, (4) *khawatir* vs *gaduh*, (5) *risau* vs *riso*, (6) *gugup* vs *gopoh*, (7) *panik* vs *tagomap*, (8) *malu* vs *malu*, (9) *segan* vs *sogan*, (10) *kaget* and *terkejut* vs *takojut*, and (11) *terpukau* vs *tabodoh*. Meanwhile, for AEV, the meaning difference was found in the verbs (1) *gembira* and *girang* vs *mogah*, (2) *lega* vs *tonang*, (3) *frustrasi* vs *suntuk*, (4) *iri* vs *angek*, (5) *jenuh* and *jemu* vs *jolak*, (6) *jengkel* vs *palak* and *rising*, and (7) *keki* vs *marsak*. SEV require UNDERGOER for the subject. For AEV, the subject is the ACTOR, and the object is the UNDERGOER. The difference of thematic relations in the two languages was found in the emotion verbs *jengkel* (BI) and *rising* (BMA).

Key words: *emotion verbs, semantic components, categorization, meaning, and semantic roles*

1. Introduction

A study of across languages is generally based on structural property. This study offers a new perspective to analyze emotion verbs, that is, from meaning to form by presenting evidence taken from Indonesian language ‘Bahasa Indonesia’ (abbreviated to BI) and Asahan Malay language ‘Bahasa Melayu Asahan’ (abbreviated to BMA). The reasons why emotion verbs were chosen were that (1) their expressions refer to the basic human experiences; (2) their semantic classes are not well restricted yet (Kitis, 2008: 3; Liu and Hong, 2008: 108); and (3) their significances are higher than concrete lexicon to explore.

Both BI and BMA may be well used to examine cases to trace the changes or shifts in meaning taking place in the cognitive structures produced by their speakers. It is assumed that the speakers of the two languages conceptualize their emotions differently. So far, no complete analysis has been made for emotion verbs in Indonesian (abbreviated to EVI) (see Mulyadi, 1998a; 1998b, 2001). Furthermore, emotion verbs in Asahan Malay language (abbreviated to EVAM) have not been analyzed at all, except for its semantic classes which have been discussed in brief by Bakar et al. (1996).

The initial evidence shows that there are five interesting semantic aspects as far as emotion verbs in across languages are concerned. The first aspect is that there is not always any one-to-one correspondence between EVI and EVAM. As an illustration, while BI differentiates the words *senang* (pleased), *riang* (cheerful), and *bahagia* (happy) lexically, BMA only has one word, namely, *senang* as their equivalent. The second aspect is that both EVI and EVAM have

complicated semantic relations. The word *marah* (angry), for example, in addition to being related to the words *murka* (rage), *kalap* (being angry as if being possessed by an evil spirit), *berang* (furious) and *gusar* (angry), is also related to *sewot* (furious); the word *sewot* is related to the words *jengkel* (annoyed) and *dongkol* (resentful); and the word *dongkol* is related to the word *kesal* (disappointed); and the word *kesal* is related to the words *dongkol*, *sebal* (resentful) and *kecewa* (disappointed).

The third aspect is that the dichotomy of being bad and being good used to describe the category of emotion verbs seems to be simplistic. The fact is that emotion verbs of *terkejut* (shocked), *kaget* (startled), and *heran* (surprised) in BI or *takojut*, *heran*, *tabodoh* (speechless) in BMA have neutral referents. The fourth aspect is that emotion verbs which belong to the same domain may have different configurations of meaning. The word *senang*, for example, can be followed by the prepositional phrase containing an animate entity; however, such a behavior is not grammatical in the words *bahagia* (happy), *gembira* (delighted), *riang* (cheerful), and *girang* (joy). And the fifth aspect is that EVI and EVAM have different semantic roles although they belong to the same class. The word *sayang* (pity) (BI), for example, is followed by the target of emotion; however, the word *mogah* (joy) (BMA) is followed by the topic of emotion under discussion.

The problems of the present study are formulated as follows: (1) what formal-semantic parameter could be accurately used to identify the EVI and EVAM memberships; (2) what the profile of the EVI-EVAM construction was like, especially the experiencer conceptualization; (3) in what degree the

categorizations of EVI and EVAM were different and similar; (4) how the meanings of emotion verbs could be compared in the two languages; and (5) how the semantic roles of the EVI-EVAM arguments were realized?

2. Research Method

Qualitative approach was used in this study (see Denzin and Lincoln, 2003: 3-4; Janesick, 2000: 382; Grix, 2004: 173; and Bungin, 2007: 23). The main data used in this study were the oral and written data obtained using observation and interview methods (Sudaryanto, 1993; Mahsun, 2005). The data were also completed with intuitive data obtained reflectively and introspectively.

The data were analyzed using identity and distribution methods (Sudaryanto, 1993; Mahsun, 2005). The identity method was used to identify the membership of emotion verbs and to compare their constructions and categorizations. The distribution method was used to compare the meaning and role of the arguments of emotion verbs. The results of data analysis were formally and informally presented (Sudaryanto, 1993: 145; Mahsun, 2005: 116). Informal presentation means that the results of data analysis was presented using words or sentences and formal presentation means that the results of data analysis was presented using signs, symbols, tables and figures.

3. Discussion

3.1 The Parameters of Emotion Verbs

EVI and EVAM were limited using the formal-semantic parameters. The formal parameters of emotion verbs included (1) transitive, (2) interrogative, (3) progressive, (4) adverbial *dengan sengaja* ‘intentionally’, and (5) reflexive. Emotion verbs and volition verbs fulfilled the transitive test; however, sensation verbs were intransitive (for example, *mencurigai* (suspect)/*menyukai* (like)/**menggigili*). The interrogative test (*Hatinya dalam keadaan apa?* ‘How did he feel?’) was relevant to emotion verbs, anomaly on sensation verbs, and was doubtful on volition verbs (for example, *Hatinya kecewa?* (Was he/she disappointed)/*??dahaga* (thirst)/*?berhasrat* (desire). The test of the adverbial *dengan sengaja* was acceptable to emotion verbs and volition verbs; however, it was unacceptable to sensation verbs (for example, *sengaja kasihan* (intentionally taking pity on ..)/*berselera* (having desire)/**gatal* (itchy). The reflexive test was acceptable to emotion verbs and sensation verbs, except for volition verbs (for example, *heran* (surprised)/*asyik* (infatuated)**berahi pada diri sendiri*/self sexual desire).

The semantic parameter of emotion verbs was formulated into the components which were framed within the cognitive scenario. The components were ‘X MERASAKAN sesuatu karena X MEMIKIRKAN sesuatu’ (X FELT something because X THOUGH something’ (compared to ‘X MERASAKAN sesuatu karena sesuatu terjadi pada bagian dari TUBUH X’ (X FELT something because something happened to the X’ BODY) (sensation verbs) and ‘X MENGINGINKAN sesuatu karena

sesuatu terjadi pada bagian dari TUBUH X (X WANTED something because something happened to the X' BODY) (volition verbs). As illustrations, *jengkel* (annoyed), *girang* (joy), and *gusar* (angry) (BI) or *mogah* (joy), *curigo* (suspect), and *cuak* (frightened) (BMA) were emotion verbs. In contrast, the words *puas* (satisfied), *lesu* (tired), and *sengsara* (miserable) were not emotion verbs; they were sensation verbs instead.

3.2 The Construction of Emotion Verbs: BI and BMA

BI has three syntactical patterns for conceptualizing the experiencer; they are the experiencer as the subject (ES), the experiencer as the object (EO), and the experiencer as the dative (ED). BMA only has two syntactical patterns; they are ES and EO. The construction of ES was formed in the passive structure (for example, *Aku terpukau melihat peristiwa itu = Tobodoh aku manengok kajadian-tu* 'I got stunned at seeing such an event'); in the active structure (for example, *Ia sudah lama mendendam kami = Sudah lamo dio-tu mandondam kami* 'He/she has resented us for a long time'), and in the incoative structure (for example, *Banyak pembeli meragukan barang ini = Rame pembeli meragukan kaelokan barang-ni* 'Many buyers were uncertain of the quality of this good'). In the ES verb, BI inserts what caused the PP to have emotion; however, in BMA, what caused the emotion tended to be placed in the subordinate clause (for example, *Kita tidak perlu sedih atas ucapannya = Tak perlu kita sedih karonu cakapnya* 'We do not need to be made to be sad by what he/she has uttered').

The EO is constructed in the causative construction (for example, *Tingkahnya menggemaskan kami = Peelnyo manggomaskan kami* ‘His/her behavior annoyed us’). In BI the EO is productively constructed in the morphological causative construction, while in BMA it is syntactically constructed (compared to *jengkel-menjengkelkan* in *palak-*mamalakkan; rising-*marisingkan*). In the causative expression, EVI can form ED marked with preposition; however, in BMA such an experiencer is usually changed into a passive construction (for example, *Kepergian ayahnya sangat menyedihkan baginya = Nan sodihan dio-tu ditinggalkan ayahnya* ‘Being left by his/her father, he/she felt sad’). In BI, the stimulus_subject in the periphrastic causative neither is nor marked; however, in BMA, it is generally marked and its matrix clause is relativized to limit the stimulus (for example, *Mayat itu membiki kami ngori = Mayat-tula nam mambikin kami ngori* ‘The human corpse made us horrified’).

3.3 The Categorization of Emotion Verbs

EVI and EVAM can be divided into stative emotion verbs (SEV) and active emotion verbs (AEV). The SEV is featured by [-kendali (controlled), -volisi (volition)], whereas AEV is featured by [+kendali, +volisi]. The SEV scenario is that ‘*X merasakan sesuatu, BUKAN KARENA X MENGINGINKANNYA* (X felt something, NOT BECAUSE X WANTED IT); however the AEV scenario is that ‘*X merasakan sesuatu KARENA X MENGATAKAN SESUATU PADA DIRINYA YANG DAPAT MENYEBABKAN SESEORANG MERASAKAN SESUATU*’ (X felt something BECAUSE X WAS SAYING TO HIM/HERSELF THINGS WHICH COULD CAUSE ONE TO FEEL IT). As some illustrations,

the words *terharu* (compassion), *kaget* (surprised), and *ngeri* (horrified) in BI belong to SEV as they suit the subcomponent '*bukan karena X menginginkannya*'; the words *mogah* (joy), *bonci* (hate), and *palak* (annoyed) are AEV as they suit the subcomponent '*karena X mengatakan sesuatu pada dirinya yang dapat menyebabkan seseorang merasakan sesuatu*'.

SEV is divided into subcategories; they are (1) '*sesuatu yang buruk terjadi*' (something bad happened) ("mirip sedih" 'sad-like'); (2) '*sesuatu yang buruk dapat/akan terjadi*' (something bad can/will happen) ("mirip takut" 'fear-like'); (3) '*orang-orang dapat memikirkan sesuatu yang buruk tentang aku*' (people can think something bad about me) ("mirip malu" 'shame-like'); and (4) '*aku tidak berpikir bahwa hal seperti ini dapat/akan terjadi*' (I didn't think that things like this can/will happen) ("mirip heran" 'amazed-like'). AEV is divided into several categories; (1) '*sesuatu yang baik terjadi*' (something good happened) ("mirip senang" 'happy-like'); (2) '*aku berpikir tentang sesuatu*' (I think about something) ("mirip sangsi" 'doubt-like'); (3) '*aku telah melakukan sesuatu yang buruk*' (I did something bad) ("mirip menyesal" 'remorse-like'); (4) '*aku memikirkan seseorang yang lain*' (I think about someone else) ("mirip cinta" 'love-like'); and (5) '*aku tidak ingin hal seperti ini terjadi*' (I don't want things like this to happen) ("mirip marah" 'angry-like').

In the level of certain categories, BI is similar to and different from BMA. They are similar in the level of subcategories as can be reflected by the verbs "*mirip malu*" (shame-like), "*mirip senang*" (happy-like), "*mirip menyesal*" (remorse-like), "*mirip cinta*" (love-like), and "*mirip marah*" (angry-like). They are

different in terms of the verb “*mirip heran*” (amazed-like) as *terpukau* vs *tabodoh* (being stunned) and the verb “*mirip sangsi*” (doubt-like) as *frustrasi* vs *suntut* (being frustrated). In the level of subcategory, BI is different from BMA in terms of the verb “*mirip sedih*” (sad-like) as illustrated by *sedih* vs *sodih*, the verb “*mirip sangsi*” as illustrated by *lega* vs *tonang*, and the verb “*mirip takut*” (fear-like) as illustrated by *khawatir* vs *gopoh*.

3.4 The Meaning of Emotion Verbs

The meaning of EVI is different from that of EVAM in regard to (sub-) components. As far as SEV is concerned, the differences in meaning include (1) *sedih* (‘...’) vs *sodih* (‘*aku ingin berpikir tentang hal ini*’) (I want to think about this thing); (2) *susah* (‘*aku ingin seseorang melakukan sesuatu*’) (I want someone to do something) vs *susah* (‘*aku ingin seseorang merasakan sesuatu yang baik tentang aku*’) (I want someone to feel something good about me); (3) *takut* (‘*aku tidak tahu apa yang akan terjadi*’) (I don’t know what will happen) vs *cuak* (‘*aku tahu apa yang akan terjadi jika aku melakukan sesuatu*’) (I know what will happen if I do something); (4) *khawatir* (‘*aku tidak tahu apakah aku dapat melakukan sesuatu sekarang*’) (I don’t know if I can do something now) vs *gaduh* (‘*aku tidak dapat melakukan apa pun*’) (I can’t do anything); (5) *risau* (‘*aku tidak dapat melakukan apa pun*’) (I can’t do anything) vs *riso* (‘*aku tidak dapat melakukan apa pun SEKARANG*’) (I can’t do anything NOW); (6) *gugup* (‘*aku tidak tahu apa yang akan terjadi jika aku melakukan sesuatu*’) (I don’t know what will happen if I do something) vs *gopoh* (‘*sesuatu yang buruk sedang terjadi*’)

(something bad is happening); (7) **panik** (*‘sesuatu yang buruk sedang terjadi sekarang’*) (something bad is happening now) vs **tagomap** (*‘sesuatu yang buruk sedang terjadi PADA KU sekarang’*) (something bad is happening TO ME now); (8) **malu** (*‘...’*) vs **malu** (*‘aku tidak ingin dekat dengan orang-orang’*) (I don’t want to be near to people); (9) **segan** (*‘aku tidak ingin melakukan SESUATU’*) (I don’t want to do SOMETHING) vs **sogan** (*‘aku tidak dapat melakukan APA YANG AKU INGINKAN’*) (I can’t do WHAT I WANT TO); (10) **kaget** (*‘BEBERAPA HAL yang buruk sedang terjadi’*) (SOME bad THINGS is happening) and **terkejut** (*‘SESUATU yang buruk sedang terjadi’*) (SOMETHING bad is happening) vs **takojut** (*‘sesuatu yang SANGAT buruk sedang terjadi’*) (something VERY bad is happening); and (11) **terpukau** (*‘aku tidak dapat berpikir tentang hal-hal yang lain sekarang’*) (I can’t think about other things now) vs **tabodoh** (*‘aku tidak tahu apa yang dapat aku lakukan’*) (I don’t know what I can do).

In AEV, the differences in meaning include (1) **gembira** (*‘sesuatu yang baik SEDANG terjadi’*) (something good IS HAPPENING) and **girang** (*‘aku tahu sekarang: sesuatu yang sangat baik telah terjadi’*) (I know now: something very good happened) vs **mogah** (*‘aku tahu sekarang: sesuatu yang sangat baik telah terjadi PADA KU’*) (I know now: something very good happened TO ME); (2) **lega** (*‘aku berpikir: sesuatu yang buruk akan terjadi’*) (I think: something bad will happen) vs **tonang** (*‘aku berpikir: sesuatu yang buruk akan terjadi PADA KU’*) (I think: something bad will happen TO ME); (3) **frustrasi** (*‘...’*) vs **suntuk** (*‘aku tidak tahu apa yang dapat aku lakukan sekarang’*) (I don’t know what I can do now); (4) **iri** (*‘sesuatu yang baik telah terjadi pada orang ini’*) (something good

happened to this person) vs **angek** (*‘sesuatu yang baik telah terjadi pada orang ini SEKARANG’*) (something good happened to this person NOW); (5) **jenuh** (*‘aku telah melakukan hal yang sama’, ‘aku tidak ingin hal seperti ini terjadi’*) (I did the same things, I don’t want things like this to happen) and **jemu** (*‘BEBERAPA HAL YANG SAMA TELAH TERJADI’, ‘aku tidak ingin hal seperti ini terjadi sekarang’*) (SOME SAME THINGS HAPPENED, I don’t want things like this is to happen now); (6) **jengkel** (*‘aku tahu sekarang: SESEORANG telah melakukan sesuatu yang buruk’*) (I know now: SOMEONE did something bad) and **rising** (*‘aku tahu sekarang: ORANG-ORANG telah melakukan sesuatu yang buruk’*) (I know now: PEOPLE did something bad); and (7) **keki** (*‘aku tahu sekarang: seseorang telah melakukan sesuatu’*) (I know now: someone did something) vs **marsak** (*‘sesuatu yang buruk telah terjadi padaku sekarang’*) (something bad happened to me now).

3.5 The Semantic Roles of Arguments for Emotion Verbs

The semantic role is determined by referring to the SEV and AEV-based EVI-EVAM logic structure. The verbs “*mirip sedih*” (sad-like), “*mirip takut*” (fear-like), and “*mirip heran*” (amazed-like) are intransitive ones whose subjects serve as the Undergoer. The verb “*mirip malu*” (shame-like) has two arguments; the subject is the Undergoer and the object is the Actor. The verb “*mirip cinta*” (love-like) has the subject as the Actor and the object as the Undergoer. The verbs “*mirip senang*” (happy-like), “*mirip menyesal*” (remorse-like), and “*mirip marah*” (angry-like) have between one and two arguments. If the verb is transitive, the

subject is the Actor; however, if the verb is transitive, the first argument is the Actor and the second argument is the Undergoer.

The SEV forms the experiencer-theme and experiencer-locative relations; however, the verb “*mirip malu*” forms the experiencer-influencer relation. The experiencer is derived from the Undergoer; however, the theme and location play non macrorole. The experiencer is derived from the Actor and the locative is derived from the Undergoer. The theme may be derived from the Undergoer or plays non macrorole, depending on the verbal semantics.

4. Novelties

Some novelties could be presented as follows. First, the formal-semantic parameter was used to identify the membership of emotion verbs. The formal parameters proposed were (1) transitive, (2) interrogative (*Hatinya dalam keadaan apa?* ‘How did he feel?’), (3) progressive, (4) adverbial containing *dengan sengaja* ‘intentionally’, and (5) reflexive. The semantic domain was formulated as the component “X FELT something because X THOUGH something.’ Second, the evaluative-volitive component was used to mark the EVI-EVAM categorization. The generated types of components revealed that (1) both BI and BMA has redundancies in their lexicons of emotion and (2) both BI and BMA did not have any particular lexicon of emotion in their inventories.

Third, the syntactical configurations of EVI were different from that that of EVAM in terms of (1) the function causing the emotion, (2) the experiencer_object, (3) the experiencer_dative, and (4) the markedness of the

stimulus_object. Fourth, the categorizations of EVI and EVAM as stative emotion verbs and active emotion verbs were made depending on the features [kendali ‘controlled’, volisi ‘volition’]. The scenario of SEV had the component ‘X felt something, NOT BECAUSE X WANTED IT’ and the scenario of AEV contains the component ‘X felt something BECAUSE X WAS SAYING TO HIM/HERSELF THINGS WHICH COULD CAUSE ONE TO FEEL IT.

Fifth, emotion verbs of cross category found by examining components included the verbs “*mirip sedih*” (for example, *susah* (distress) (SEV) vs *kasihan* (pity) (AEV), “*mirip takut*” (for example, *cemas* (worry) (SEV) vs *curiga* (suspect) (AEV), “*mirip malu*” (for example, *segan* (reluctant) (SEV) vs *menyesal* (remorse) (AEV), and “*mirip heran*” (for example, *takjub* (astonished) (SEV) vs *kagum* (admiration) (AEV). Sixth, SEV differs from AEV in terms of subcategories. The subcategories of SEV were made of (1) “*mirip sedih*” (sad-like), (2) “*mirip takut*” (fear-like), (3) “*mirip malu*” (shame-like), and (4) “*mirip heran*” (amazed-like). The subcategories of AEV were made up of (1) “*mirip senang*” (happy-like), (2) “*mirip sangsi*” (doubt-like), (3) “*mirip menyesal*” (remorse-like), (4) “*mirip cinta*” (love-like), and (5) “*mirip marah*” (angry-like).

Seventh, the particular features which differed the meaning of EVI and that of EVAM were as follows. The features referring to elements were (1) personal, (2) temporal property, (3) types of events, (4) quality of events, (5) quantity of events, (6) actual/potential danger, and (7) particular persons. In terms of components, the differing features were (1) perception of thought, (2) request for assistance, (3) awareness of events, (4) submission, (5) distance, (6) existence

of others, (7) curiosity, (8) failure in thinking about, (9) failure in acting, (10) satisfaction, (11) arrogance, (12) repetition of events, and (13) perceptual.

Eighth, the differences in the number of arguments between EVI and EVAM were as follows. The verbs with single arguments included “*mirip sedih*”, “*mirip takut*”, and “*mirip heran*”; the verbs with multiple arguments were “*mirip malu*” and “*mirip cinta*”. The verbs which could have one or two arguments were “*mirip senang*”, “*mirip sangsi*”, “*mirip menyesal*”, and “*mirip marah*”. In terms of thematic relations, the differences between EVI and EVAM included *jengkel* ‘being annoyed’ (BI) and *rising* (BMA). The former was formed by the experiencer-locative relation and the latter was formed by the experiencer-theme.

5. Conclusion and Suggestion

5.1 Conclusion

Both formal and semantic parameters were recommended in this study. The formal parameter was used for emotion verbs such as (1) transitive, (2) interrogative (using the interrogative *Hatinya dalam keadaan apa?*), (3) progressive, (4) adverbial using *dengan sengaja*), and (5) reflexive. The semantic parameter was used for emotion verbs formulated as ‘*X merasakan sesuatu karena X memikirkan sesuatu*’ (X felt something because X thought something).

While BI has three syntactical patterns for conceptualizing the experiencer; they are ES, EO, and ED, BMA has two; they are ES and EO. In the two languages, the construction ES was formed using passive structure, active

structure, and incoative structure. The EO was constructed using causative structure. In the causative construction, EVI formed preposition-marked ED.

The subcategories of EVI were similar to those of EVAM in regard to “*mirip malu*”, “*mirip menyesal*”, “*mirip cinta*”, and “*mirip marah*”. The subcategories of EVI were different from those of EVAM in terms of “*mirip heran*” (*terpukau* vs *tabodoh*), “*mirip sangsi*” (*frustrasi* vs *suntuk*), “*mirip sedih*” (*sedih* vs *sodih*), and “*mirip takut*” (*khawatir* vs *gopoh*).

The differences in meaning between SEV in BI and that in BMA included (1) *sedih* vs *sodih*, (2) *susah* vs *susah*, (3) *takut* vs *cuak*, (4) *khawatir* vs *gaduh*, (5) *risau* vs *riso*, (6) *gugup* vs *gopoh*, (7) *panik* vs *tagomap*, (8) *malu* vs *malu*, (9) *segan* vs *sogan*, (10) *kaget* and *terkejut* vs *takojut*, and (11) *terpukau* vs *tabodoh*. The difference in meaning between AEV in BI and that in BMA included (1) *gembira* and *girang* vs *mogah*, (2) *lega* vs *tonang*, (3) *frustrasi* vs *suntuk*, (4) *iri* vs *angek*, (5) *jenuh* and *jemu* vs *jolak*, (6) *jengkel* vs *palak* and *rising*, and (7) *keki* vs *marsak*.

The semantic roles of the arguments in EVI-EVAM were based on their subcategories. In SEV the semantic role of “*mirip sedih*”, “*mirip takut*”, and “*mirip heran*” was the Undergoer _subject, except “*mirip malu*” whose semantic role was the Undergoer_subject, the Actor_object). In AEV, the subject was the Actor and if the verb was transitive, the object would be the Undergoer. The thematic relation in AEV was the experiencer-influencer, the experiencer-locative, and the experiencer-theme. The thematic relation in AEV was the experiencer-locative and the experiencer-theme.

5.2 Suggestion

The research in semantics of the languages which are genetically related is new in Indonesia. Although this study is complicated, it has successfully revealed the universal and specific aspects of languages apart from the human thought and conceptualization of the world. Further research exploring the lexical semantics of other languages is needed.

Furthermore, it is suggested that a semantic dictionary of the verbs of emotion in BI and MBA should be compiled. Such a dictionary should refer to sets of original meanings in order to limit the meanings of words. It will be easily understood by speakers of two languages and other languages.

6 Acknowledgements

In this opportunity, I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to those who have contributed in one way or another to this research, especially Prof. Dr. Ni Luh Sutjiati Beratha, M.A., as a supervisor, Prof. Dr. Oktovianus, M.Hum., as co-supervisor I, Prof. Dr. I Nengah Sudipa, M.A., as co-supervisor II, and the board of examiners: Prof. Dr. Aron Meko Mbete, Prof. Dr. Drs. Ida Bagus Putra Yadnya, M.A., Prof. Dr. I Wayan Pastika, M.A., Prof. Dr. I Ketut Darma Laksana, M.Hum., and Dr. Ni Made Dhanawaty, M.S., for their critical comment and suggestions for the improvement of this research. A word of appreciation should also go to the administrative staff members of the Study Program of Linguistics of Udayana University.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakar, A. dkk. 1996. "Struktur Bahasa Melayu Asahan". (laporan penelitian) Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Broekhuis, H. 2008. "The Subject of Causative Object Experiencer Verbs." [dikutip 5 November 2008] Tersedia dari: http://www.fdlww.uvt.nl/~broekhui/publicaties/object_experiencer_psych_verbs.doc.pdf.
- Bungin, M. B. 2007. *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik, dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Denzin, N. K. dan Y. S. Lincoln (ed.) 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Edisi ke-2. London: Sage Publications.
- Dineen, A. 1990. "Shame/Embarrassment in English and Danish". *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 10: 217—230.
- Foley, W. A. dan R. D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frawley, W. 1992. *Linguistic Semantics*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goddard, C. 1994. "Semantic Theory and Semantic Universal". Dalam C. Goddard (ed.) 1996. *Cross-Linguistic Syntax from a Semantic Point of View (NSM Approach)*, 1—5. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Goddard, C. 1996a. "Building a Universal Semantic Metalanguage: the Semantic Theory of Anna Wierzbicka". Dalam C. Goddard (ed.) 1996. *Cross-Linguistic Syntax from a Semantic Point of View (NSM Approach)*, 24—37. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Goddard, C. 1996b. "Grammatical Categories and Semantic Primes". Dalam C. Goddard (ed.) 1996. *Cross-Linguistic Syntax from a Semantic Point of View (NSM Approach)*, 38—57. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Goddard, C.. 1998. *Semantic Analysis: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goddard, C. 2008. *Cross-Linguistic Semantics*. [dikutip 10 Maret 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://book.google.co.id/book?id=RE9Ale7afmEC&dq=cross-linguistic+semantic+goddard%printsec=frontcor>.
- Grix, J. 2004. *The Foundations of Research*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Janesick, V. J. 2000. "The Choreography of Qualitative Research Design: Minuets, Improvisations, and Crystallization." Dalam Denzin, N. K. dan Lincoln, Y. S. 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Edisi ke-2. London: Sage Publications.
- Kearns, K. 2000. *Semantics*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Kitis, E. 2008. "Emotion as Discursive Constructs: The Case of the Psych-Verb 'Fear'." [dikutip 10 Maret 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://www.enl.auth.gr/staff/EKitisFear2.pdf>.
- Kutscher, S. 2008. "Argument Realization of Psych-Verbs in An Active: The Case of Laz (Anderßen Variety)." [dikutip 10 Maret 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~gast/swl3/abstracts/pdf/swl-23.pdf>.
- Levin, B. 2007. "The Lexical Semantics of Verbs III: Semantic Determinant of Argument Realization." [dikutip 22 Oktober 2008] Tersedia dari: <http://www.stanford.edu/~blevin/lisa07 semdet.pdf>.
- Liu, M. dan S. Hong 2008. "Mandarin Emotion Verbs: A Frame-Based Analysis". [dikutip 10 Mei 2009] Tersedia dari: [http://www.colips.org/journal/volume18/JCLC_18\(3\).2.pdf](http://www.colips.org/journal/volume18/JCLC_18(3).2.pdf).
- Mahsun. 2005. *Metode Penelitian Bahasa*. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Marin, R. dan L. McNally. 2009. "Inchoativity, Change of State, and Telicity: Evidence from Spanish Reflexive Psychological Verbs." [dikutip 10 Maret 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/jUxZDcyM/marin-mcnally09.pdf>.
- Mulyadi. 1998a. "Makna *Malu* dalam Bahasa Indonesia (Kajian "Wacana Kebudayaan"). *Linguistika*, 8: 46—57.
- Mulyadi. 1998b. "Struktur Semantis Verba Bahasa Indonesia". (tesis). Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.
- Mulyadi. 2001. "Konsep Emosi dalam Bahasa Melayu". *Dewan Bahasa*, 1: 28—35.
- Saeed, J. I. 1997. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sudaryanto. 1993. *Metode dan Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistis*. Yogyakarta: Duta Wacana University Press.

- Tantos, A. 2004. "Rhetorical Relations in Verbal Eventual Representations? Evidence from Psych Verbs." [dikutip 10 Maret 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/tls/2004/papers1551.pdf>.
- Van Valin, R. D. 1999. "Generalized Semantic Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface." [dikutip 28 Oktober 2008]. Tersedia dari: http://linguistics.buffalo.edu/people/faculty/vanvalin/rrg/vanvalin_papers/gensemroles.pdf
- Van Valin, R. D. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin Jr., R. D. 2006: "A Summary of Role and Reference Grammar." [dikutip 12 Juni 2009] Tersedia dari: [http://latina.phil2.uni-freiburg-de/raible/Lehre/2006/.../RRGsummary.pdf](http://latina.phil2.uni-freiburg.de/raible/Lehre/2006/.../RRGsummary.pdf).
- Van Valin, R. D. dan R. LaPolla. 1999. *Syntax: Structure, Meaning, and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Voorst, J. 2008. "The Aspectual Semantics of Psych-Verbs." [dikutip 11 April 2009] Tersedia dari: <http://ifla.uni-stuttgart.de/institut/mitarbeiter/florian/kurs/psych-verbs/handout7.pdf>.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1990. "The Semantics of Emotion: *Fear* and Its Relatives in English". *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 10: 359—375.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1991. *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Social Interaction*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1992. *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. (ed.) 1996a. *Cross-Cultural Communication*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1996b. "The Syntax of Universal Semantic Primitives. Dalam C. Goddard (ed.). 1996. *Cross-Linguistic Syntax from a Semantic Point of View (NSM Approach)*, 6—23. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1996c. *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1999a. *Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1999b. "Emotional Universal". [dikutip 9 Oktober 2008] Tersedia dari: http://elies.rediris.es/Language_Design/LD2/wierzbicka.pdf.