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ABSTRACT

The research aims to look for word-formation from suffix -i and -pe and the prefix-ken. The problem of the research was whether the suffix -i and -ken and the prefix pe-can form transitive in sentences. This study used the qualitative approach. The complex predicate data were analyzed using the agih method which is part of the language itself which becomes the determining tool. This is an appropriate method of analyzing language. This study indicates that sentence formation in the Karo language initially uses the VOS word order. At the suffix -i, the transitive word order VOS is found, the suffix -ken used the VO word order and at the prefix pe- also used the VOS word order. The suffix -i was initially used with adjectives, intransitive verbs, and nouns to form a root word in the form of a locative transitive verb (referring to a place). If suffix -ken combined with a root word which is a group of adjectives, intransitive verbs, or nouns, the meaning becomes causative, making the sufferer become/do something. The prefix pe-functions to change adjectives, intransitive verbs, and nouns into transitive verbs. The derivative form produces a causative meaning.

1. Introduction

The Karo language is still used in Indonesian society today. As one of the regional languages, the Karo language plays an important role in the fields of education, agricultural extension and health, especially for those living in rural areas. Karo language is still used in communication. Therefore, it is necessary to preserve the Karo language. Coaching the Karo language needs to be done to preserve the use of the Karo language as a better communication tool. One of the development efforts is through education. As an object of linguistics, several aspects have been studied by Karo linguists in Indonesia. Most of them are from the Karo community themselves and some are from outside the Karo community. Some researchers who have conducted research on the well-known Karo language are Guntur Tarigan (1984) and Geoff Woolamms (1996). The research they have produced greatly contributes to the preservation of the Karo language. Their research also contributes to researchers, especially focusing on the morphology and syntax of the Karo language in Indonesia. Their research showed that how well Karo is used and grammar in society. Some researchers who have discussed the Karo language typology are Surbakti (2012), whose research describes the syntactic form in the Karo language, describes the classification of the syntactic structure of the Karo language, and proposes a form of syntactic typology in the Karo language. The syntactic typology of Karo language obtained in this study is based on the classification of word order that dominantly appears in the VSO / PSO type because Karo language is generally a passive sentence where P is at the beginning of a sentence subject is a noun—followed by SVO / SPO. The classification based on Mode: (1) declarative consists of two parts: positive declarative and negative declarative, where the dominant pattern appears as the VS / PS pattern/type. (2) Interrogative Basic sentence types can be changed into "yes/no" question sentences. Classification based on clauses: (1) The dominant single sentence that appears is a single sentence of type V-S-O or P-S-O. (2) The dominant multilevel compound sentence is the clause with the adi marker 'i'p is the adverbial marking feature, and if it is placed at the beginning of the sentence, it will become a clause in the adverb extension. The basic pattern of compound sentence expansion of adverbs using the word adi is generally the basic pattern of K-V / P and K-V / P-S. (3) Equivalent Compound Sentences connect two clauses that have two patterns. The basic pattern of compound sentences with the Karo
equivalent is S-P. (4) Rapatan S equivalent compound sentences associated with the coordinating racial markers ‘and’. Classification Based on Active-Passive Sentences: (1) The dominant active sentences are those with an S-P pattern. In the active sentence of the Karo language, there are at least two core constituents, usually with the arrangement S, and P, other core constituents S, P, O. (2) Passive speech is divided into ordinary passive form and non-subject passive, in which both of these forms can appear in the passive form accidentally.

The second research was conducted by Tarigan and Mulyadi (2019). It was found that the sentence formation obtained in Karo grammar was originally VOS. At first, Karo language used transitive sentences (VO), but after several researchers had found standard language knowledge, Karo language knowledge has now developed well and has been adjusted to become SPO.

Furthermore, in her research, Nofiana (2001) found that the Karo clause is a verb or verb phrase and the Karo intransitive verb has three elements, namely verbs with affixes, non-affixes, and verbs duplicate. Verbs with an affix consist of ci-, ki-, er-, -um, si, en- with the form of the adjective, verb and numeral. Verbs that do not have an affix are in the form of basic and state verbs, and intransitive verbs duplicate Karo in the form of an affixed reduplication and unaffixed reduplication. When viewed from the completeness of the sentence, the results of their research are complete at the syntactic level, which includes phrases, clauses, and sentences in Karo. On this occasion, in an effort to preserve one of the Karo languages and its use in a better way, the writer tries to focus on transitive sentences in the Karo language that use the suffix -i and -ken as well as the prefix pe-. The writer tries to use the suffix -i and -ken as well as the prefix pe- in the sentence. Do the suffixes -i and -ken also prefix pe- can form a transitive sentence. The author feels the need to research the -i and -ken suffix as well as the pe-prefix in Karo because it will also bring benefits to researchers in the future.

2. Literature Review

The basis and direction of the study of linguistic typology also come from the idea that there are differences in universality and universality in differences across languages. This kind of rationale develops in such a way that it builds into a theoretical and practical framework as an attempt to group language(s) through cross-language comparisons. Song (2001: 2) in Jufrizal (2008:4), for example, expresses interesting opinions based on these thoughts. According to him, apart from the differences between the languages of the earth, certain behaviours belong together between these languages, which are a common feature of human language. Therefore, some linguists are in direct contact with the investigation of this unity by studying an enormous variety of structural variations across languages. This expert is known as a linguistic topologist (topologist). Their findings of variation across languages are referred to as linguistic typology (typology).

Typology is a variation system phenomenon that broadly and states various assumptions or ideas through markers in a system (Kerf, 1987: 8-12; Comrie, 1981: 30; Shopen, 1992: 96; Dixon, 2010: 242; Moravcsik, 2013). Typology is the study of language types based on the structural features of a language. The aim is to determine the type “whether a language or language X when observed from its structure”. Typology theory, according to Dixon (2010) was placed in the basic units of universal syntax or theoretical concepts S, A and O. The concept of O is the subject of an intransitive clause, the concept of A is the agent of a transitive clause, and the concept of O (P, according to Comrie and O according to Dixon) is a transitive clause object. Furthermore, Dixon explains the basis of syntactic and semantically based marking in each language characterized by ergative -absolute, nominative-accusative cases. In general, there are three things to pay attention to in marking in morphologically ergative languages. These three things are: 1) S = O (absolute) distinguished from A (ergative) which is then called a language that has an ergative system. 2) Grammatical structure is a relationship or unity formed between one (unit) predicate and the elements or grammatical functions that accompany it (argument) to realize basic single sentences whole either through grammatical or semantic bonds (Lyons, 1968: 209-212; Dixon, 2010; Alsina, 1996; Palmer, 1994). Grammatical structure is a process of grammatical rules that tends to be the subject/pivot (Manning, 1994: 34-40) S = A (nominative), which is distinguished from O (accusative), which is then called accusative language.) S and O are all different Dixon stated that the concept of universal syntactic units could be used to describe the phenomenon of grammar I in all languages. Thus, semantically A and S are classified as grammatical subjects. Dixon’s view can be proven in languages of the accusative type. Accusative languages treat transitive clause A the same as intransitive clause S and treat P in a different way. Treatment A and S similarity can be identified through marking cases and ordering constituents (word order). English, for example, is one of the accusative-type languages. English treats the transitive clause A the same as the intransitive clause S and treats P differently. S as a ‘subject’ similarity can also be identified semantically through a syntactic process. The syntactic process includes relatedness, activation, and control of passing arguments that are correlated in coordinative and subordinative clauses. English and several other languages can be classified based on word order as a major syntactic element. In linguistics, such a language is known as a configurative language. Perhaps there is a lot of interest in classifying language on word order as typological characteristics. In general, this classification is known from the use of the terms subject, verb, and object, which are abbreviated as the letters S, V, and O. Theoretically, there are six possible classifications of language based on sequence, namely:
The classification that is commonly encountered is the classification of language with the subject at the beginning of the sentence. The second classification is the language that places the verb at the beginning of the sentence. Language classifications that place objects at the beginning of a sentence are rare (Aitchison 1981).

The following are examples of languages belonging to each type of language classification based on word order (examples of sentences written literally) based on Surbakti’s research (2012: 5).

| Word Order | Sentence | Language  |
|-------------|----------|-----------|
| SOV         | Farmer cuts a tree | Turki     |
| SVO         | Farmer cuts a tree | Indonesia |
| VSO         | Cut farmer a tree. | Welsh     |
| VOS         | Cut a tree farmer | Malagasi  |
| OVS         | A tree cut farmer | Hixkaryana|
| OSV         | A tree farmer cut | Apurina   |

### 3. Methodology

This study used qualitative methods. The qualitative method is a research method based on existing facts or phenomena that empirically live in the speakers (Sudaryanto, 2015). All data were obtained using the watch and note method. The complex predicate data were analyzed using the *agih* method which is part of the language itself which becomes the determining tool. This is the right method for analyzing language (Sudaryanto, 2015: 18). This research was begun by collecting data. Data were collected by means of observation and interviews. In the observation method, data is understood and recorded. In the interview method, the informants were asked how to use complex predicates in the sentences they use in their daily conversations. The data source of this research is the book of three native Karo speakers who live in the village of Sigara-gara Patumbak Kampung, Patumbak District, Deli Serdang Regency. The informants interviewed were male and female. They are 17-55 years old. The search for health protocol data was still carried out during the Covid-19 Pandemic.

### 4. Results and Discussion

From the results of data collection carried out in the field, there are two endings and one prefix that can affect the formation of words in sentences in Karo language. Suffixes and prefixes are -i-suffix and -ken and pe-prefix. The prefixes and suffixes obtained can produce transitive and causative sentences in Karo VSO.

#### 1.1 Suffix –i

Suffix -i was originally used with adjectives, intransitive verbs, and nouns to form a root word in the form of a locative transitive verb (referring to a place).

**Examples:**

1) *Kundul*  
   *Sit*  
   :  
   *kunduli*  
   sitting

2) *Cirem*  
   *Smile*  
   :  
   *ciremi*  
   smiling

3) *Sira*  
   *Salt*  
   :  
   *sirai*  
   salting

4) *Laklak*  
   *Peel*  
   :  
   *laklaki*  
   peeling

5) *Kepar*  
   *Cross*  
   :  
   *kepari*  
   crossing

**Examples in sentences**

1) **Kundul jelma sinterem amak ta ndai**  
   V O S  
   Sitting people our mat.

2) **Cirem Pak Guru aku**  
   V O S  
   Smiling teacher at me.

3) **Sirai gulenta ya nakku**  
   V O S  
   Salting our vegetables my son.

4) **Laklaki sitik bawang ena nakku**  
   V O S  
   Peeling garlic son my.
Peeling the onion my son.

5) **Anakku ngo lawes kepahi lau si mbelin.**

\[ S \quad V \quad O. \]

My son has gone crossing the sea.

All the sentence become transitive language in karonese sentence.

1.2 **Suffix-ken**

Suffix -ken applies to all groups of words and produces transitive root words that have different meanings from each other:

1) Suffix –ken if combined with a root word that is a group of adjectives, intransitive verbs, or nouns, the meaning becomes causative, making the sufferer become / do something.

Examples:

| Root Word | Suffix | Meaning          |
|-----------|--------|------------------|
| Tangger   | -ken   | cooking          |
| Rende     | -ken   | singing          |
| Sinik     | -ken   | shuting          |
| Baba      | -ken   | bringing         |

Examples in sentences:

1) **Tanggerken nakanta man karaben.**

\[ V \quad Objek \quad Adverb \]

Cooking our rice for evening.

2) **Sehkel jilena sorana rendeken lagu karo ei.**

\[ Keterangan \quad V \quad Adverb \]

How beautiful the sound singing the Karonese song.

3) **Siniken min gelah sibegi ia ngerana.**

\[ Verb \]

Shutting so we can hear what he said.

4) **Babaken tasku eina**

\[ Verb \quad Object \]

Bringing my bag..

If verb that describes a place to store something, then the addition of the suffix -ken results in a derivative which is interpreted as “to put the object (noun):

Examples:

1) **Karang cage** : karangken cage
2) **Peti thrum** : Petiken thrumming

Exercises in sentences:

1) **Ben me wari karangken manukta nakku.**

\[ Adverb \quad V \quad Object \]

It was evening cage our chicken my son.

2) **Petiken jelma sinterem jelma si nggo mate ndai.**

\[ V \quad S \quad Adv \]

Thrumming people the dead body.

There is a suffix –ken in a phrase.

1) **Penggel dua** become two : **penggelduaken** becomes two
2) **Lanai lit** nothing anymore: **lanailitken** dissolve

1) **Suffix-ken** combine with preposition me- (verb)-kan (toward/will/for/about) (suffix in root disappear for the word process below):

Examples:

| Root Word | Suffix | Meaning   |
|-----------|--------|-----------|
| Begiken   | -ken   |listening  |
| Ngerana   | -ken   | discussion|

2) **Suffix –ken** which gets the addition which is followed by an object which is on the tools used in the format. Example:
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1) Ambek throw : ambekken batu throw the stone
2) Suan plant : suanken benih planting the seed
3) Suffix –ken which appear in some words of verb pseudo-refleksif where there is no suffering which presenting which generally present in analysis is causative.

Examples:
1) Kiam run : kiamken run
2) Berkat go : berkatken go

1.3 Prefix pe-
The function Prefix pe- is changing adjective, intransitive, and noun become transitive. The word order become causative.

1) Examples of prefix pe- which become a causative.
   a. Galang big : pegalang make it bigger
   b. Kitik small : pekitik make it smaller
   c. Sikap ready : pesikap serving

Examples in sentences:
   a. Pegalang sora lagu ena
       V O Adv.
       Make it bigger the Karo song.
   b. Pekitiki sora lagu ena
       V O Adv
       Make it smaller the song.
   c. Pesikap amak ta.
       V O S
       Make it ready our mat.

2) Examples of prefix pe- which made the object go somewhrer.
   a. Karang cage : pekarang ask an object to cage
   b. Lau river,water : pelau watering
   c. Rumah rumah : perumah calling home

The three examples of the words above at suffix-i, and -ken and the prefix pe- form a transitive sentence in a sentence. There also serves as a causative. So, it can be concluded that the formation of Karo language words in the suffix-i, suffix –kind and prefix pe- uses VPO.

5. Conclusion
The research aims to look for word-formation from suffix -i and -pe as well as the prefix-ken. Based on the findings of the study, it is found that Karonese word order uses VOS. At suffix-i, the transitive word order VOS is found, the suffix -ken uses the VO word order and at the prefix pe- also uses the VOS word order. The suffix -i was originally used with adjectives, intransitive verbs, and nouns to form a root word in the form of a locative transitive verb (referring to a place). The suffix –ken, if combined with a root word which is a group of adjectives, intransitive verbs, or nouns, the meaning becomes causative, making the sufferer become/do something. The prefix pe- functions to change adjectives, intransitive verbs, and nouns into transitive verbs. The derivative form produces a causative meaning.
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