The Configurations of the Process of Doing, Feeling, Thinking, and Relating in Lampungese Language Clauses

AFRIANTO
afrianto@teknokrat.ac.id
Universitas Teknokrat Indonesia
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
EVA TUCKYTA SARI SUJATNA
NANI DARMAYANTI
Universitas Padjadjaran
Bandung, Indonesia
FARIDA ARIYANI
Universitas Negeri Lampung
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This descriptive-qualitative research explores the processes configured in Lampungese language clauses. Here, the processes are structured in clauses showing physical actions, feelings, thinking, relation, behaviour, and existence. It investigates the processes using Hallidayan transitivity system and focuses on the constituents forming a clause, such as participant, process, and circumstance. In order to keep a natural setting, the data of this research were collected by documentation from passages of six lesson books of Lampungese language. The results of analyses show that the process of doing is realized with *nyeghbu*, *ngemulai perlawanan*, *ngelawan*, *ngebantu*, *ditulis* and *diteghusko*, whereas the mental process is constituted by *nyeghah*, *ngenal*, *nganggop*, and *dikenang*. Meanwhile, the realization of relational process is *dimaksudko*, which is classified as an identifying relational process. It is also found that a relational clause can be structured without any relational process. The disappearance of the process can be categorized as zero relational process and marked with ∅. The result of this research is expected to give a contribution to document the structure of the Lampungese language.

Key words: clause, Lampungese, process, transitivity

INTRODUCTION

Indigenous language extinction is an issue among linguists, and this situation has also happened in Indonesia. Among the 701 indigenous languages found in Indonesia, Lampungese language is categorized as a threatened language (Ethnologue 2019). This language has many dialects which are grouped into two main dialects; *Nyow* and *Api*. Geographically, *Api* dialect is spoken by Lampungese on the southern coastal line, western, southern, and middle regions of Lampung, whereas *Nyow* dialect is used by Lampungese living in northern and eastern regions.

Further, Lampung is situated in various tribal and lingual societies, so Lampungese language has become unpopular in daily communication among people living in the region. This consequently makes the Indonesian language the only alternative language to communicate in daily conversation. This situation makes Lampung language unused.

Many other indigenous languages in Indonesia face this problem. It has been observed that a total of 701 indigenous languages exist. Among them, 18 are classified as institutional, 81 are categorized as developing, 260 are considered vigorous, 272 are identified as being in a precarious state, and 76 are deemed to be dying (Ethnologue 2019). At this point, one alternative way to preserve them is by exploring through research and study (Hinton 2011).

Based on the underlying problem, the researchers decide to study Lampungese language, particularly for investigating the structure of its clauses and documenting the results.

Structurally, a clause has at least a subject and a predicator. The followings are examples of clauses in Lampungese.

Clause A

Jenderal Sudirman mak haga nyeghah jama Belanda.
General Sudirman not want surrender with Netherlands.
(General Sudirman never gave up to Dutch troops.)

This clause consists of a subject (*Jenderal Sudirman*), a predicator (*mak haga nyeghah*), and an adjunct (*jama Belanda*). The predicator is formed in a verbal phrase consisting of a negation marker (*mak*), an adverb (*haga*), and a verb (*nyeghah*). In addition, the verb (*nyeghah*) refers to feeling to stop fighting and admit being defeated and it thus deals with the psychological matter.

Clause B

Pangeghan Di Ponegoro mak gentar jama kompeni.
Prince Di Ponegoro not afraid with colonizer.
(Prince Di Ponegoro was never afraid of the colonizer.)

The clause has a subject (*Pangeghan Di Ponegoro*), predicator (*mak gentar*), and object (*kompeni*). Here, *mak gentar* is realized by an adjective (*gentar*) which is preceded by a negation marker (*mak*). '*gentar*' refers to a feeling of fear or worry and is negated by '*mak*' so that it has the opposite meaning, which is no feeling of fear or worries and it refers to a spirit and powerful feeling.

Both clauses (A and B) are configured in different structures. The different structures are indicated by the presence of predicators, each of which has its own configuration. In clause A, the predicator is in the form of a verb whereas in clause B, it is constituted by an adjective. This point is another thing that this research is projecting.

Besides, this research is also aimed at configuring the structure of clauses functionally by observing the semantic function and role of each constituent through the transitivity system. For example, the predicator (*mak haga nyeghah*) in clause A construes a feeling dealing with a process of mental (psychological process). In this case, the subject (*Jenderal Sudirman*) is the person who undergoes the feeling while the object (*Belanda*) is the one that the subject thinks about. Meanwhile, clause B has a predicator realized by an adjective (*gentar*) and a negation marker (*mak*) and it functions to attribute the subject. Here, both the predicator and the subject demonstrate a process of relation.

This research is designed to capture the process configurations (physical doing, feeling, and relating) among six types of processes. It employs the notion of transitivity from the standpoint of systemic functional grammar (SFG) to investigate and elucidate the arrangement of subject-predicate-object to their respective functions and roles. What is more, in this perspective, each constituent semantically has a role in a clause; those are participant, process, and circumstance and these constituents are configured in a transitivity system (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). In particular, this research is addressed to investigate the components of transitivity in Lampungese language clause.

Commonly, SFG researchers analyzed languages that function as national languages. This research, however, analyzed an indigenous language. Going with the indigenous language, it can be a reference for its theoretical framework and object. Furthermore, it is noted that there have been many pieces of research discussing languages with SFG. They specifically discussed metafunctional

constructions in which the transitivity system is a part of their analyses, such as metafunctional construction of French (Caffarel 2004), German (Steiner and Teich 2004), Japanese (Teruya 2004), Tagalog (Martin 2004), Chinese (Halliday and McDonald 2004), Vietnamese (Thai 2004), Tulugu (Prakasam 2004), and Pitjantjatjara (Rose 2004). Besides, there were also other researchers discussing metafunction in other languages, such as Bardi (2008) who studied Systemic Functional Description of Grammar of Arabic. Then, Lavis, Arus, and Mansila (2010) published a book presenting the elaboration of SFL of Spanish. Meanwhile, Sujatna (2012), Sujatna (2013a), and Wiratno (2018) applied SFL in Indonesian and Javanese clauses.

There are also some other researchers who have made transitivity analyses. By his research, Nguyen (2012) argued that types of processes indicate the characteristics of a character in the story whereas Cunanan (2011) and Ezzina (2015) employed transitivity to analyze literary works. Then, Sujatna (2013a) investigated the mood and transitivity system in slogan of some airlines companies whereas Ong'onda (2016) analyzed newspaper headlines through transitivity. Next, Opara (2012) investigated the transitivity system in Emecheta's narrative discourse. Other researchers conducted two pieces of research examining Shakespeare's *Donne's, and Blake's* poems and Rowling's novel to figure out the processes of transitivity, i.e. Afrianto, Indrayani, and Soemantri (2013); Afrianto and Zuhud (2014) ; and Afrianto and Inayati (2016). Meanwhile, Umam and Anis (2018) investigated transitivity in Medina Charter. Sihura (2019) made transitivity analysis on a movie whereas Zhang (2017) as well as Zhu and Li (2018), applied transitivity to find out political motivation. In addition, a comparative study of transitivity in two languages was also conducted by previous researchers, such as Yuli and Yushan (2012), who compared English and Chinese, as well as Afrianto (2019), who compared English and Lampungese language. Compared to those pieces of research, only this current research analyses an indigenous language and figures out the correlation between the types of processes and their functions embedded in a text. Both make this current research different from the previous ones.

In the perspective of SFG, a clause has three aspects of meaning and function called metafunction (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). They are ideational, interpersonal, and textual metafunction. This research went with ideational metafunction realized in transitivity. Transitivity is a system that explores clauses to figure out all components and define their functions and meanings. The constituents of transitivity are a participant, process, and circumstance (Thompson 2014). The following is an example of transitivity analysis in Lampungese language.

Ikam lapah ngawil nambi
I go fishing yesterday
(I went fishing yesterday)

It can be noted that *Ikam* is a participant who does something. The phrase *lapah ngawil* is a process defining an action, and the word *nambi* is a circumstance modifying when the action was taken by the participant. The transitivity system explores who does what to whom, what/who is what/who when, where, why, and how to function (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). They further posit that the transitivity system views the atmosphere of experiences as a manageable construction of process types and each of them has their schema to construe a particular experience.

The experiential meaning of the process involves doing, sensing, saying, behaving, having, classifying/identifying, and existing. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), supported by Deterding and Poedjosoedarmo (2001), Eggins (2004), Lock (2005), Bloor and Bloor (2004), Emilia (2014), Thompson (2014), and Balog (2019) classify the process into six types, namely material, mental, relational, verbal, behavioural, and existential processes. The material process outlines physical doing/activities whereas the mental process deals with the five senses and goes on in the internal world of the mind, such as thinking, imagining, liking, wanting, and seeing (Thompson 2014). Then, a relational process construes the relationship between participants; one entity modifies or characterizes another one. Further, a relational process is basically indicated by to be; such as is, am, are, and copular verbs; such as seem, become, have, own, and possess (Bloor and Bloor 2004). The next type is the behavioural process. It indicates habitual actions or activities which are usually done psychologically and physically, for instance; breathing, coughing, sneezing, sleeping, and listening.

On the other hand, a verbal process is employed in a configuration of 'x says' and 'y says' and quotes what has been uttered (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). The last type of process is existential process. It demonstrates the existence of an entity. According to Bloor and Bloor (2004) the existential process in English is realized by an empty subject (there) and a copular verb (be). Another component sometimes found in a clause other than process and participants is circumstance. Circumstance modifies processes to answer the questions of when, where, how, and why because it gives information on place, time, reason, role, and manner (Halliday and Matthiessen 2014). Along with Halliday & Matthiessen, Matthiessen, Teruya, and Marvin (2010) specify it to some extent, namely temporal, spatial, manner, cause, accompaniment, matter, and role. However, through the transitivity system, this research explores and describes the configurations of clauses concerning the process of doing, feeling, thinking, and relating only.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research applies the qualitative method. There are two characteristics of this research that has become the foundation for applying qualitative method. First, it is intended to configure and describe configurations of constituents in clauses (Stake 2010). Second, it is aimed at exploring the process of clauses showing doing, feeling, thinking, and relating (Croker 2009). Third, it is not intended to generalize the findings but it is supposed to invent any lingual aspects as varieties of language use (Creswell 2014).

To have data in written form, this research employed six lesson books in written in Lampungese language as the data source. Collecting data from such books did not mean ignoring the originality since the books were written by Lampungese native speakers and intended for educational purposes. It means that Lampungese language used in these books is of a formal style and universally understood by its people. Hence, this research gained and used the data that are real, natural, and universal (Silverman 2015). Aside from that, through library research, this research only chose passages and then broke them down into clauses (Mann 2015). Each clause is indicated by a combination of at least a participant and a process. Furthermore, to find data in the passages, this research applied documentary search (Atkinson and Coffey 2004).

In addition, for patterning the structure and the configuration of heroic expression, this research applied three steps, i.e. (1) identifying heroic expression in clauses which focuses on the semantic aspect by considering the meaning of each constituent; (2) identifying the semantic roles of each constituent in a clause,

such as participants, process, and circumstance; (3) patterning the structure of each constituent which is based on the types of processes in the transitivity system.

FINDINGS

This research was designed to capture configurations of physical doings, feelings, thinking, and relating in three types of processes i.e. material, mental, and relational process. Each process is structured in clauses. Therefore, this section is divided into three parts of discussion: material, mental, and relational clauses. As a note, the discussion ia not only limited to the process but it also includes other related constituents, such as participants and circumstances.

The Process of Doing

A material clause is indicated by a process that construes physical doing. Physical doing refers to an activity done by an agent physically by using hand, foot, and body. The agent is in this case called 'actor' (Darani 2014). Another participant that is victimized through a material process done by the actor is called a goal. It can be characterized that a material clause has three constituents: actor, material process, and circumstance.

The process of doing in Lampungese, which is structured in the material clause can be exemplified in the following six clauses. The analyses are divided into two parts, clauses (1)-(4) and clauses (5) and (6).

(1) *Raden Inten I dacok nyeghbu benteng Belanda ghik matiko Leliever.*
(2) *Raden Inten I hinjilah si ngemulai perlawan tihadop penjajahan kompeni Belanda si dimulai di tahun1817.*
(3) *Beliau jama gagah bekhani ngelawan penjajah kompeni Belanda.*
(4) *Beliau munih langsung ngebantu korban perang.*

Clause (1), *Raden Inten I dacok nyeghbu benteng Belanda ghik matiko Leliever*, has a process *nyeghbu* that construes a physical doing. This physical doing refers action fighting against enemies and it shows such a struggle done by the actor (*Raden Inten I*) toward the goal (*benteng Belanda*). In addition, this clause also has another process, *matiko*, that means an extreme struggle and makes somebody else died. The detailed structure of Clause (1) can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Material Clause (1)

Actor	Process: doing	Goal	-	Process: doing	Goal
Raden Inten I	*dacok-nyeghbu*	*benteng-Belanda*	*ghik*	*matiko*	Leliever
Raden Intan I	can attack	fortress-Netherland	and	kill	Leliever
Raden Intan I could attack Netherland's fortress and kill Leliever.					

Table 1 shows the configuration of actor, process material, and goal. It can be seen that there are two configurations of material process and goal which are connected by a conjunction (*ghik*). Both processes are done by an actor (*Raden Inten I*). Here, *Raden Inten I* is portrayed as the one who has power and defeats his enemy (the colonizer) to defend and save his people.

On the other hand, Clause (2), *Raden Inten I hinjilah si ngemulai perlawan tihadop penjajahan kompeni Belanda si dimulai di tahun1817*, portrayes *Raden Intan I* who had begun his struggle toward the colonizer. It is realized in the verbal group *ngemulai perlawanan*. Regarding the process type, the clause has a material process because the actor performs a physical doing (Mehmood and Amber 2014; Senjawati 2016; Suparto 2018; and Zahoor and Janjua 2015).

Table 2: Material Clause (2)

ACTOR	PROCESS: MATERIAL	GOAL	PROCESS: MATERIAL	CIRCUMSTANCE
Raden Inten I-hinjilah	*ngemulai - perlawanan*	*tihadop-penjajahan kompeni-Belanda*	*dimulai*	di-tahun 1817
Raden Intan I-this	begin-fight	toward-colonizer-company-Netherland	start	in-year 1817
Raden Intan I had begun his struggle toward Dutch colonizer since 1817.				

Table 2 demonstrates a material clause, which consists of actor, material process, goal, and circumstance. This configuration shows a process of physical action realized by *ngemulai perlawanan* and *dimulai*. In addition, this clause also has circumstance, that is *di tahun 1817*. This circumstance refers to a particular year when *Raden Inten I* began his struggle. In this case, It demonstrates temporal information.

Clause (3), *Beliau jama gagah bekhani ngelawan penjajah kompeni Belanda*) also performs a circumstance in *jama gagah berani*. This circumstance shows how the actor does something physically. Aside from that, it modifies the process of doing, *ngelawan*, and portrays that *Raden Inten I* bravely fought to the colonizer. In addition, Clause (4): *Beliau munih langsung ngebantu korban perang* has circumstance too and there are two circumstances found, namely *munih* and *langsung*. The word *munih* means additional and something happening at the same time while *langsung* defines something done directly. Furthermore, the process of doing *ngebantu* modifies what the actor does to wounded people in war by directly helping. The structural analyses of Clause (3) and Clause (4) are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Material Clauses in Configurations of Circumstances and Processes of Doing

ACTOR	CIRCUMSTANCE	PROCESS: DOING	GOAL
Beliau	*jama gagah berani*	*ngelawan*	*penjajah kompeni Belanda*
He	with-strong-brave	fight	colonizer-company-Netherland
He bravely fought to Dutch colonizer.			
Beliau	*munih langsung*	*ngebantu*	*korban perang*
He	also-direct	help	victim-war
He also directly helped people who got wound in the war.			

Table 3 displays the configuration of a material clause in which the circumstance is in between the actor and the process of doing. It can be seen that the actor is realized by a pronoun (*Beliau*), which is used to refer to a particular referent mentioned before in the previous clause. In Clause (3) it refers to *Raden Inten I* whereas in Clause (4) the same pronoun refers to *Abdul Moeloek*.

Two more material clauses in Lampungese language can are exemplified in Clause (5) and Clause (6).

(5) *Kehibatan Radin Intan ditulis di lom bentuk sughat-sughat makai bahasa Belanda.*

(6) *Perjuangan ngelawan kompeni Belanda diteghusko putra Raden Imba Kusuma, Raden Inten II.*

Even though the positions of the constituents *Kehibatan Radin Inten II* and *Perjuangan ngelawan kompeni Belanda* are at the beginnings of their clauses, both are classified as goals. It can be indicated by the form of the process. In Lampungese language, when a verb has the prefix *di-*, the process is passive. Comparatively, a passive form in Indonesian language has the same structure as well (Alwi et al. 2014; Sneddon et al. 2010; and Afrianto 2015). Because of this passive structure, the goal is positioned at the beginning of the clause while the actor is placed after the process as shown in Clause (6). In this clause, the actor is *putra Raden Imba Kusuma* or *Raden Inten II*. On the other hand, Clause (5) does not employ any actor. It just has goal, process, and circumstance. Each constituent of both clauses can be examined in Table 4.

Table 4: Material Clauses in Passive Structures

GOAL	PROCESS: DOING	CIRCUMSTANCE
Kehibatan Radin Intan	*di-tulis*	*di lom bentuk sughat-sughat makai bahasa Belanda*
Wonderfulness-Raden Intan	(*di-*)write	in-inside-form-letter-letter-use-language-dutch
The wonderful story of Raden Intan was written in the forms of letters in Dutch.		

GOAL	PROCESS: DOING	ACTOR
Perjuangan-ngelawan-kompeni-Belanda	*di-teghus-ko*	*putra Raden Imba Kusuma; Raden Inten II*
Struggle-fight-company-Netherland	(*di-*)continue(*-ko*)	son-Raden Imba Kusuma-Raden Inten II
The struggle to fight Dutch colonizer was continued by Raden Imba Kusuma's son; Raden Inten II.		

Table 4 displays the configurations of the goals that construe the magnificent story of struggling and fighting against the colonizer. Both processes, *ditulis* and *diteghusko*, demonstrate physical doings. Therefore, they are categorized into material processes.

The Process of Feeling and Thinking

Mental clauses deal with the psychological processes, such as sensing, perceiving, thinking, and desiring. Clause (7) demonstrates a psychological or mental process.

(7) *Raden Intan mak haga nyeghah ghena gawoh*.

Clause (7) is realized by the configuration of a proper name (*Raden Intan*), negation marker (*mak*), adverb (*haga*), and process (*nyeghah*). This configuration shows *Raden Intan* who never gave up on the situation and kept struggling for his people. Related to this configuration, the subject (*Raden Intan*) is the one who feels the spirit of never giving up. Therefore, it is a senser.

Table 5: Mental Clause

SENSER	PROCESS: FEELING	CIRCUMSTANCE
Raden Intan	*mak haga nyeghah*	*ghena gawoh*
Raden Intan	not want surrender	that just
Raden Intan never wanted to surrender.		

Table 5 demonstrates a mental clause consisting of senser, mental process, and circumstance. It is clear that the process deals with a feeling or affection. In this case, Clause (7) confirms that a heroic expression can be expressed in a mental clause.

The other examples of mental clauses can be seen in Clause (8) and (9)

(8) *Belanda ngenal ia jama julukan Singa Lampung.*
(9) *Belanda nganggop Raden Intan II sebagai ulun sai kuat ghik sakti.*

Clause (8) employs a mental process (*ngenal*). Here, it refers to a cognitive process in which someone recognizes someone else (Sujatna 2013b). Besides, a prepositional group *jama julukan Singa Lampung*' modifies *ia*' by providing the characteristics. In addition, it is shown that *ia* becomes someone called *Singa Lampung* by *Belanda* or *ia* is the object. In a mental clause, the object is called a phenomenon (entities which are sensed, perceived, or thought). The same configuration is also found in Clause (9). *Belanda* is a senser, *nganggop* is a mental process, and *Raden Inten II* is the phenomenon. In addition, Clause (9) has a prepositional group functioning as the circumstance, which, in this case, modifies the phenomenon (Johari 2017), that is *sebagai ulun sai kuat ghik sakti*.

Table 6: Mental Clauses with the Processes of Thinking

SENSER	PROCESS: THINKING	PHENOMENON	CIRCUMSTANCE
Belanda	*ngenal*	*ia*	*jama julukan Singa Lampung*
Netherlands	know	him	with call lion Lampung
People of the Netherlands called him The Lion of Lampung (*Singa Lampung*).			
Belanda	*nganggop*	*Raden Intan II*	*sebagai ulun sai kuat ghik sakti*
Netherlands	think	Raden Intan II	as person who strong and powerful
People of the Netherlands assumed Raden Intan II as a powerful person.			

Table 6 demonstrates circumstances which modify the phenomena, *ia* and *Raden Intan II*, each from Clause (8) and (9). Regarding the type of mental process, both *ngenal* and *nganggop* perform a cognitive mental process since each deals with thinking and assuming respectively.

In addition, Clause (10) also has a mental process in the word *dikenang*. It relates to memorization. In other words, it has a cognitive process.

(10) *Sappai ganta kewangian gelaghni dikenang rakyat Lappung.*

It is noteworthy that the constituent *kewangian gelaghni* defines a personal image of *Raden Intan II*. The phrase portrays his struggle, sacrifice, and power to defend the area of Lampung and to protect his people from the colonizer. This personal image becomes a reflection of *Raden Intan II* which is remembered by Lampung people till now on.

Table 7: Mental Clause in Passive Structure

CIRCUMSTANCE	PHENOMENON	PROCESS: THINKING	SENSER
Sappai ganta	*kewangian gelaghni*	*dikenang*	*rakyat Lappung*
Till now	fragrance name (-*ni*)	(*di-*) remember	people Lampung
Lampung people still remember his name till now.			

Table 7 displays a passive construction; it is in the process, which is configured in a combination of a prefix (*di-*) and a verb (*kenang*). Furthermore,

dikenang shows a cognitive process or, in this case, is a process of thinking. Also, a circumstance, *sappai ganta*, is found at the beginning of the clause, refers to a present perfect continuous time. It, thus, explains temporal information.

The Process of Relating The process of relating refers to a relational process indicating a relational clause. In English, copular verbs or linking verbs and to be (such as 'is', 'am', 'are', 'was', and 'were') perform a relational process. Compared to English, Lampungese relational process can also be in the form of copular verbs as in Clause (11).

(11) *Gelagh ina dimaksudko guwai ngehargai jasa-jasa, kesetiaan ghik tindak kepahlawanan di lom ngebila Negara ghik Bangsa Indonesia.*

Clause (11) consists of three constituents, namely *Gelagh ina*, *dimaksudko*, *guwai ngehargai jasa-jasa, kesetiaan ghik tindak kepahlawan*, and *di lom ngebila Negara ghik Bangsa Indonesia*. Here, *dimaksudko* functions as a linking verb, which connects *gelah ina* to *guwai ngehargai jasa-jasa, kesetiaan, ghik tindak kepahlawanan*. This connection is reversible. It means that both constituents can be exchanged and it does not change any meanings and roles. So, *dimaksudko* can be categorized into the relational process or the process of relating. It can specifically be labeled as an identifying relational process whose one constituent (subject) is called token and the other one (complement) is named value (Thompson 2014). Each constituent of Clause (11) is presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Relational Clause of Token-Value

TOKEN	PROCESS: RELATING	VALUE	CIRCUMSTANCES
Gelagh-ina	*di-maksud-ko*	*guwai-ngehargai-jasa-jasa-kesetiaan-ghik-tindak-kepahlawanan*	*di lom - ngebila - Negara ghik - Bangsa Indonesia*
Name-that	(*di-*)mean(-*ko*)	to-honor-service-service-loyalty-and-action-heroic	in-inside-defend-country-and-nation-Indonesia
The title is meant to honour his service, loyalty, and heroic action to defend his country.			

Table 8 demonstrates an identifying relational clause in which a token is identified by a value. in other words, value is an identifier while token is the identified. There are two more relational processes in Clause (12) and (13).

(12) … *perjuangan ghakyat Lampung teghus berkobar*.
(13) *Di tahun 1866 unyin peghlawanan di Lampung buakhir*.

Clause (12) has a different structure. It just has two constituents, namely *perjuangan ghakyat Lampung* and *teghus berkobar*. There is no linking verb found. However, it can be argued that *teghus berkobar* functions to modify *perjuangan ghakyat Lampung* so that the phrase is classified as one of the participants in the relational clause, which is an attribute. In this case, the participant modified is called carrier. In addition, even though there is no relational process, Clause (12) can be categorized into a relational clause since the attribute can substitute the function of the process. This absent relational process is called a zero relational process (Afrianto 2022).

Clause (13) also performs a similar configuration. It has the attribute *buakhir* which modifies the carrier *unyin peghlawanan*. Besides, there are two configurations of circumstance, i.e. *Di tahun 1866* and *di Lampung*. It is noteworthy that in the previous discussion, *di* is categorized as a prefix indicating a passive form. However, *di* that is found in Clause (13) is a preposition. When it

precedes a temporal configuration, it forms temporal circumstance. On the other hand, when it initiates a place or position, it configures a spatial circumstance.

Table 9: Relational Clauses of Carrier-Attribute

CIRCUMSTANCE	CARRIER	∅	CIRCUMSTANCE	ATTRIBUTE
-	*Perjuangan-ghakyat-Lampung*	-	-	*teghus berkobar*
-	struggle-people-Lampung		-	continuous-flame
The struggle of Lampung people is still on fire.				
Di-tahun-1866	*unyin-peghlawanan*	-	*di - Lampung*	*buakhir*
In-year-1866	all-struggle		in - Lampung	continuous-flame
In 1866, all struggles in Lampung were over.				

Table 9 demonstrates the configuration of relational clauses by the relations of carriers and attributes. It is also called an attributive relational clause ((Halliday and Matthiessen 2014; and Thompson 2014). Compared to Clause (11), Clause (12) and (13) do not have a relational process. However, such clauses are still grammatically acceptable. This absence of relational process is called zero relational process and is marked with ∅ (Afrianto 2022).

DISCUSSION   The configurations of the process of doing in Lampungese language are realized with verbs showing physical actions, such as *nyeghbu*, *ngemulai perlawanan*, *ngebantu*, *ditulis* and *diteghusko.* In conjunction with these significant findings, it is noteworthy to mention that scholars such as Wiratno (2018) and Emilia (2014) assert that the actions categorized as material doings serve to convey the conceptual notion that entities actively engage in performing actions that have a tangible impact on other entities within their environments.

Meanwhile, the mental process in Lampungese can be realized with *nyeghah*, *ngenal*, *nganggop*, and *dikenang*. In this case, *nyeghah* construes a feeling; while *ngenal*, *nganggop*, and *dikenang* refer to the process of thinking. Emilia (2014) refers to these phenomena as sensory processes, which encompass the actions of perception—those that engage our sensory faculties, i.e. visual perception, auditory perception, gustatory perception, and olfactory perception.

Concerning the relational process, Lampungese language has two types of it, those are identifying and attributive. Afrianto (2019) argues that both English and Lampungese have a similar form. Halliday and Matthiessen (2014) posit that when a participant alters, delineates, and typifies another, this is classified as an attributive relational clause. Conversely, when a participant represents, signifies, and recognizes another, this is classified as an identifying relational clause. This research found *dimaksudko* as an identifying relational process because it construes a representational relation.

It is also found that, in Lampungese, a relational clause can be structured without a relational process. The disappearance of the relational process is categorized as a zero relational process marked with ∅. Afrianto (2022) argues that a zero relational clause shows no process linking participants (carrier and attribute). For example, in clause *Hasil ni helau nihan. Hasilni* is the carrier and *helau nihan* is the attribute. In the framework of Indonesian and Lampungese language traditional grammar, the constituent *helau nihan* plays a role as a predicate (Sneddon et al. 2010b; Chaer 2009; and Udin et al. 1992). Moreover, Alwi et al. (2014b) posit that the constituent functioning as a predicate can be in the form of a noun or nominal group. It also happens in Lampunges language.

CONCLUSIONS   Configurations of clauses construing the processes of doing, feeling, thinking, and relating in Lampungese language are indicated by verbs. These verbs are formed through affixation in the forms of prefixes, such as *nye-*, *nge-*, and *di-*. This investigation reveals that the intricate and multifaceted process of actions is comprehensively manifested through verbs, such as *nyeghbu*, which denotes initiation; *ngemulai perlawanan*, indicating the commencement of resistance; *ngelawan*, representing opposition; *ngebantu*, which implies assistance; as well as the verbs *ditulis* and *diteghusko,* both of which pertain to the act of writing and the process of documentation respectively.

Subsequently, the thinking and feeling processes can be realized by verbs, such as *nyeghah*, which suggests a form of understanding; *ngenal*, indicating recognition; *nganggop*, which is associated with the act of usage; and *dikenang*, which denotes the concept of remembrance and memory. In contrast, the relational process is predominantly exemplified through the verb *dimaksudko*, which encapsulates the essence of intention or purpose. It is noted that a relational clause possesses the capacity to be constructed independently from a relational process. Thereby, it indicates a level of autonomy in linguistic structure. The absence or disappearance of the relational process is classified under the terminology of zero relational process which is conventionally denoted by the symbol $\varnothing$.

The investigation of the configurations of the processes of doings, feelings, thinking, and relating in this research aimed to document the linguistic aspects of Lampungese language clauses. Therefore, it can be a reference for other researchers to study the language.

REFERENCES   Afrianto. 2015. "Passive Voice in Indonesian and English Poems: A Comparative Study of Frost's and Rendra's Poems". *Aurora* 2 (I): 17–28.

Afrianto. 2019. "English and Lampungnese Relational Processes". *Lingua: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 19 (2): 118–129.

Afrianto. 2022. "Zero Relational Process in Lampung Language Clause". *Linguistik Indonesia* 40 (1): 63–82. https://doi.org/10.26499/li.v40i1.192

Afrianto, Afrianto, and Anisa Inayati. 2016. "Existential Process in Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secret: A Systemic Functional Linguistic Study". *Teknosastik* 14 (1): 26. https://doi.org/10.33365/ts.v14i1.83.

Afrianto, Lia Maulia Indrayani, and Ypsi Soeria Soemantri. 2013. "Transitivity Analysis on Shakespeare's Sonnets." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 19 (1): 78–85. https://doi.org/10.9790/0837-19117885.

Afrianto and Dudih A. Zuhud. 2014. "Mental and Relational Process of Transitivity in Donne's and Blake's Poems: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach". *International Journal of English and Education* 3 (2): 581–84.

Alwi, Hasan, Soenjono Dardjowidjojo, Hans Lapoliwa, and Anton M. Moeliono. 2014. *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Atkinson, Paul and Amanda Coffey. 2004. "Analysing Documentary Realities". In *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, and Practice*, 57–75. London: Sage Publication.

Balog, Persieus S. 2019. "Transitivity Analysis of Selected Privilege Speeches of Senator Miriam Dofensor-Santiago". *Asian Journal of English Language Studies* 7: 43–65.

Bardi, Mohamed Ali. 2008. A Systemic Functional Description of the Grammar of Arabic". (Doctoral Dissertation). Macquaire University

Bloor, Thomas, and Meriel Bloor. 2004. *The Functional Analysis of English* (Second Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Caffarel, Alice. 2004. "Metafunction Profile of the Grammar of French". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Chaer, Abdul. 2009. *Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia: Pendekatan Proses*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Creswell, John W. 2014. *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Method*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication Inc.

Crocker, Robert A. 2009. "An Introduction to Qualitative Research". In Juanita Heigham and Robert A Crocker (eds.). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cunanan, Bonifacio 2011. "Using Transitivity as a Framework in Stylistic Analysis of Virginia Wolf's Old Mrs. Grey". *Asian EFL Journal, Professional Teaching Articles* 54: 69–79.

Deterding, David H and Gloria R. Poedjosoedarmo. 2001. *Grammar of English*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.

Eggins, Suzanne. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Emilia, Emi. 2014. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. Bandung: Pustaka Jaya.

Ethnologue. 2019. "Ethnologue". 2019. https://www.ethnologue.com/country/ID/languages.

Ezzina, Rym. 2015. "Transitivity Analysis of *Crying Lot of 49* by Thomas Pynchon." *International Journal of Humanities Cultural Studies* 2 (3): 283–292.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood, and Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Fourth. London: Routledge.

Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood and Edward McDonald. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Chinese". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hinton, Leanne. 2011. "Revitalization of Endangered Languages". In Peter K Austin and Julia Sallaban (eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Endangered Languages*: 291–311. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johari, Tontowi. 2017. "Transitivity in Wasiat Renungan Masa Pengalaman Baru and Its Relevance to Indonesian Language Learning at Senior High School: SFL Approach". *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics* 1 (2): 47–52.

Lavid, Julia, Jorge Arus Hita, and Juan Rafael Zamorano-Mansilla. 2010. *Systemic Functional Grammar of Spanish: A Contrastive Study with English*. New York and London: Continuum.

Lock, Graham. 2005. *Functional English Grammar, an Introduction for Second Language Teacher* (8th Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mann, Thomas. 2015. *The Oxford Guide to Library Research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, James R. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Tagalog". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Matthiessen, Christian MIM, Kazuhiro Teruya, and Lam Marvin. 2010. *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Continuum.

Mehmood, Ashad, Roshan Amber, Sobia Ameer, and Rabia Faiz. 2014. "Transitivity Analysis: Representation of Love in Wlides's the Nightingala and the Rores." *European Journal of Research in Social Science* 2 (4): 78–85.

Nguyen, Hanh Thu. 2012. "Transitivity Analysis of *Heroic Mother* by Hoa Pham". *International Journal of English Linguistics* 2 (4). DOI:10.5539/ijel.v2n4p85.

Ong'onda, Anashia Nancy. 2016. "Transitivity Analysis of Newspaper Headlines on Terrorism Attack in Kenya: A Case Study of Wetgate Mall, Nairobi". *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 6 (9): 77–85.

Opara, S. 2012. "Transitivity System in Selected Narrative Discourse". *International Journal of Arts and Commerce* 1 (7): 109–21.

Prakasam, Vennelakanti. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Telugu". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rose, David. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Pitjantjatjara". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Senjawati, Dessy. 2016. "Transitivity Analysis of Tenth Grade Student Recount Text". *Journal of English and Education* 4 (1): 1–22.

Sihura, Meltarina. 2019. "Transitivity Process in Frozen Movie: A Study of Systemic Functional Grammar." *International Journal of Systemic Functional Linguistics2* 2 (2): 79–85.

Silverman, David. 2015. *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Sneddon, James N, Alexander Adelar, Dwi Noverini Djenar, and Michael C Ewing. 2010. *Indonesian Reference Grammar* (2nd Edition). New South Wales: Allen and Unwin.

Stake, Robert E. 2010. *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Steiner, Erich and Elke Teich. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of German". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Sujatna, Eva Tuckyta Sari. 2012. "Applying Systemic Functional Linguistics to Bahasa Indonesia Clause". *International Journal of Linguistics* 4 (2): 134–146.

Sujatna, Eva Tuckyta Sari. 2013a. "Mood System and Transitivity of Airline Slogan: A Comparison of National and Regional Airlines." *International Journal of Linguistics* 3 (3): 42–52.

Sujatna, Eva Tuckyta Sari. 2013b. *Understanding Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Bandung: Unpad Press.

Suparto, Agustinus Dias. 2018. "Transitivity Analysis on Framing in the Online Articles". *Kata Kita: Jornal of Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 20–27.

Teruya, Kazuhiro. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Japanese". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thai, Minh Duc. 2004. "Metafunctional Profile of the Grammar of Vietnamese". In Alice Caffarel, James R Martin, and Christian MIM Matthiessen (eds.). *Language Typology: A Functional Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Thompson, Geoff. 2014. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. New York: Routledge.

Udin, Nazaruddin, R. Sudrajat, Wardinah Akhyar, Imam Rejono, and Efendi Sanusi. 1992. *Tata Bahasa Bahasa Lampung Dialek Pesisir*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Umam, Khaerul and Muhammad Yunus Anis. 2018. "Transitivity Pada Teks Penyusunan Pasal Piagam Madinah (Pendekatan Tata Bahasa Fungsional)." In *Prosiding Konferensi Nasional Bahasa Arab IV*: 577–587.

Wiratno, Tri. 2018. *Pengantar Ringkas Linguistik Sistemik Fungsional*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Yuli, Sun and Zhao Yushan. 2012. "A Comparison of Transitivity System in English and Chinese." *Cross-Cultural Communication* 8 (4): 75–80.

Zahoor, M and Fauzia Janjua. 2015. "Construction in Tributive Songs: Transitivity Analysis of the Song I Am Malala". *Trames: Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 19 (3): 201–213.

Zhang, Yichao. 2017. "Transitivity Analysis of Hilary Clinton And Donald Trump's First Television Debate". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature* 6 (7): 65–72.

Zhu, Yujie and Fengjie Li. 2018. "Transitivity Analysis of American President Donald Trump's Innaugural Address." *International Journal of Literature and Arts* 6 (2): 28–34.

ARTICLE CITATION IN *THE CHICAGO MANUAL OF STYLE 16*

In-text Citation
Afrianto, Sujatna, Darmayanti, and Ariyani (2024, 99) .....
..... (Afrianto, Sujatna, Darmayanti, and Ariyani 2024, 99)

Reference List Entry
Afrianto, Eva Tuckyta Sari Sujatna, Nina Darmayanti, and Farida Ariyani. 2024. "The Configurations of the Process of Doing, Feeling, Thinking, and Relating in Lampungese Language Clauses". *Leksema: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 9 (2): 93-105. https://doi.org/10.22515/ljbs.v9i2.8886.