Narrative Structure of 'Frog Story' by Two Minang Speakers

Yusrita Yanti and Santi Kurniati

Universitas Bung Hatta and Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary

Anthropology, Padang Field Station

Abstract

This paper aims to examine narrative structures (NS) in 'Frog Story' by two Minang speakers coming from Sawahlunto (MS) and from Tapan (MT). In this analysis we use Labov's analytical framework. Labov proposed the basic components of a narrative's structure consists of six components, namely (1) abstract (summary and/or point of the story); (2) orientation (to time, place,characters and situation); (3) complicating action (the event sequence, or plot, usually with a crisis and turning point); (4) evaluation (where the narrator steps back from the action to comment on meaning and communicate emotion); (5) resolution (the outcome of the plot); and (6) a coda (ending the story and bringing action back to the present). Data of this analysis were taken from Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Padang Field Station. From the data analysis, the result shows not all components of narrative structures are adhered. For example, in character components, a narrator (MS) only use a pronoun *nyo/inyo*, kawan-kawannyo, whereas a narrator (MT) meets all the elements of narrative structures. In the component 'orientation', MT presented the characters Yora, Roro, *Ama* (mother), *Apa* (father) and described the situation in detailed. Then, in the component 'complicating action' some differences were made. Consider the following examples:

> 1.MS : pas sampai di rumah. pas inyo ngecek ka ama nyo.
>   "*den nio **bali sepeda** Ma*". a nyo jawek dek ama nyo.
>   **"(un)tuk a bali sepeda ndak usah lah bali-bali sepeda ndak ado pitih ama do**".
>   tu inyo **mangareh** juo nio mintak balian samo ama nyo, tapi ama nyo tetap ndak
>   nio do. tu inyo mancari jalan lain untuak bisa bali sepeda tu. (complicating action)
> 2. MT : tu pai nyo pulang kan. ka rumah nyo. nyo tanyoan ka ama nyo.
>   "Ma e, kawan-kawan punyo sepeda Ma, tadi batamu di den Yora samo apo".
>   "e samo si Roro di muko tu". nyo kecekan inyo, nyo lah ado sepeda.
>   "padahal e den ado sepeda lai do ma, baa tu Ma, *den nio **basepeda** Ma*".
>   "**manga Ang pakai-pakai sepeda**" cek amae. "ancak lah (a)po lai, jalan kaki lai
>   beko jatuah ko tatungkuik lo ko kan". "tu, tu baa lai tu Ma". "**yo kalau punyo nio**
>   **bali sepeda bali lah surang manabuang awak**, *emaik-emaik awak*, kalau ama yo
>   ndak ado pitih do". "ama la jaleh kini miskin". (Complicating action)

The examples (1-2) show some differences in the way to convey the wishes of MS and MT, they used different words choice and diffrent strategy. In direct strategy (speech), "***den nio bali sepeda ma***", and indirect stratetgy "***Ma e, kawan-kawan punyo sepeda Ma, tadi batamu di den......baa tu ma, den nio basepeda***". This paper will discuss (1) how Minang speakers (MS and MT) adhere six components of Labov's analytical framework, (2) language style or words choice that convey the same idea, (3) some characteristics of Minangkabau dialect such as *manyengek-nyengek (marengek-rengek)*, *tasuruik ati (ibo ati)*, in expressing emotion, and (4) how MS and MT share values of Minangkabau culture through the story.

References

Holmes, J. (2003). Narrative Structure: Some Contrasts Between Maori and Pakeha Story-
        telling in Sociolinguistics. Edited by Panelston, C.B. and Tucker G.R. Malden:
        Blackwell Publishing.
Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. Language in the Inner City:

Studies in the Black English Vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Pensylvania. 354-394.

Labov, W. And Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative Analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In Helm, June (ed). Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts. Seatle: University of Washington Press,12-44.

Smith, J. (2006). Narrative: Sociolinguistic Research. York : Elsevier Ltd.