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0 INTRODUCTION*

In these preliminary descriptive studies, one paper (Verhaar 1984; this volume) lists all affixes near-exhaustively, it is hoped, including those of verbs. That study, however, is almost entirely sheer morphemics and a full description of any of the categories involved, in the present case verbs, should include just what characterizes verbs as categorically verbs, including the valency of verbs; with regard to the number of Arguments and various properties of verbs in relation to those Arguments. Needless to say, there are many other aspects of grammatical organization involving verbs: syntactic, deictic and discourse-pragmatic. In the present paper only valency will be taken for our subject, with only occasional reference to those other topics just mentioned, with appropriate references to forthcoming papers in the present Series. It is, we feel, only by such a rigid "division of labor" that anything like a comprehensive description is going to be possible.

The majority of verbs in Contemporary Indonesian are affixed, with affixation peculiar to the verb, so that identification of affixed verbs as verbs is for the most part unproblematic. There are, in principle, problems, however, with nonaffixed forms as verbs; mostly the question will be: verb? or adjective? Consider lexemes like lepas "loose", or mati "dead". As the glosses suggest, they may be considered as adjectives; semantically they seem typically stative, rather than active, processual, or eventive, which are features more readily associated with verbs. However, the matter is not that easy. Consider lepas, for example, in laju dia lepas 'then he got free', or mati in anak itu mati sekakita 'the child died instantaneously'. Certainly lepas and mati in these examples are "eventive", not "stative". There is a clear beginning and/or a clear end to what is described as happening. Should lepas and mati, then, be described as "bicatgorial"?

We suggest that we rely on syntactic rather than (only) on semantic parameters of such lexemes, for them to be considered as verbs. Granted, lepas and mati may be used "eventively"; however, they do not admit of a second Argument; that is, there are dia lepas (oleh musuh) 'he was set free by his enemy' or dia mati (oleh flu) 'he died of the flu' wellformed? They are not. In contrast, dia kena flu 'he got [i.e. 'was hit by'] the flu', or hai itu lupa olehnya 'that thing he forgot [lit. 'that thing was forgotten by him']' are perfectly wellformed, so kena and lupa are indisputably verbs. Granted, kena and lupa are semantically not stative; however, neither are lepas and mati, in some uses of them. We need, then, grammatical rather than semantic criteria for consistency in description. Other grammatical criteria are likewise syntactic, or morphemic. An obvious syntactic criterion is the possibility for an affixless lexeme to have an Object, as is the case, e.g., in tahu 'to know' (see 1.2, below). A morphemic criterion is the possibility of having a paradigmatic ter- alternate, in the case of an affixless lexeme: examples are tertidur 'to fall asleep', from tidur 'to sleep'; or terjatuh 'to fall down', from jatuh 'to fall'. The ter- test is especially convincing since genuine adjectives may also have ter- for the superlative.

Nevertheless, after such tests there remain cases which are, at least in principle, doubtful, like hingga 'to perch', omong 'to chat', singgah 'to stop by', etc. For such instances, however, it seems most convenient to simply consider them as verbs, rather than adjectives, because by far most grammarians consider them so.

The present paper assumes that all verbal affixations have already been listed, as noted; see Verhaar 1984, 1.3 (a) (i), 1.3 (b) (i), 1.3 (c) (i), 7.0 through 7.8. It is convenient to begin with affixless verbs (1, below), and then to treat verbs largely determined by their characteristic affixations (2 through 5); then the syntactic properties, in what we call the "syntactic paradigm" of each of those classes, will be treated (6); finally "additional Arguments" of the "inalienable possession" type will be discussed (7).
AFFIXLESS VERBS

1.0 The class meant here is exemplified by jatuh 'to fall', tidur 'to sleep', bangau 'to rise', tahu 'to know', and alike. One would be tempted to call them "monomorphic' verbs, but for the fact that some of them may occur in reduplicated form (e.g. jatuh-jatuh 'to fall repeatedly'; duduk-duduk 'to sit around [together]; etc.), so that they are then not monomorphic, though still affixless. "Affixless verbs", then, seems to be the most appropriate term.

For a better understanding of what follows a few notes should be made about what will not be considered as included in the class of "affixless" verbs:

(i) We do not include "precatégorials", i.e. bound lexical forms, which need affixation of some kind to have categorial membership of any kind assigned to them. Precategorials will be treated separately in this series; see [FP-7]; and Verhaar 1984: 0.3. Precategorials are marked by a colon to the left (with the gloss, if "preverbal", without "to"), e.g. as :sebut 'name', :ilihat 'see', :basuh 'wash', etc.

(ii) The Ñ- prefixed form of me- (and memper-) verbs count as polymorphic, simply because they are affixed, i.e. with the (paradigmatic) prefix Ñ-: they are so considered because the Ñ- is clearly recoverable. See Verhaar 1984: 1.1; 1.3 (a) (i), 7.0 (f), 7.6. Note that such Ñ- forms are not "citation forms": see Verhaar 1984: 0.4.

(iii) We do not include here compound verbs with "Object-incorporation", such as basuh tangan 'to wash one's hands'; cari untung 'to seek profit'; etc. These verbs have (derivational) Ñ-. These are treated in 5, below.

(iv) We will not include here verbs, in Informal Indonesian, without men- or ber-, which would be the prefixes attached to them in Formal Indonesian. The berdropping is almost exclusively due to interference from Javanese (which has no cognate for the ber- form; see Poedjosoedarmo 1970). Examples: lompat 'to jump (melompat); juang 'to struggle' (berjuang); etc. Note, however, that some ber- verbs have ber- less forms also in Formal Indonesian, e.g. lari is distinct from berlari; mandi is distinct from bermandi. Such examples follow below. Finally, while some informal verbs like kasih 'to give', and bilang 'to say' are distinctly colloquial and informal, they will be given below anyway, because of their high frequency and their difference with prefixed alternants.

(v) Reduplication of affixless verbs (see above, this section) does have valency consequences, but it does also when affixed. See below, 2.11. For reduplication morphemically, see [FP-8]; for reduplication syntactically as "context-sensitive", see [FP-9].

Affixless verbs may be divided into the following subclasses:

(a) Auxiliaries.
(b) Semitransitives.
(c) Intransitives without nuclear Complements.
(d) Passives.
(e) Intransitives with nuclear Complements.
(f) Reduplicated verbs requiring a plural Subject.

These may now be dealt with briefly, in 1.1 through 1.6.

1.1 Affixless auxiliaries are: akan 'shall/will'; bakal 'will'; berant 'to dare'; bisa 'can'; boleh 'may, be allowed to'; dapat 'can'; harus 'must, have to'; hendak 'to want'; ingin 'to want'; mau 'to want'; mesti 'must'; mungkin 'may, to be possible'; suatu 'to be willing [condescending]; suka 'to want, to desire'. Of these, it may be doubted whether akan and bakal are genuinely verbal, but it is not outlandish to consider them as such. These verbs are auxiliaries, i.e. they combine with, and sequentially precede, the "main" verb (which may, as in many other languages, be dropped if understood from the immediate context). These auxiliaries may be described from various angles: their time deixis (Kaswanti 1984a; [FP-4]); their sequential position as "qualifiers" ([FP-5]; [FP-6]); their "predication" in ergative and accusative organization [FP-3]. At this point it is only necessary to illustrate their use in some examples:

(1) Saya harus/dapat/bisa/boleh 'I have to/can/can/may datang jam sepuluh. come at ten o'clock.'

(2) Bolehkah saya mengganggu sebentar? 'May I trouble (you) for a moment?'

(3) Dia akan/mesti memeriksa makalah 'He will/must examine my paper.'

(4) Saya.

(5) Kenulitan itu mau diatasinya. 'He wants to overcome that problem.'

(6) Kami ingin mengadakan perundingan. 'We [excl.] want to engage in negotiations.'

(7) Hal seperti itu tidak mungkin 'It is not possible that such terjadi. a thing will happen.'

(8) Sudilah kiranya membaca surat 'Would you be so kind as to saya ini.' read this letter of mine.'
(8) Ayah tidak suka pergi malam hari. 'Father does not like to go out in the evening.'
(9) Saya tidak berani menantang dia. 'I do not dare to challenge her.'
(10) Kelak anak ini bakal menjadi Presiden. 'Later this child will become President.'
(11) Pesawat itu jatuh ketika sedang bersiap-siap hendak mendarat. 'The plane fell when it prepared to land.'

Some of these auxiliaries may function in some other categorical capacity: akan may be a preposition [FF-18]; mungkin may be an adverbial Qualifier [FF-6]; FF-19]; while berani, ingin, mau and mungkin may be used as nonauxiliaries; see below.

1.2 A number of affixless verbs may be called "semisynthetic", in that they have a measure of transitivity, under certain constraints. These verbs are: bikin 'to make'; bilang 'to say'; hafal 'to memorize'; ikut 'to follow'; ingat 'to remember'; kasih 'to give'; lupa 'to forget'; makan 'to eat'; masuk 'to enter'; mina 'to request'; minum 'to drink'; mohon 'to request'; naik 'to climb'; percaya 'to believe'; punya 'to have'; suka 'to like'; tahan 'to be able to stand'; tahu 'to know'.

These verbs may be subclassified, not, however, without some overlap, and the following classification is presented because it makes for a convenient treatment of the valencies of these verbs.

(a) The verbs makan, minum, mina, mohon, and ingat are similar in that they have fully transitive parallels with men-, but not circumfixed: memakan, meminum, meminta, memohon, mengingat. Something is to be said for considering the short forms of the first four of these verbs (i.e. excepting ingat) as prenasalized "nonsyllabically" (Verhaar 1984: 3.2[d]). However that may be, these short forms may take Objects, but only in free form, not encliticized (i.e. not as -ku/-mu/-nya; those enclitics invariably require the syllabically prenasalized form: men- or memper-; see Verhaar 1984: 7.2). Consider the following examples:
(12) Si Dul tidak mau makan roti. 'Dul doesn't want to eat bread.'
(13) Saya harus minum obat tiga kali sehari. 'I have to take ['drink'] medicine three times a day.'
(14) Dia minta hal itu demi Ali. 'He is asking this for the sake of Ali.'
(15) Kami mohon hal itu dalam doa. 'We [excl.] ask this in (our) prayers.'
(16) Saya tidak ingat itu. 'I don't remember that.'
(17) Saya akan makan (‘nya)/minum (‘nya) 'I am going to eat/drink/ request/remember ingat (‘nya). (‘kit).'
(18) Saya akan memakannya/mememininya/ 'I am going to eat/drink/ memintanya/memohonnya/mengingat- request/remember it.'

n ya.

As apparent from these examples, syllabically prenasalized forms of these verbs (as is the case with the same forms of all other transitive verbs), may have encliticized Objects; their "short" forms, however, can only have "free' Objects.

Analytically, the apparent short forms of these verbs may in fact be ə-alternates of the ("long") men- forms; consider:
(19) Obat itu harus kamu minum 'That medication you have to take before meals.'
(20) Saya selalu minum obat ini 'I always take this medication before meals.'

In (19), it is impossible to separate kamu and minum by any other constituent; this is because minum in (19) is analytically, ə-minum, the zero alternant of the paradigm of meminum, not minum, which has no other paradigmatic alternate; see Verhaar 1984: 7.6. While inseparability of kamu and minum in (19) is already a strong argument for the zero analysis, another is that, but for this construction, the Object (obat itu) could not precede the verb (i.e. in (19) obat itu is either Object-of-ergative or Subject-of-passive, and could precede the verb in either case). In contrast, in (20), the interposition of selalu between saya and minum already argues that minum cannot be ə-minum; also, in (20), the Object (obat ini) could not wellformedly precede the verb. Therefore, in (20), we have the "short" form minum. Similar examples could establish such differences of the other four verbs of this class (a).
(b) In this class belong bikin,
bilang, and kasih, all of which are colloquial-informal, but so high in frequency that they should be included in the description of this section. The verb mem-
bilang exists, but it means 'to count'; there is also berbilang 'to count', and
berbilang may in addition be an indefinite quantifier, meaning 'some'. Bilang, there-
fore, is not just a case of ber- or men-
dropping (see [iv], in the beginning of
1.1, above), even though it is informal-
colloquial, because of its different mean-
ing, i.e. 'to say'. The verb kasih 'to
give', is decidedly informal-colloquial,
though the noun kasih (or kasih sayang, or
cinta kasih) 'love' is formal; kasih may
be a three-place verb. Consider the fol-
lowing examples:

(21) Dia bilang "Jangan"!
'He said "Don't!'" 

(22) Mereka bilang bahwa si Yem
'They say that Yem is mistaken.'
keiliru. 

(23) Saya sudah bilang itu tadi.
'I already said that a moment
ago.' 

(24) Kasih (sayo) obeng!
'Give (me) the/a screwdriver!' 

(25) Lalu saya kaish dia seratus
'Then I gave him one hundred
Rupiah.
Rupiahs.' 

(26) Saya bikin banyak kemarin.
'I did a lot yesterday.' 

Note that none of these verbs can have a
cliticized Object ('bikinnya; *bilangnya;
'kasihnya). Some dictionaries give mem-
bilang for 'to do', as 'colloquial', but it
seems to be rarely used.

(c) The following verbs are conve-
niently treated as one subclass: ingin,
ikut, lupa, masuk, mau, naik, percaya,
punya, suka, tahan, tahu. One thing these
verbs have in common is that they occur
also in circumfixed form: menginginkan
'to desire'; mengikutii 'to follow'; melu-
pakkan 'to forget'; memasukii 'to enter';
menaui 'to desire'; menukii 'to climb';
mempercayai 'to believe'; mempunyai 'to
have, to possess'; menyukai 'to like';
menahan (the only noncircumfixed one in
this group) 'to (be able to) withstand';
mengetahui 'to (get to) know'. (Other
circumfixations with some of these are
possible, but not synonymous with the af-
fixless forms.) Lupa may also be passive
(1.4). Consider the following examples:

(27) Ibu ingin dua.
'Mother wants two.' 

(28) Saya ikut Romo.
'I followed the priest [i.e.
everywhere, working with him].' 

(29) Kamu pasti sudah lupa alamatnya.
'You must have forgotten his
address by now.' 

(30) Jangan lupa payung!
'Don't forget (your) umbrella!' 

(31) Ayahnya masuk kamar.
'His father entered the room.' 

(32) Pak lurah tidak mau hal semaaron
'The village head doesn't want
itu, anything like that.' 

(33) Jangan naik sepeda itul
'Don't use that bicycle!' 

(34) Saya tidak percaya itu. 
'I don't believe that.' 

(35) Dia punya dua ratu buku.
'He has two hundred books.' 

(36) Mereka tidak suka teh.
'They don't like tea.' 

(37) Saudara tahan obat?
'Can you take this medicine?'
[i.e. 'Are you not allergic
to it?'] 

(38) Sekretaris kami tahu persoalan-
'Our [excl.] secretary knows
annyra.
the case [i.e. 'the problem'].'

Like the verbs in (a) and (b), these verbs
cannot have encliticized Objects, only
"free" Objects. Some of the verbs of this
subclass may have Objects with preposi-
tions: ikut dengan 'to go with'; lupa
akan 'to forget'; percaya akan 'to believe';
suka akan 'to like'; tahu tentang 'to know
about'.

1.3 Most affixless verbs are intransi-
tive. The following list should be fairly
exhaustive (it excludes intransitives with
nuclear complements): ada 'to be [LOC]';
bangkit 'to rise'; bangun 'to rise'; batuk
'to cough'; benar 'to feel turned off';
berak 'to defecate'; bonyong 'to take a
ride [with someone]'; datang 'to come';
duduk 'to sit'; hadir 'to be present';
harap 'to hope'; heran 'to be amazed';
hidup 'to live'; hilir 'to disappear';
hilir 'to go downstream'; hinggap 'to
perch'; hinggat 'to sway'; istirahat 'to
rest'; jadi 'to get done, to happen'; ja-
tuh 'to fall'; kawin 'to marry'; kembali
'to return'; kencing 'to urinate'; kentut
'to fart'; khawatir 'to worry'; lahir 'to
be born'; lapor 'to report'; lari 'to run';
mampu 'to be able'; mandi 'to take a bath,
to bathe [oneself]'; mangkat 'to die [said
of royalty]'; menang 'to win'; mongok 'to
(go on) strike'; musik 'to go upstream';
muni 'to appear, to show up'; mundur 'to
retreat'; muntah 'to throw up'; nampak 'to appear'; omong 'to chat'; pamit 'to take one's leave'; peduli 'to care'; perl oleh 'to go away, to leave'; pulang 'to go home'; sampai 'to arrive'; singgah 'to make a short visit'; sutd 'to ascend'; surut 'to decrease'; ssewut 'to increase'; peduli 'to care'; perl 'to come forward'; tenggelam 'to sink'; terbang 'to fly'; terbit 'to rise'; terjun 'to dive'; tii 'to arrive'; tinggal 'to stay'; tumpong 'to fall down'; tumpuh 'to grow'; tumpak 'to flow out'; turun 'to go down'; turut 'to follow'.

What these verbs have in common is only that they are monomorphic and intransitive. In all other respects they differ rather significantly:

(i) Though all these verbs are origins of various morphemic derivations (see [FF-1]), not all of them have verbs derived from them; e.g. mampu, mangkat, pangling and pasang do not.

(ii) Some verbs of this class do have verbs derived from them, but of a different subclass, especially transitive verbs (see [FF-1]): e.g. mengawinkan 'to marry [someone]'; menghalau 'to worry about'; memuntahkan 'to vomit [something]'; menurut 'to visit' etc.

(iii) Not all these verbs are equally current: some are Jakarta dialect, e.g. bonong; others are Javanese, e.g. pangling; others again are highly literary, e.g. mangkat. However, the Jakartanese and Javanese items are so high in text frequency that they should be mentioned.

(iv) A number of verbs in this class have ber-forms rather closely synonymous with the ber-less forms: next to ada, bangkit, batuk, harap, iatrihah, kena, lari, mandi, and tumpong, we find: berada, berbangkit, berbatuk, berharap, beriatrihah, berkena, berlari, bermandi, and bertumpong. Note that the ber-less forms are not just cases of substandard ber-dropping (1.0 (iv)). Though synonymy of the ber-forms and the ber-less form is very close, there are some differences in style, first of all, and also idiomatically, as follows. Berada is closer to 'to sojourn [in a certain place]' than ada, which is locative in a less nuanced sense: 'to be [in a place]'. While both berbangkit and bangkit would be all right in the sense of 'to get up (to a standing-up posture)', bangkit dari antara orang mati 'to rise from the dead' can have bangkit only, not *berbangkit. Where harap (without a Subject) means 'please' (harap lapor pada petugas 'please register with the person in charge'), *berharap would be out. While lari means 'to run' just as lari, yet 'to run away' can only be lari, not *berlari (e.g. la 'berlari dari penjara' he escaped [distanced himself by running]). Similarly, while both mandi and bermandi mean 'to take a bath, to bathe', bermandi needs a Complement: bermandi peluh/keringat 'to bathe in perspiration' (also: mandi peluh/ke-

(v) A number of other verbs in this class have forms also intransitive, in fairly close synonymy with the men-less forms: next to benu, berak, bungkak, hilang, hilir, hinggat, omong, suat, turun and turut, we find: membenu, membun, membungkak, menghilang, menghilir, menghinggat, mengomong, menguut, menurut and menurut. Again, there are some differences between those 'long' and 'short' forms as well. For a number of the verbs just given, the men-form is more "processual" in meaning, especially menghilang 'to (be in the process of) disappear(ing)'; menghilir 'to (be in the process of) go(ing) downstream'. In fact for some of these items it could not without plausibility be argued that they are "adjectives" rather than verbs, e.g. hinggat 'swaying', with menghinggat as the (processual) verb derived from it (0). Benu is often rather "static": saya (selalu) benu (akan hal semaam itu) 'I (always) hate (a thing like that)'; saya benu 'that really turns me off! In contrast, membenu would rather mean 'to hate [a person]'. While turun would normally mean 'to go down [the stairs, e.g.], menurut would be more characteristically used for inanimates (jalananya mendaki, lalu menurun 'the road climbs first, then goes down'). While turut simply means 'to follow' (often with another men-form, e.g. turut membangun 'to join in building'; ikut, which is often intransitive, may replace turut), menurut, again, is more "processual": kereta api menurut rel 'the train hugs the rail'. Note that menurut may also be a preposition: 'according to' (Verhaar 1984: 12.2; [FF-18]).

(vi) For some items of this class the "parallel" ber- or men- forms are rather different. E.g., while menjadi is 'to become', jadi means 'to happen' (ka-lau aara ini, tidak jadi 'as to this program, that's not going through!'; menjadi would be out here). While datang is 'to arrive, to come', men- forms are 'sudden', or may be an adjective (minggu mendatang 'this coming week'). While ja-tuh means 'to fall', berjatuh is 'to give (financial) support'. Finally, while tinggal means 'to stay', meninggal means 'to die'.

The verbs of class 1.3, being intransitive, do not give rise to any problems, since like all intransitives they have only one argument, i.e. the Subject. One verb, not yet mentioned, is peculiar, i.e. mulai, in that it is not monomorphic (the base is mula 'beginning', followed by "locative" -i), but without men-, although that form memulai 'to begin [trans.]' also exists. Note that the form mulai discussed here does not analytically represent *-mulai (which is normally the "zero" form of memulai), and therefore it is convenient to consider (zeroless) mulai as monomorphic; there seems to be no other such forms in the language. Consider (39) and (40):
In (39), *mulai* is the ("full") verb of the clause. In contrast, in (40), *mulai*, analytically, stands for *mulai* with *saya* inseparable from that verb form. The noun *pelakanaananya* is its Object. In contrast, *mulai* in (39) has *saya* separable from it by an appropriate constituent, as well as a non-Object Complement.

1.4 Next, there are the passive nonaffixed verbs. The following list should be fairly exhaustive: *kena* 'to be hit'; *lupa* 'to be forgotten'; *tampak* 'to be seen'; and *tembus* 'to be pierced'. They are passives formally in that they may have Agents, as in *kena* flu 'to get [i.e. 'to be hit by'] the flu'; *lupa* olehnya 'to be forgotten by him'; *tampak* oleh kita 'there appeared to us [i.e. 'was seen by us (incl.)']'; *tembus* oleh tombak 'pierced by a spear'. *Kena* may have *oleh* 'by' for the Agent, though probably not in *kena* + disease [like the flu]; *lupa*, if passive and accompanied by an Agent, must have *oleh*. This is also the case with *tembus*, except when used figuratively: *tembus* mata 'transparent [i.e. 'see-through in quality']'.

It is useful to consider these forms as bases for affixed verbs: *mengenal* 'to hit, to affect'; *melupakkan* 'to forget' (note that *lupa* may also be 'to forget'; see 1.2) *menampakkan* 'to reveal, to make visible'; *menembus* 'to pierce'. All these verbs, being transitive, have passives as one would expect in normal fashion. Thus there are (to limit ourselves to *di-* passives only): *dikenal*, *dilupakkan*, *ditampakkan*, *ditembus*. These 'systemic' associations, being established in the language as they are, would naturally tend to work the other way with other verbs. For example, *menerbolehkan* 'to allow, to permit', from *boleh* 'may', would make it possible to have *boleh* reanalyzed as 'be allowed to', such that an Agent would be possible, though only in highly conditioned contexts. Similarly, *mengharuskannya* 'to make obligatory', from *harus* 'must', could open *harus* for the meaning 'be obligated'. Consider (42) and (44), and then compare with (41) and (43):

(41) *Saya boleh pergi* (*boleh petugas*). 'I have permission (from the official) to leave.'

(42) *Kamu boleh!* *Lho, boleh oleh* 'You have permission! I really

siapa! wonder from whom!'

(43) *Saya harus kembali* (*oleh Ayah*). 'I have to go back (because my father tells me so).'

(44) *Kamu harus! Lho, harus oleh* 'You have to! I really wonder

siapa! at whose orders!'

(45) *Akhirnya Ken Arrok mati. Oleh* 'Finally Ken Arrok died. And

anaknya sendiri! it was his own son who killed him!'

Sentences (41) and (42) are a dialogue, and in (42) the astounded speaker takes on to *boleh* by repeating it as a passive with an Agent, even though an Agent in (41) would be deviant. A similar analysis holds for *harus* in the second clause of (44). The productivity of such "passivizations" syntactically of forms which are normally "passive" only semantically is shown in *mati* in (45). 'To kill' is *mem- bunuh*, while *mematikan* (from *mati* 'dead') is only figurative in meaning (e.g. *mematikan* mesin 'to turn off the engine'); nevertheless (nonfigurative) *mati* in (45) serves as the point to tack an *oleh* Agen-
tive on to.

1.5 Intransitives with nuclear Complements are not limited to affixless verbs; in fact, there are more such types with affixed verbs; see 2.1 (v). Here are a few examples of affixless verbs with nuclear Complement: *duduk perut* 'to become pregnant'; *jatuh ainta* 'to fall in love'; *jatuh hati* 'to take a liking [to a person]'; *mandi uang* 'to roll in money'; *mandi mayat* 'to wash a deceased person's body'; *naik banding* 'to appeal (to a higher court)'; *naik haji* 'to make a pil-
grimage to Mecca (and become a haji)'; *sengyum kambing* 'to smile (in embarrass-
ment)'; *tidur ayam* 'to be half asleep, to catnap'; *tidur siang* 'to make a siesta'; *turun tangan* 'to take (disciplinary) action'.

A large part of such expressions are merely idiomatic, and constitute fairly unique cases of the intransitive verb plus obligatory Complement type. Relatively few of them exhibit some features of "Object" in the Complement; a clear case is *mandi mayat*, also *turun tangan*. Note that *turun tangan* is different from the compound type consisting of a zero plus verb stem plus incorporated Object (as in *cari untung* 'to seek profit'; *kirim surat*), on which see 5, below. Such compounds invariably allow of the full men-
form parallel (e.g. *mencari untung/kentungan; mengirimkan surat*), whereas expressions like *turun tangan* do not allow of any parallel like *menurunkan tangan* on the same reading.
1.6 Some reduplicated verbs, of this affixless class among others, may require a Subject that is at least semantically plural. Consider the following examples:

(46) Mereka duduk-duduk dan bicara
terus.
talked a lot.

(47) Dia omong-omong terus.
'She kept right on talking.'

(48) Jangan lar-i-lari di situ!
'Don't you [pl.] run around
Agak licin!
there! Too slippery!'

As is pointed out by Simatupang (1983: 133ff.), a reduplicated verb may affect interpretation of the Subject. Mereka in (46), for example, could not easily, in other than highly conditioned context, be (singular) dia. This, however, is not invariably the case, as shown in (47), where omong-omong signifies repeated talking by the same person. In (48), in most contexts, the addressee is plural. On reduplication, see [FF-8].

2 MEN- AND MEMPER- VERBS

2.0 This class comprises a number of subtypes which may be listed as follows:

(a) Men- verbs, circumfixed or non-circumfixed, intransitive.

(b) Men- verbs, noncircumfixed, transitive, two-place.

(c) Men- verbs, noncircumfixed, transitive, three-place.

(d) Men- verbs, noncircumfixed, with iterative -i.

(e) Men-|kan verbs, transitive.

(f) Men-|i verbs, transitive.

(g) Memper- verbs, noncircumfixed.

(h) Memper-|kan verbs.

(i) Memper-|i verbs.

(j) Men- verbs, circumfixed or non-circumfixed, with optionally oblique Object.

(k) Reduplicated verbs, requiring plural Subject.

For derivations of all these verbs, see [FF-1]. For an inventory of affixes, and examples, see Verhaar 1984, 3 through 6; for their paradigmatic affixations, see Verhaar 1984, 7.0 through 7.8. Classes (a) through (k) must now be dealt with in 2.1 through 2.11.

2.1 These intransitive men- verbs are in most cases noncircumfixed, and circum-
fixed in some. Only a minority of men- verbs are intransitive, and slightly productively so. For our purposes here we may distinguish the following subclasses:

(ii) Verbs indicating a process: membengak 'to swell'; melebar 'to become wider'; memutih 'to become white'; membi-

ru 'to become blue'. Apart from being processual, these verbs are often inchoative.

(ii) Verbs signifying an essentially "punctual" event: mendat "to land";

melaut "to put out to sea"; menyeberang "to cross over"; mengalak "to bark"; mele-
burk "[with]"; etc.

(iii) Transitive verbs which can be used also intransitively: menutup 'to close [without apparent Agent]'; membuka 'to open [without apparent Agent]'. The possibility of this intransitive use is a lexical characteristic of these verbs. That is to say, these cases should be distinguished from the possibility of all transitive verbs to be "decontextualized" in the antipassive: a grammatical possibility.

(iv) Only very few circumfixed men- verbs (and no circumfixed memper- verbs) are intransitive: memadat 'to be suffi-
cient'; menawukupi 'to be sufficient'; Complements of memadat and menawukupi must have untuk 'for'. Merupakan, though it may be transitive ('to form, to shape'), is in by far the highest frequency a copula verb and will be treated in [FF-13]. Here it may simply be noted that the Complement of merupakan as copula must be a noun and cannot be an adjective.

(v) Some intransitive men- verbs have nuclear complements, i.e. in special idioms: meninggal dunia 'to die' (mening-
gal itself is also 'to die'; dunia means 'world'); membaning tulang 'to slave away' (bulang 'bone'); membalas budi 'to recip-
rocate [a good deed]' (budi 'character'); membalas dendam 'to take revenge (dendam 'revenge'); memaang telinga 'to listen carefully' (telinga 'ear'); menggolok mata 'to catch the eye' (mata 'eye'); menggan-
tang asap 'to build castles in the air' (asap 'smoke'); the expression means liter-
ally: 'to measure smoke with the measure of content called gantang'; etc. (see
Fokker 1951: 18).

Note that most of these verbs, if used outside these expressions, are trans-
itive. In these expressions, however, they are intransitive, for they cannot be passivized: *tulang dibaning; *dendam dbalas; etc. The passive of meninggal is sometimes used in the sense of mening-
galakan 'to leave behind'; we have heard constructions like Sepeda ini saya tinggal
'I leave my bicycle here', on which see [FF-3].

(vi) A small number of men-|kan verbs have a durative-stative meaning which is, but for the form, so low in transitivity that they are semantically almost indistin-
guishable from (stative) adjectives.

(Fokker 1951: 17): menyerangkan 'gratifying, pleasant'; merugikan 'disadvantageous, unprofitable'; menguntungkan 'advantageous,
profitable'; mengherankan 'astonishing'; mengharukan 'moving (emotionally)'; menje-
mukan 'boring'; membosankan 'boring';
mengacaukan 'disappointing'; mengerikan
'terrifying'; mengagumkan 'astonishing';
etc. Each of those verbs could be used
(in contrast to those of [iv] above) tran-
sitively; however, when used intransitive-
lly they are mostly used as adjectival
predicates, and cannot then have an Object
of any kind. Consider:

(49) Perbuatan itu mengacaukan
'occasion' disappoinring the
'secretary.'

(50) Kelalaian saudara agak menge-
'Your negligence is rather
cacaukan (*secretary).
disappointing (*the committee).' Here follow some more examples of
verbs of the types (i) through (vi):

(51) Kakinya mulai membengkak.
'His foot began to swell.'

(52) Tidak boleh menyeberang di sini.
'It is not allowed to cross
[the road] here.'

(53) Persediaan yang ada tidak akan
'The stock there is will not
memenuhi (untuk kita).
be enough (for us).'

(54) Caranya menyenangkan.
'His manner [of doing things]
is pleasant.'

saling (preverbally):

(55) Kedua penjahat itu pukul-memukul-
'both criminals kept hitting
kus sebentar, lalu saling ber-
one another for a few moments,
pisah.
and went away from one another.'

(56) Marilah kita saling maaf-memaaf-
'Let us forgive one another.'

2.2 Noncircumfixed transitive men-
verbs are large in number, though only
weakly productive (see FF-1). Most of
them are two-place verbs, such as membuka
'to open'; menutup 'to close'; mendidik
'to educate'; membangun 'to build'; mendo-
rong 'to push, to urge'; etc. The argument
structure presents no surprises:

(57) Kami akan membuka pameran jam
'We excl. will open the ex-
sibition at nine o'clock.'

(58) Lembaga ini sedang membangun
'This institution is construct-
ing three buildings.'

2.3 Some transitive men- verbs, howev-
er, have three arguments, at least poten-
tially. Two verbs are prominent in this
regard, mengajar "to teach" and memberi
'to give'. Consider:

(59) Saya mengajar dia bahasa Arab.
'I teach him Arabic.'

(60) Ibu memberi adik saya pisang.
'Mother gave my (younger)
brother/sister a banana.'

There are, however, special problems with
these two verbs. The following construc-
tions are instructive:

(61) Saya mengajarı dia bahasa Arab.
'I teach Arabic to him.'

(62) Saya mengajarkan bahasa Arab
'I teach Arabic to him.'

(63) Bahasa Latin diajar tahun depan.
'Latin will be taught next year.'
In (61), mengajar is formed with the men-i circumfix, placing the "target" of the teaching (i.e. the student) in Direct Object position, just as in (59). Therefore, what is remarkable is (59), not (61), which follows ordinary rules as set forth below (2.6) at least as far as this "promotion" to Direct Object is concerned; (61) is exceptional, however, in that the accusative Object is not oblique (most Objects in second position, with men-i verbs, take dengan; see 2.6, below). The base :ajar (the colon marks precategoricals, see Verhaar 1984: 0.3; and passim) may also take the circumfix men-kan, which makes the accusative Object, i.e. the matter taught, the Direct Object, as illustrated in (62). When, however, such a construction is passivized, as in (63), the -kan marker may be dropped. A comparable complication is found with the verbs memberi and memberikan, which both mean 'to give'. Here, however, these two forms are interchangeable in the active, except when the dative Object is Direct Object; then memberi is the correct form, and memberikan is out. This holds also for the passive: The Subject of memberi (i.e. of diberi or [.....] beri or ku-kauberi) must be the dative argument, while the Subject of memberikan (i.e. of diberikan or [.....] berikan or ku-kauberikan) must be the accusative argument, both illustrated in (64) and (65) respectively.

Native speakers differ widely in evaluating acceptability of these examples (which are unsolicited samples from native speakers, most of them with Javanese for their first language). Some reject all of (66) through (74); others accept (69) and (71) through (74) others again accept all of (66) through (74).

Most of these sentences, however, have paraphrases in two-place constructions, with the third NP as an "extranuclear" constituent. The following are found wholly acceptable by all native speakers we have consulted:

(66) Dia menuntut kami ganti rugi. 'He demanded compensation from us.'

(67) Mereka membantu keluarga miskin 'They help poor families with
pakaian bekas.'

(68) Idhata menyumbang sekolah kami 'Idhata contributed to our [excl.]
alat-alat permainan.

school equipment for games.'

(69) Bu Tuti mendikte kami soal-soal 'Mrs Tuti dictated the examina-
  ujian.

(70) Presiden menyokong para korban 'The President contributed six
gempa enam ton beras.
tons of rice for the victims of the
earthquake.'

(71) Fajar mentraktir Agus eskrim. 'Fajar treated Agus to ice cream.'

(72) Ibu menagih tante hutangnya 'Mother asked auntie last year
tahun lalu.
for the money she owed.'

(73) Pak Yono melatih kami senam. 'Mr Yono gives us [excl.] exer-
cises in physical education.'

(74) Mereka menjamu kami anggur.
'they entertained us [excl.]
as their guests with wine.'
and menyebut 'to call' may be three-place verbs because of an "appositional Object":

(82) Dia memanggil saya adik.  
'He calls me (his) (younger) brother/sister.'

(83) Kami menyebut dia juara.  
'We [excl.] call him the champion.'

The "appositional Objects" differ from "appositional Adjuncts", which require a preposition. The verbs concerned are, e.g., memandang 'to consider [someone as]', memperlakukan 'to treat someone as', as in:

(84) Pak guru memandang dia sebagai  
'siswa yang terpandai.'  
'the brightest pupil.'

(85) Mereka memperlakukan saya sebagai  
'gai penasihat.'  
'They treat me as a consultant.'

2.4 For "iterative" -i with men- verbs (this suffix does not occur with memperverbs), see Verhaar 1984, 6.1. These -i verbs syntactically differ in no way from the "same" verb without -i. They are two-place verbs, and present no surprises in Argument structure. A few examples suffice here:

(86) Ibu mencocipi masakan anak  
'putrinya.  
'Mother tastes some of what  
'her daughter has cooked.'

(87) Anjingmu menjilati makanan  
'bayi itu.  
'Your dog keeps licking the  
'baby's food.'

(88) Petani itu mencangkuli kebun.  
'The farmer hoes the garden  
'here and there/everywhere.'

2.5 As noted in Verhaar 1985, 5.2, verbs derived by men- -kan circumfixation have a role marker -kan as belonging to no fewer than five semantic types: benefactive, instrumental, dative-accusative, accusative-causative and nonaccusative. In the benefactive and instrumental -kan constructions, the NP's concerned are in Direct Object position; with dative-accusative -kan, the causee is in Direct Object position, while the dative NP is the person entrusted with the work caused (by the Subject NP's referent) to be done; with accusative-causative -kan, the causee is again in Direct Object position, while a third NP (if any, that depends on the nature of the verb lexically) fulfills a role dependent on that lexical nature; finally, there are men- -kan verbs which are not causative and do not differ from noncircumfixed transitive men- verbs (except that with them -kan is needed to mark transitivity) in regard to syntactic organization.

There are various differences between these five types which are more conveniently listed before each of them is discussed individually. First, the benefactive, instrumental, and dative-causative -kan constructions all have three-place verbs; the accusative-causative constructions are either two-place or three-place; finally, the noncausative -kan constructions are two-place verbs.

Second, only the benefactive -kan constructions have double Objects, neither of which is oblique (i.e. marked by an appropriate preposition); all the others that have three arguments have the nonpromoted (accusative) NPs so marked.

Third, only in benefactive -kan constructions with promoted nonaccusative NP's must the accusative NP follow the verb, even in their "passives". In the other types (if three-place), the accusative NP may (in "active" as well as "passive") either precede or follow the verb, depending on discourse-pragmatic parameters.

Fourth, only with benefactive -kan constructions is the promotion of the nonaccusative (in this case: benefactive) NP optional; with all the other (three-place) types, the promotion is obligatory.

Given these characteristics, we will now treat each of the five types individually, in (a) through (e).

(a) Benefactive. As noted, these constructions are characterized by several properties: these -kan verbs are all three-place verbs; they have double Objects, i.e. neither oblique; the benefactive Object can be in Direct object position; the accusative Object must be postverbal (even in the "passive"!); and the promotion of the benefactive Object is optional. Consider the following examples:

(89) Saya membelikan Ayah baju baru  
'I bought for father that new  
itu.  
'shirt.'

(90) Saya membukakan Bapak pintu.  
'I will open the door for you  
(Sir).'

(91) Ali menyembelihkan saya ayam  
'Ali slaughters for me this  
besar ini.  
'big chicken.'
Note that the benefactive Object is here promoted to Direct Object position; the accusative Object follows the benefactive Object. The nature of the promotion is a discourse-pragmatic one: to place the benefactive Object in a more topical position (than would be possible with non-
-kan constructions, see below); for this, see [FF-10].

The promotion, however, is optional. Alternative constructions are illustrated here:

(92) Saya membelikan baju baru itu
untuk ayah.
Untuk ayah saya membelikan
baju baru ini. [comp. (89)]

(93) Saya membukakan pintu untuk
ayah.
Untuk Bapak saya membukakan
pintu. [comp. (90)]

(94) Ali menyembelihkan ayam besar
ini untuk saya.
Untuk saya Ali menyembelihkan
ayam besar ini. [comp. (91)]

In fact, (89) through (91) do not need
-kan, at least from a purely "structural"
point of view; we illustrate this here
only for the first example:

(95) Saya membeli baju baru itu
untuk ayah.
Untuk ayah saya membeli baju
baru itu.

Here it must be asked, then, what the dif-
ference is between (92) through (94) on
the one hand and the -kan-less paraphrases
on the other. It is fair to say that the
-kan form emphasizes the benefactive na-
ture of the action; and it is not without
importance to note here that (benefactive)
-kan verbs are relatively few in number
(but those few are high in text frequency),
and that the process is not productive.

Some experts look upon the nonpro-
moted -kan constructions (as in (92)
through (94) as due to interference from
Javanese (which language does indeed al-
low of the benefactive -aké construction
with promotion of the benefactive Object
optional). However, others are inclined
to think of such constructions as genu-
inely Indonesian, since they also occur
in other first languages in Indonesia.

According to a basic rule of sequen-
tial order in Indonesian, the Object with
men- verbs (i.e. in their "active" men-
form) must invariably follow the verb,
and can never precede it. While this
would apply straightforwardly enough to
the Direct Object (ayah in (89); Bapak in
(90); ayam besar ini in (91)), it applies
also in these constructions to the accu-
sative Object. Thus (89) could not be
wellformedly rephrased as *Baju baru itu

saya membelikan Ayah, nor could (90) as
*Pintu saya membukakan Bapak, and nor.
could (91) as *Ayam besar ini Ali menyem-
belihkan saya. In contrast, with the non-
promoted benefactive Objects such left-
extrapositions are possible, simply because
they are oblique (i.e. marked by the pre-
position untuk), as illustrated by the
second example in each of (92) through (94).

Even in the "passive" the accusative
Object, in promoted benefactive -kan con-
structions, cannot be fronted, even though
naturally enough the promoted Object can
(though it does not have to; see 6, below):

(96) Ayah saya belikan baju baru.
[comp. (89)]

*Baju baru saya belikan ayah.
*Baju baru ayah saya belikan.

(97) Bapak saya bukanakan pintu.
[comp. (90)]

*Pintu saya bukanakan Bapak.
*Pintu Bapak saya bukanakan.

(98) Saya disembelihkan Ali ayam
besar ini.
[comp. (91)]

*Ayam besar ini saya disembe-
lihkan Ali.
*Ayam besar ini disembelihkan
Ali saya.

The asterisked examples show that left-
extraposition of the accusative Object is
deviant no matter how the other arguments
are arranged sequentially. As for the
nonasterisked examples, they are unpro-
blematic only when the Agent is pronounval,
while where this is not the case (as in
(98)), there may be doubt as to wellformed-
ness. Some native speakers have rejected
(98) (first, unasterisked example), but
there is some reason to think that it would
be quite acceptable in the case where Ali
is "old information" in the discourse con-
text.

However, in nonpromoted benefactive
-kan constructions the accusative argument
becomes the regular Subject, and would
therefore normally occur prverbally:

(99) Baju baru itu saya belikan un-
tuk ayah.

(100) Pintu itu saya bukanakan untuk
Bapak.

(101) Ayam besar ini disembelihkan
Ali untuk saya.

There is further the problem of coreferen-
tial deletion of the benefactive and/or
accusative argument in constructions (usu-
ally ergative) in which deletion is called
for in the discourse context. Consider
(102) as a question that provides a pos-
sible preceding context for (103) which
would be wellformed, while (104) would be
only if untuk is used.
In (103), the zero represents pinto yang terkunci, the accusative Argument, therefore, not the promoted benefactive NP, which is absent. In (104), without untuk, Bapak would be the promoted benefactive NP, which is impossible wellformedly; this, of course, also goes to show that the interpretation of Ø in (103) represents the accusative NP. With untuk present, (104) is a nonpromoted construction, wellformed in every way.

As noted, with benefactive -kan constructions, promotion of the nonaccusative NP is optional; if there is no promotion, the -kan marker itself is dispensable. But all this is purely structural. Discourse-pragmatically, however, there is certainly a difference among these possible constructions. Consider the following examples (Kaswanti 1984b; I have expanded the author's data slightly):

(105) Saya ingin memesan roti seperti yang (i) *kaubatkan dulu. (ii) kaubat untuk saya dulu. 'I want to order a loaf of bread like the one you baked for me before.'

(106) Saya ingin memesan roti seperti yang (i) kaubat untuk ibumu dulu. (ii) *kaubatkan ibumu dulu. 'I want to order a loaf of bread like the one you baked for your mother before.'

(107) (i) Saya akan kaubelikan apa? (ii) *Apa yang akan kaubeli untuk saya kalau saya pulus ujian? 'What will you buy for me if I succeed in that examination?'

(108) Tolong (i) bawakan (saya) kopor ini (ii) *bawa kopor ini untuk saya! 'Please carry this suitcase for me!'

(109) Tolong (i) bawakan dia kopor itu. (ii) bawa kopor untuk dia. 'Please carry this suitcase for him.'

Note that -kan seems to be obligatory when the beneficiary is Ego; therefore we find -kan in (105) (i), (107) (i), (108) (i), such that (105) (ii) and (108) (ii) are unlikely to be wellformed in most contexts. In contrast, -kan is out in (106) (ii), because the beneficiary is not Ego. However, -kan for a non-Ego beneficiary is not impossible, as shown in (109) (i), although without -kan (as in (109) (ii)) the construction could be all right also. I have some confirmation (from Kaswanti Purwo, pers. comm.; however, only tentatively so far) for the idea that the speaker in (109) (i) is on the side of dia, and therefore uses -kan in bawakan; whereas (109) (ii) could be wellformed if the speaker is not really concerned about the third person and has other reasons for making the request he does.

The above examples compare Ego and third person as beneficiaries; it appears that "identification" of Ego with some third person is the basis for -kan use. Such an "identification" is of course much more easily made with second person: relevant data are (90), (103), (104).

(b) Instrumental. These -kan constructions have what may be called a "double Object", the instrumental one promoted (obligatorily) to Direct Object position, while the accusative NP is marked (usually with pada). This oblique NP need not be postverbal, though it normally is. Some examples will be given first, leaving out the Subject (of "active") for simplicity's sake:

(110) memukulkan tongkat pada anjing 'to use a stick to beat the dog'

(111) membalutkan kain pada luka 'to apply a bandage to the wound'

(112) membelenggukan rantai pada kakì 'to fasten a chain to the foot'

(113) menaambukkan oemet pada kuda 'to apply the whip to the horse'

(114) Menembakkam peluru pada lawan 'to shoot a bullet at the opponent'

(115) menakuarkan plau pada janggut 'to use a razor to shave the beard'

(116) mengikatkan tali pada pinggang 'to tie a rope around one's waist'

(117) membelaikan wang pada barang 'to use one's money for luxury mewah articles'

It is descriptively convenient to consider such instrumental constructions (of which this language has at least several hundred; see [FF-1]) as not prototyp-
ical, the prototypical construction being the "same verbs without -kan, and the instrumental NP nonpromoted, in oblique relation to the verb. Here follow the prototypical constructions of (110) through (116):

(118) memukul anjing dengan tongkat ('to beat')
(119) membalut luka dengan kain ('to bandage')
(120) membelenggu kaki dengan rantai ('to fetter')
(121) menoambuk kuda dengan oemeti ('to strike')
(122) menembak lawan dengan peluru ('to shoot')
(123) menoukur janggut dengan pieau ('to shave')
(124) mengikat pinggang dengan tali ('to secure, to tie')

However, there is no *membelanja to match instrumental membela
nja 'to do one's shopping', which is intransitive.

In both the prototypical and instrumental constructions, the oblique NP, precisely because it is oblique, may (although only for special discourse-pragmatic reasons) be left fronted, as in:

(125) Dengan oemeti ia menoambuk 'With his whip he struck kuda berulang kali. the horse repeatedly.'
(126) Pada kakinya mereka membeleng- 'To his foot they fastened gukan rantai. a chain.'

Sentence (125) is noninstrumental, and the fronted NP is dengan oemeti: in (126), a promoted instrumental construction, the accusative NP pada kakinya is fronted. For the discourse-pragmatic parameters of this fronting, see [FP-14].

(c)  Dative-causative. These are very few; as examples are given here: menjahitkan 'to farm out for sewing'; and mereparasikan 'to farm out for repair'. The Direct Object is the NP whose referent is caused to be X-ed ("X") being the activity signified by the verb, while the second Object (which is obligatorily present) ("datively", i.e. marked by pada or ke) obliquely indicates the person entrusted with the work. Consider:

(127) Saya menjahitkan pakaian saya 'I have a tailor to make my ke taylor. clothes.'
(128) Tetangganya selalu mereparasi- 'My neighbor always has his kam mobilnya pada bengkel ini. car maintained in this garage.'

In this (c) type it is convenient to include a construction in which the dative NP is in Direct Object position but may be made optionally oblique by marking with kepada:

(d) Accusative-causative. This type of men-|kan constructions carries a meaning which may be phrased as 'to cause O to (be) X', where "O" is the Object NP and "X" the verbal base. For derivation rules, see [FP-1]. Examples:

(129) Presiden menginstruksikan 'The President has instructed (kepada) Sekretarit Negara the Secretary of State untuk mempersiapkan kunjungan Affairs to prepare the State negara. Visit.'

The verb menginstruksikan is a two-place verb; the further Complement (untuk [.....]) cannot take NP form (for example, it cannot take the form, marked or not, persiapan [.....]).
Mengelaskan means 'to clarify', i.e. 'to make clear' (jelas 'clear'); memasukkan means 'to put inside', i.e. 'to cause to go in' (masuk 'to go in'); memberlakukan is 'to make valid', i.e. 'to cause to be valid' (berlaku, a verb, means 'to be valid'); etc. see [FF-1]. In short, the base is either an adjective, noun, or a verb. What is caused to be X is the NP in Object position. These constructions contain two-place verbs and present no surprises syntactically.

(e) Noncausative. These -kan verbs are somewhat difficult to describe semantically, among other things in that the characterization "noncausative", though somehow apposite, seems almost exaggerated. That is, to say, a verb like menganjurkan, which belongs to this type, is derived from :anjur 'bring forward', a precategorial (see [FF-7]), so that it cannot be clear what it would mean to say that menganjurkan is 'to cause 0 to be :anjur' (since it would make :anjur look like an adjective, or a verb, while, being precategorial, it is neither). This is the main problem about trying to classify this type with (d) above, to which this type is nonetheless rather close. The ambiguity is in that all transitivity entails a certain degree of "causation". It seems convenient and fairly straightforward to distinguish the menganjurkan type from the accusative-causative type of (d) above.

Here follow some examples:

(135) Saya akan menguraikan hal itu
'I will explain that in more detail in a moment.'

(136) Dia merindukan cita-cita itu.
'He longs for the fulfillment of those ideals.'

(137) Pasien itu membatukkan darah.
'The patient coughs up blood.'

(138) Kenakanlah jasmu!
'Put on your coat!'

(139) Kita harus mengerjakan semua-
'Ve have to do all these
nya ini.
jobs.'

These verbs are all two-place verbs, and present no syntactic surprises.

2.6 Most men-|-i verbs are transitive
(for exceptions, see 2.1 (iv)). They are to be distinguished from men- verbs having the "iterative" -i suffix (see 2.4). The men-|-i verbs treated here have the -i as a "locative" role marker; that is to say, the NP in Direct Object position is the "Locative" NP, "promoted" to Direct Object position for topicalization strategy reasons (see [FF-10]). The "locative" meaning meant here is often figurative, but in such a way that the (literally) locative meaning is "prototypical". Here are some examples:

(140) Tentara telah menduduki wil- 
yah itu.
'area.'

(141) Si Dul sudah mengetahui hal
'already.'
itu.

(142) Saya ingin menanggapi surat
'I wish to reply to your letter-
Saudara sebagai berikut.'

These are two-place constructions. There are, for these constructions, no "prototypical" ones without the -i ending; there are no such verbs as 'menduduk, or 'mengetahui' (menanggapi does exist: 'to listen'). Other men-|-i verbs also lack either men- or men-|-kan "paralleles": mengawali 'to begin' (mengawal; mengawal); memulai 'to begin [tr.]' (memula; memulakan), so it seems that a number of men-|-i verbs have to be described in their own terms.

Only very few men-|-i verbs are (so to speak) "three-way": one trio is memu-
at-memuatkan-memuat; consider the following examples:

(143) Truk yang besar itu memuat
'Big truck contains
batubara.
coal.'

(144) Mereka memuatkan batubara di
'They loaded coal onto the
atas truk yang besar itu.
big truck.'

(145) Mereka memuati truk yang besar
'They loaded the big truck
itu dengan batubara.
with coal.'

Larger in number are the men-|-i verbs which have only one different role marking form, i.e. either with men- or with
memper- verbs are confined to those derived from very constrained classes of bases only; see [FF-1] for those constraints. The memper- verbs under consideration here are all transitive, causative, and two-place verbs. Consider the following examples:

(153) Kami akan memperbanyak naskah anda. your typescript.'

(154) Rahmat telah memutusakan akan memperistri Tuti. marry Tuti.'

(155) Jumlah ini harus dipeutruga. 'This total has to be divided into three.'

The thing named in the Object NP is caused to undergo the action signified by the base. There are no special surprises, syntactically, in this type of construction.

2.8 Memper-|-kan verbs are like all memper- verbs in that they are causative. They are all two-place verbs. Consider these examples:

(156) Pancasila mempersatukan rakyat. 'The Pancasila unifies the people.'

(157) Saya telah memperingatkan saudara: jangan berbuat ber- don't do that again!'

2.9 Memper-|-i verbs are also like all
other memper- verbs in that they are causative; the -i is "locative" (often metaphorically). It is, with memper- verbs, never "iterative"; see 2.4. In contrast to many men-[-i verbs, memper-[-i verbs are all two-place verbs.

Consider:

(160) Pada tanggal 17 Agustus 1985 'On August 17, 1985 the Republik Indonesia memperingati public of Indonesia commemorative 40 tahun berdirinya Indonesia rates forty years of Indone-

merdeka. sia's independence.'

2.10 A number of men- verbs and memper- verbs (circumfixed and noncircum-

fixed) are peculiar in that they have optionally oblique accusative Objects. These may be called Direct Objects in that, obliquely or not, they become Sub-

doct of the "passive" (i.e., in some discourse contexts, Objects of ergatives). The obliqueness is marked by prepositions like akan, mengenai, tentang. Consider:

(161) Dia mengingat (akan) ayahnya. 'He remembers his father.'

(162) (Tentang) masalah ini akan 'That problem will be ex-

diuraikan nanti. plained in a moment.'

(163) Kemudian kita harus memperde-

batkan (mengenai) soal tadi. cuss this question.'

The verbs taking these optional prepositions are verbs of 'saying', 'explaining', 'feeling', 'discussing', 'thinking' although by no means all of those. The list is a closed one, and seems to com-

prise no more than a dozen verbs, some of which are: menguraikan (tentang) 'to ex-

plain'; menjelaskan (tentang/mengenai) 'to explain'; memikirkan (tentang) 'to think over'; mengingat (akan) 'to remem-

ber'; mempertanyaan (tentang) 'to dis-

cuss'; memperdebatkan (tentang/mengenai) 'to debate'; mempertimbangkan (tentang/ mengenai) 'to consider'; membicarakan (tentang) 'to discuss', and a few others. Note that the preposition (if present) does not combine with the Object in a so-called "prepositional Object", at least as this term is used in the grammar of English (to object to something, for example), in that, in that conception of a "prepositional Object", the preposition

clings, not to the Object, but to the verb (e.g. as in that proposal was objected to). In contrast, in Indonesian "passives" of the verbs mentioned, the preposition (if used) sticks to the Patient as much as it does in "actives", as is clear from (162) (tentang masalah ini).

For the rest, these constructions do not harbor any syntactic surprises; they are all two-place verbs.

2.11 As is set forth elsewhere, reduplicated forms in Indonesian, especially in verbs, have a wide variety of meaning elements, in different verbs, in regard to the reduplication. For this, see [PF-8]. One such meaning entails a Sub-

ject that is at least semantically plural. Consider:

(164) Kambing itu baru mengem-

'bik- ngembik terus. bleating continuously.'

(165) Singa suka mengaung-ngaung.

' Lions like to roar.'

In (164), the talk must be either about one particular goat that bleats repeatedly (hence the reduplication), or more goats that bleat. In either case the talk is about particular goats; in the former case one goat that bleats more than once, in the latter case more goats each of which bleats either just once or more than once. It is the latter meaning of reduplicated mengembik-mengembik that necessitates the plural Subject (in this case semantically only). In (165), the talk is about the lion (in general; not one particular lion), and the reduplicated mengaung-ngaung therefore means repeated roaring, not entailing plurality of the Subject. For a discus-

sion, see Simatupang 1983:133ff.

3 BER- VERBS

3.0 This class comprises various subclasses to be treated one by one below:

(a) Ber- verbs, noncircumfixed, with a simple or composite base.

(b) Ber-[-an verbs, reciprocal, with a simple or composite base.

(c) Nonreciprocal ber-[-an verbs, with simple or composite base.

(d) Ber-[-kan verbs, with composite base.

(e) Reduplicated ber- verbs and ber-[-an verbs (of the (b) and (c) types), requiring a plural Subject.

Details about these affixations them-

selves are found in Verhaar 1984, 8.0
through 8.4. The *ber*- verbs mentioned there (8.4), belong to the (a) class above for the purposes of the present description, and they have no special characteristics syntactically. For rules and constraints in derivation rules (a) through (d), see [FF-1].

One general characteristic of all *ber-* verbs (of (a) through (e)), is that they are one-place verbs; i.e. with only the Subject NP (which can only be an NP, i.e. both morphemically and syntactically free). Prima facie many *ber-* constructions look like two-place verbs, as may appear from a typical example, (147). However, it is descriptively much more consistent to consider such apparent "Complements" as Complements not to the entire *ber-* verb, but only to the base of that verb, with the exception only of *clausal* Complements. This will be further explained in the relevant subsections, 3.1 through 3.5, dealing with (a) through (e) respectively.

3.1 Noncircumfixed *ber-* verbs may have either a simple or a composite base. If the base is composite, the additional component may be a quantifier, an attributive adjective, or a noun. If a noun, it may be an incorporated noun, with all the constraints on incorporated nouns valid across languages. If the base is simple, the verb may be reflexive or nonreflexive. If nonreflexive, it may be either static or nonstatic. Consider the following examples:

(166) Ahmad sudah beristri.
'Ahmad is already married.'

(167) Ahmad beristri dua.
'Ahmad has two wives.'

(168) Tetanggamu bermaksud baik.
'Your neighbor means well.'

(169) Rumah ini beratap tinggi.
'This house has a high roof.'

(170) Saya belajar bahasa Arab.
'I am learning Arabic.'

(171) Petani itu juga berjualan kuda.
'Vegetarian also sells horses.'

(172) Saya berukur setiap pagi.
'I shave (myself) every morning.'

(173) Putri yang cantik itu sedang berbedak di depan kaca, her face in front of the mirror.'

(174) Kamu 'kan berdaulat!
'You are your own boss, aren't you!'

(175) Mereka berpendapat bahwa hal itu tidak mungkin.
'that is not possible.'

(176) Saya berenang setiap pagi.
'I swim every day.'

Composite bases with *ber-* are found in (167), (168), (169), (170), (171). In (167), the second component of the base (dua) is a quantifier, the only one possible with this verb: 'Dia beristri baik, for 'He has a good wife' is not wellformed. An adjective in attributive relation to the first component of the base, however, is possible with *maksud* as in (168) (*bermaksud baik 'to be wellintentioned'), or with *atap*, as in (169) (*beratap tinggi 'to have a high roof'). An Object noun as a second base component is found in (170) and (171). The latter is a good example of an incorporated noun; for example, *Dia berjualan kuda ini (for 'he sells this horse') would not be wellformed, since *kuda* would be definite. Note that *berjualan* cannot refer to a particular act of selling something and refers rather to someone's status as the seller of things; for 'He sells this horse' one would have to use *menjual*: *Dia menjual kuda ini.*

However, a noun as second component of the base with *ber-* verbs need not be an "incorporated" one; cf. (170), where the noun is certainly definite (bahasa Arab 'the Arabic language'). It seems, however, that *belajar* is somewhat of an exception since there is no corresponding *mengajar* for 'to learn' (mengajar does exist, but it means 'to teach'). It should be noted that *clausal* Complements are possible with *ber-* verbs (rather than just with the base), as demonstrated by (175), where the Complement is the subclause bahwasanya [...].

Similarly, *bermaksud* could have a nonfinite verbal Complement introduced by *untuk* 'in order to', as in Kami bermaksud untuk berangkat pagi hari 'We are planning to leave in the morning'.

A simple base is found in (166) (*beristri* 'to be married [as said of male]', static); in (172) (*berukur* 'to shave oneself', reflexive); in (173) (*berbedak* 'to powder oneself/one's face', reflexive); in (174) (*berdaulat* 'to be independent', static); in (175) (*berpendapat* 'to be of the opinion', static); and in (176) (*berenang* 'to swim', nonstatic).

3.2 Reciprocal *ber-[-an] verbs occur both with a simple and with a composite base, as is illustrated by the following examples:

(177) Beny dan Sri berpacaran
'Beny and Sri have been
Like all ber- verbs, the ones of this class are all one-place verbs. Sometimes (though rarely) the base is composite, as in ber-lumuran darah in (182); usually the base is simple. The Subject NP must be plural, at least semantically, sometimes also overtly, as in kertas-kertas in (184). For this plurality, see also 3.5, below.

3.4 All ber-|kan verbs have a composite base which may be of various forms: with most of these verbs with a noun (in some instances of this type with an optional preposition), making the second component of the base oblique; with other verbs of this type the second component of the base if an adjective. As for the verb itself, some ber-|kan verbs are synonymous with the noncircumfixed ber- verbs with the same stem; others have circumfixation obligatorily. All this is illustrated in the following examples:

(185) Tempat ini berisi air.
'This container contains water.'

(186) Tempat ini berisikan air.
'This container contains water.'

(187) Di situ ada tentara berleng-
'Vere were troops there,
kapkan senjata.
fully armed.'

(188) Sesudah bekerja tiga jam, ia
'Aftter working for three hours,
bermandikan peluh.
he was perspiring all over.'

(189) Nabi itu menampakkan diri,
'The prophet appeared,
bermandikan oahaya.
enveloped in light.'

(190) Datanglah pahlawan, bersenja-
'Then came the hero, armed
takan pedang.
with a sword.'

(191) Raja itu berpakaikan jubah
'The king was vested in a
kebesaran.
mantle, manifesting his ex-
alted position.'

(192) Kebudayaan yang baru bersen-
'The new culture is based on
di(kan) (pada) kebudayaan
the old culture.'
yang lama.
(193) Kain itu bertepli(kan) merah. 'The cloth has goldthread hems.'

(194) Republik Indonesia berdasarkan(ka) 'The Republic of Indonesia has
'pada) Pancasila.
the Pancasila for its foundation.'

(195) Rencana kami berpanjikan 'Our plans have the develop-
pembangunan Indonesia.
ment of Indonesia written in
their banner.'

Note first the difference between prefixed ber- verbs and their circumfixed
ber-|kan analogues, such as berisit and
berisikan in (185) and (186); bersendi
and beresendikan in (192), etc. For most
of them there does not seem to be any appreciable difference in meaning, except
for the somewhat more exclusive style of the
ber-|kan form, which dates back to
older Malay. One might even say that the
ber-|kan constructions all have a some-
what archaic flavor: a good example of this is berpakaikan in (191), a verb that
is now known only to few speakers of In-
donesian and would be used only for spe-
cial stylistic effect. The demise of
ber-|kan verbs in the recent history of
Indonesian, as compared to older Malay,
may have something to do with the strong
influence of Javanese, which language does
not have any cognate of this verbal form
(or, indeed, of noncircumfixed ber- verbs
more generally (Poedjosodoarmo 1970)).
In a rare case a purely semantic differ-
ence seems to be associated with the differ-
ence between these verbs with ber- only
and those with ber-|kan. An example of
this is berisit air and berisikan air:
according to some of our informants,
berisit air suggests that water is indeed
what is normally contained in the contain-
er; while berisikan air seems to suggest
that the container is not necessarily for
water normally. However that may be,
there seems to be no comparable nuance
difference between berpanji and berpanji-
kan, between berdaaar and berdaarkan, or
between bersendi and beresendikan, except
for a difference in style.

These ber-|kan verbs are all one-
place verbs, and the appearance of two-
place verbs is due to the base being com-
posite; thus the full bases of the above
examples are, respectively: isi air for
both (185) and (186), lengkap senjata,
mandi peluh, mandi cahaya, senjata pedang,
pakai jubah kebun, sendi kebumahan
yang lama, tepi merah, dasar Pancasila,
pangun pembangunan Indonesia. As noted,
the "Complement" of the original base is
usually a noun, but it may also be an
adjective (merah in (170)). If a noun,
the word is obliquely marked by pada 'on'
[at', whether it is or is not largely a
matter of lexical characteristics of the
ber-|kan verb concerned.

3.5 Replicated ber- verbs as well as
all ber-|an verbs (whether reduplicated
or not) may require a Subject NP which is
plural at least semantically. On redupli-
cation as a morphemic process, see [FF-8].
For the ber-|an verbs, see examples (177)
through (184). For other ber- verbs, con-
sider:

(196) Binatang yang menyusui dapat
'Mammals can swim (*around).'
berenang(*-renang).

(197) Rumah yang beratap-atap tinggi
'It is houses with the high
itu akan dibongkar (semua).
roofs will (all) be torn down.'

In (196) the point is made negatively:
that is, a statement about mammals in
general clashes with what can only mean-
fully be said about some mammal(s) in
particular; berenang meaning 'to swim',
applies to the species in general, while
berenang-renang 'to swim around, to keep
swimming' can only be said about some par-
ticular individual(s) of the species. In
(197) rumah must refer to more houses
(optionally made explicit as plural by
semua), since there is talk about more
than one roof.

4 KE-|AN VERBS

4.0 Ke-|an verbs are passive verbs.
That is, they have no active voice, and
in fact the ke-|an form is the only mem-
ber of the entire paradigm. Negatively
(as noted in Verhaar 1984, 9.0), these
ke-|an forms as passives cannot be con-
sidered as the passives of the "corre-
sponding" verbs with men-|i. About this,
more below. At this point it is convenient
to present some data first, in a distinc-
tion between "adversative" (4.1) and "non-
adversative" ke-|an verbs (4.2) (the dis-
tinction is due to Dardjowidjojo 1980),
which will be discussed in some more detail
below also.

4.1 For "adversative" ke-|an verbs, consider:

(198) Kami kehujanan.
'We [excl.] were caught in
a rainstorm.'
A comparison with the "corresponding" men-[i] verbs is instructive in various regards. *Kejatuhan, for example, may be compared with *menjatuhki 'to let [something] fall on [something]', so that it would seem that a passive like *dijatuhki must be close to *kejatuhan. There are significant differences, however, between the two forms: *dijatuhki may have an Agent with control of the action (and, if ergative, it even must), while *kejatuhan has no such Agent, i.e. not with control of the action. Therefore, it seems appropriate not to consider the ke-[an] verbs as just paradigmatic alternates of the "corresponding" men-[i] verbs. Before going on to other rather cogent reasons, it is as well to mention here that none of these "adversative" ke-[an] verbs seem to have "corresponding" ter- forms, a comparison worth making seeing that many ter- forms are "accidental", i.e. there is either no Agent or only an Agent without control over the action. The only exception is ketutupan, which might be replaced by tertutup; however, ketutupan is really Javanese and careful speakers might reject (207) in favor of Punioak gunung Merapi tertutup kabut.

This said, the following appears relevant. Not every ke-[an] verb has a men-[i] parallel, e.g. there is no verb menourt(*t) corresponding with keourii, and no menopet(*t) corresponding with keopetan. Inversely, the above ke-[an] verbs pretty much exhaust the list of the "adversatives", which is a closed one, while men-[i] verbs are relatively numerous, relatively productive, and only in limited number "adversative". For example, the verbs mendatangi 'to visit', mendapati 'to meet, to find', and mamasuki 'to enter' do not at all necessarily imply anything "adversative" for their Patient NP's, i.e. for the Subjects of their "passives", while the "corresponding" ke-[an] forms are unambiguously "adversative".

Finally, the non-Subject NP (if any) in these ke-[an] constructions are in many instances hardly to be called "Agents" (even if one adds "without control", see above), and rather "bleach", neutralizingly, to something like an "Instrument" role (see [FF-11]). It seems reasonable then, to conclude that these ke-[an] verbs cannot be considered as paradigmatic alternates of the "corresponding" men-[i] verbs, i.e. of their "passives".

The syntactic organization of these ke-[an] constructions varies considerably, and leads to distinctions of various types among them. In (198), for example, we have an obligatorily one-place construction.
This seems to be contradicted by (199), but it seems more consistent to treat *hujan salju* ('rain [that is] snow') as 'snow'. *Hujan* is here a "Classifier" for *salju* (for such "Classifiers", see [FF-15]), as a composite base for the *ke*-an circumfixation, as around the first component only. For *kehujanan* in both (198) and (199) holds something not holding, so far as we are aware, for any other *ke*-an verb: i.e. that what is adversatively inflicted upon the "victim" Subject NP is semantically contained in the very base of the *ke*-an verb (for a similar organization of *ber*- verbs, see 3, above). It is because of this very semantic property, i.e. that what is the "Cause" or the "Agent" of the adversative event is at the same time the base of the *ke*-an verb, that there is no place for any other such NP in the construction. In other words, because of its semantic properties, *kehujanan* must be a one-place verb.

The constructions (200) through (203) illustrate the second NP as an "Agent" or "Instrument" of some sort, as optional. Yet even within this class there are differences which must be ascribed to the lexical characteristics of the *ke*-an verbs concerned. For example, while *kekuatan* may have *oleh* 'by', introducing the "Agent", that preposition would be dubious in (201), while possible in (202) and (203). However, this may be due to the circumstance that the "Agent" does not immediately follow the verb.

Yet another type is the one with an obligatory "Agent": (204) through (208). As for (208), *kebanjiran* has an "Agent"/"Instrument" only because that verb is used figuratively. Compare with that example (203), where *kebanjiran* has that "Agent" optionally. Finally, there is the type characterized by a non-'Agent' second NP. Note that the second NP, under one interpretation or another, is in a possessive relation to the Subject NP. Then, however, there are differences to be ascribed once again to lexical characteristics of the *ke*-an verb in each case: the possessee NP in (209) and (210) is optional, while in (211) through (213) it is obligatory. It seems straightforward to interpret this obligatoriness of the possessee NP as due to the possession being (at least "nominally") "inalienable". On additional NP's in what would otherwise be one-place constructions, see 7 below.

4.2 The list of "nonadversative" *ke*-an verbs is also a closed list, and it is short. The following examples illustrate every member of the list, so far as we are aware:

(214) *Segera benda itu kelihatan. 'Immediately Mr. Dirdjo saw*

*(oleh)* Pak Dirdjo. *that thing.*

(215) *Segera, benda itu kelihatan. 'Immediately people saw that*

*(oleh)* orang. *thing.*

(216) *Hati-hati, jangan sampai keli- 'Be careful, it shouldn't get*

*hatan (oleh)* orang. *to the point where people actually see/know this.*

(217) *Kalau sampai kelihatan (oleh) 'If the police knows/sees*

polisi, kita bisa selaka! *this, we've had it!*

(218) *Lalu kelihatan *(oleh) saya/ 'And then there appeared to*

kamu/beli/[etc.] sesooek *me/you/him [WON]/[etc.] a fig-

tubuh di antara pepohonan. *tue of someone among the trees.*

(219) *Kedengaran *(oleh)-ku/-mu/-nya *'What I/you/he heard was*

suara yang aneh. *a strange sound.*

(220) *Sebagian barangnya ketinggalan *'He had (unintentionally) left*

*(oleh)nya di hotel). *part of his luggage at the hotel.*

(221) *Barangnya? Wah, ketinggalan! *'The luggage? Too bad, he*

forgot it!'

(222) *Hal itu kelupaan. *'That thing was forgotten.'

(223) *Bakwa dia mau cerai sudah *'That he wants to get divorced*

ketahuan orang. *people already know.*

What these verbs have in common is that, in one way or another, they relate to knowledge of some kind; even ketinggalan and kelupaan fit that characterization, though negatively.

Note the absence or presence of an "Agent" (more appropriately, an "Experiencer"); and, in the presence of one, the presence or absence of *oleh* 'by'. None of these verbs needs an "experiencer" obligatorily. If there is one, the general rule is that *oleh* 'by' must be used. (Note, therefore, that the reason for the obligatoriness of *oleh* in (219) is not merely that the "experiencer" happens to be encliticized.) Only with the verb kelihatan are there additional complications. Note that in (214), (215) and (218) *oleh* is
obligatory (even with orang, compare with this 6.11 below: orang with di- passives cannot have oleh), and that in (216) and (217) oleh is optional (it is therefore with this verb never prohibited). It seems that oleh is obligatory with this verb in the case where kelihatan "literally" signifies visual perception, while it is optional if a "mode of knowing" is signified which just happens to be visual.

5 Ø-DERIVED VERBS WITH INCORPORATED OBJECT

5.0 The type that must be reviewed here is well represented by expressions like owa tangan 'to wash one's hands', kirim surat 'to send a letter', and cari untung 'to seek profit'. Several things characterize them: first, there is no verbal prefix formatively; second, the Object is indefinite.

The absence of a formative prefix is a striking characteristic especially of the examples given just now, for :owa, :kirim, and :cari are "precategorials" (see [FF-7]), and could therefore not occur without some prefix. Hence in these examples zero derivation is postulated: analytically, cari is (not :cari but) Ø-cari; kirim is (not :kirim but) Ø-kirim; cari is (not :cari but) Ø-cari. If, then, the postulated zero prefix holds for what would otherwise be precategorials, it seems descriptively consistent to postulate zero prefixation as well for nonprecategorial verbs of this type of construction, i.e. with incorporated Object.

Note that the zero postulated here is not paradigmatic, as it is in some "passive" forms of men- and memper- verbs (on which see Verhaar 1984, 7.6), but derivational. That is to say, these zero forms are not paradigmatic members of the corresponding men- verbs (memper- verbs, as it happens, have no corresponding Ø-forms for the construction under review here), but independent formations, which are especially suited to the requirements of Object incorporation. In fact, these verb-plus-incorporated-Object constructions are compounds (see Verhaar 1984, 16).

For the Object in these constructions obtains what obtains for incorporated Objects across languages. That is to say, though they may be referential, they must be indefinite; they also cannot be quantified, given an attribute (including by relativization), or separated from the verb with which they form a compound.

5.1 Consider the following examples:

(224) Saya akan kirim surat (*ini) 'I am going to send a/*this

sebulan sekali. letter every month.'

(225) Dia mau cari untung (*itu) saja 'All he wants to do is seek (*that) profit.'

(226) Kamu harus basuh (*kedua belah) 'You have to wash (*both) your tangan dulu. hands first.'

(227) Tidak boleh buang air sebelum (You) may not defecate before dokter datang. the doctor comes.'

(228) Gertak gigi pun tidak ada 'It won't even help to grind gunanya. your teeth.'

(229) Saya harus ke sana untuk mina 'I have to go there to say diri. goodbye.'

(230) Tidak tahu diri, orangnya. 'He has no manners, that man.'

(231) Jangan pandang bulu! 'Don't show preferences (for certain persons)!'

(232) Raja itu naik takhta tahun 'The king ascended the throne yang lalu. last year.'

(233) Si Dul tidak akan tahan uji 'Dul will not stand the test menghadapi tantangan ini. in facing this challenge.

(234) Dia harus unjuk gigi. 'He'll have to show he's not afraid.' [i.e. 'He has to show teeth']

(235) Mereka mandi keringat. 'They were perspiring very much.'

(236) Presiden akan turun tangan 'The President will bear down sendiri. on (certain) people himself.'

Most of these zero verbs (kirim, basuh, cari, etc.) are derived from precategorials, as noted above, but not all of them are. Minta, for example, is a free form (of a special type: see Verhaar 1984, 3.2 (d); see also 1.2 (a), above),
through it is analyzed as Ø-minta in (229). In (230), the form is Ø-tahu, from (free) tahu; and similarly with naik, tahan, mandi, and turun. In the case of turun, an additional reason for postulating the zero (Ø-turun) is in that turun is intransitive ('to go down'), while the Ø-turun form derived from it in (236) is semantically equivalent to menurunkan 'to bring down'.

All these verbs have men- verbs which are semantically equivalent: mengirimkan 'to send'; menaari 'to seek'; membahas 'to wash'; etc. Needless to say, these verbs could be used instead of the zero form in (224) ff., and they would have to if the Object were to be definite. Thus 'I am going to send this letter' would have to read Saya akan mengirimkan surat ini, cf. (224), and similarly with the other verbs, with the exception only of turun tangan (which has an idiomatic special meaning): menurunkan tangan would mean 'to lower one's hand'.

The incorporated Object in constructions such as in (224) ff. must be indefinite and unquantifiable; this has been indicated by the asterisk-marked constraints in (224) through (226).

6 SYNTACTIC PARADIGMS

6.0 In Verhaar 1984, 7.0 through 7.8, paradigmatic alternates of verbs are reviewed. That review, however, was merely an inventory of affixes, involving Arguments like Subject and Object only in so far as they take cliticized form. Naturally, such an inventory fails to provide adequate data for understanding the syntactic dimensions of the morphemes of the verbal paradigm. We may, then, distinguish that morphemic from the syntactic paradigm, which raises a number of questions exceeding affixational processes. The description of such a syntactic paradigm will be attempted in the present section.

For example, diambilnya 'he took' may periphrastically take the form of diambil olehnya, or diambil oleh dia, or (d)iaambil, including furthermore also the pronoun variation possible with preposed (morphemically free) pronominal agatives, as in beliau ambil, or Bapak ambil. Also to be included here are the Arguments which take fully nominal form, as in diambil oleh tetangganya or diambil tetangganya, etc. Again then it appears that such syntactic or "periphrastic" paradigmatic members, since they are constrained in various ways, deserve special treatment.

On the other hand, the object of the description in the present section is merely the syntactic paradigm, and not yet other problems related to verbal syntax: for example, though some reference will be made to sequential order in this section, that topic merits special treatment for its own sake ([FF-5]). So does the problem of verbal diatheses ([FF-3]) and the Qualifiers (to the verb) ([FF-6]), as well as a number of discourse-pragmatic issues to which brief reference is to be made below ([FF-4], [FF-10], [FF-14]).

Given these limitations of what we are aiming at in the present paper, we will now proceed to discuss various forms of the syntactic paradigm of verbs. This will be done for:

(a) Intransitive men- verbs
(b) Transitive men- and memper- verbs
(c) Other verbs, apart from (a) and (b)

A general discussion, for the most part clarifying terms to be used, will precede discussion of these items, i.e. in 6.1. Then (a) is treated in 6.2 through 6.4, (b) will be dealt with in 6.5 through 6.12. Finally 6.13 will discuss (c).

6.1 In the following, memper- verbs will not be sought out for special treatment. First, as all memper- verbs are transitive, they do not come in treating intransitive verbs. In dealing with transitive men- verbs, however, we will have no occasion to deal with memper- verbs either. They behave in all respects relevant to the subject matter of the discussion, in exactly the same manner as the transitive men- verbs, except only that with memper- verbs, -per- precedes the verb base. That is to say, prefixes and initial parts of circumfixes precede this -per-, while other affixes do not affect it.

In dealing with transitive men- verbs, it is appropriate to distinguish the various diatheses only as "active" (which in fact may be antipassive) and "passive" (which in fact may be ergative). Such distinctions are better treated without regard for accusativity and ergativity, as those will be treated elsewhere ([FF-3]). We will, then, enclose the terms "active" and "passive" in "scare quotes" to alert the reader that we prescind from the problem of accusativity and ergativity, since for the purposes of the descriptions to follow below, that distinction would be irrelevant in most cases. In some instances, however, the distinction should be made, and then passives will be mentioned without the quotes, and as distinguished from ergatives.

The next preliminary clarification to be made concerns the expression "NP". By "NP" will be meant any Argument that is both morphemically and syntactically free, including coreferentially deleted zero. Its being morphemically free entails, negatively, that it is not a clitic; its being syntactically free entails, negatively, that it is not inseparable from the verb. Thus ku- in kuba I 'I read' is not an NP because it is a clitic; it is not free morphemically; aku in aku baca I 'I
read' is not an NP either because aku is inseparable from baca, even though morphemically it is free. It should be added here that an agentive cliticized to oleh 'by', as in olehnya 'by him', is also considered as not having NP status because -nya is cliticized (even though olehnya as a whole is both morphemically and syntactically free). On the other hand, aku in dia mengundang aku 'She is inviting me' is an NP because, apart from being morphemically free, it is also separable from mengundang (and therefore syntactically free). So is dia mengundang aku 'call Amin for me', or temanmu yang datang kemarin in temanmu yang datang kemarin tidak akan kami undang 'your friend who came yesterday we [excl.] will not be inviting'. This understanding of "NP" will greatly facilitate formulation of rules in the description below. Note finally that the expression "noun phrase" differs from our sense of "NP" in that the latter need not be a word group, while the former is.

Another clarification is needed for the expression "full honorific pronoun". Consider words like Bapak and Ibu; these may be ordinary nouns, as in Bapak tidak akan datang 'Mr [So-and-so] will not be coming', or Ibu melarang, Mrs [So-and-so] forbids it'. In this nominal use of Bapak and Ibu, the short forms thereof (which are somewhat more "intimate" socially than the long forms), i.e. Pak and Bu, must be accompanied by the proper name: Pak Pardjo 'Mr Pardjo', Bu Tuti 'Mrs Tuti'. Note that in both uses ("long" and "short") these "nouns" may be "vocative", i.e. to address the person. Thus Bapak/Bapak Tardjo/Pak Tardjo tidak akan datang may mean 'You (Sir/Mr Tardjo) will not be coming'; Ibu/Ibu Tuti/Bu Tuti melarang 'You (Madam/ Mrs Tuti) forbid it'. So far this information is mainly to tell such "honorifics" in their nominal use (even vocatively) apart from their pronominal use. It remains to note that the "nominal" use is normal as arguments to verbs, both vocatively and nonvocatively.

The "pronominal" use of such words as Bapak and Ibu appears as proposed pronominal Agentive with Ø forms of transitivizing verbs, and is subject to the following constraints: First, only the "long" forms can be used if no proper name follows; second, proper names can follow when these proper names are minimally short, and in that case the "short" form of the pronoun is preferred. Examples appear in 6.8 below. Note that such Agentives are "pronominal", not "nominal", in that they cannot be "third person" and must be "second person".

Other examples of such honorifics (both "nominal" and "pronominal") are:
Prfesor '(you) Professor'; Saudara '(you) brother/brotherfriend'; kakak '(you) older brother/sister'; adik '(you) younger brother/sister'; Ustad '(you) Sir [i.e. Islamic leader]'; Bapak (or Pakar) '(you) Father [i.e. Catholic priest]'; Pendeta '(you) [Protestant] Minister'; and a number of others. It should be noted here that there is one honorific which is among the "normal" pronouns, i.e. beliau 'he/she [HON]'. For all pronouns see [FF-16].

Given these clarifications, here follows the order of constructions to be described, as syntactic paradigms, below.

First, the constructions involving intransitive men- verbs, and the intransitive use of transitive men- verbs, must be treated (6.2); then the ter- constructions of affixless verbs and of intransitive men- verbs will be dealt with (6.3); this will be followed by transitive constructions of men- verbs (6.4). After that, "zero" imperatives are to be described (6.5). Then, for the remaining types (i.e. "zero" -- other than the "zero" imperatives --, ku-/kau- constructions, ter- constructions, and di- constructions) there is one complication obtaining for all of them, i.e. the sequential position of the Patient NP relative to the verb, and some brief notes about that problem must be given first (6.6). Then follows the ku-/kau-construction (6.7), the "zero" construction (other than the zero imperative) (6.8), the di- construction with only a Patient NP (6.9), the di- construction with an Agent in non-NP form (6.10), the di- construction with an Agent in NP form (6.11), and, finally, the ter- construction of transitive men- verbs (6.12).

6.2 The intransitive men- construction.
The following rule covers all varieties of this construction, which comprises intransitive men- verbs and intransitive men- constructions of transitive men- verbs. This type may be broken down under the following two rules:

(237) Transitive men- verbs may be used intransitively, or with strongly reduced transitivity in two ways, requiring men- and having no other paradigmatic alternates. First, in an imperative of low transitivity, and this again in two forms: with an Object NP, but only with negative imperatives (with -lah optionally attached to jangan, not to the verb form); and in the affirmative without an Object altogether; and in either case without a Subject. Second, nonimperatively, anti-
passively, with a Subject NP (which must be preverbal), and suppressing the Object.

Rule (237) is about intransitive verbs, rule (238) about transitive verbs used intransitively. The Subject (if any) is specified in both rules as an NP, i.e. it cannot be a clitic, and must be separable from the verb. On the particle -lah, see [FF-17]. In (238) it is specified that the Object of an imperative with reduced transitivity must be an NP, i.e. it cannot be cliticized, or be inseparable from the verb. The other specifications are straightforwardly clear. Consider the following examples:

(239) Kakinya membengkak.
'His foot is swelling'/

(240) Lalu menyegeranglah dia.
'And then he crossed over.'

(241) Menyegeranglah di sini!
'Cross over here!'

(242) Jangan(lah) menyegerang di sini!
'Don't cross here!'

(243) Membaca(lah)!
'Do your reading!'

(244) Jangan(lah) membaca koran!
'Don't do any newspaper reading!'

(245) Jangan membaca('nya)!
'Don't do any reading!'

(246) [Context:] Sampaikanlah pesan
'Pass that message
itu kepadanya!
on to him!'

Ya ......, saya akan menyampaikan
'All right, ..... I may pass
itu on (to him) (someday).'

Note that the (normal) preverbal position of the Subject is exemplified in (239), and the (rather rare) postverbal position in (240). In the latter case the verb is strongly "foregrounded" (with -lah as a foreground marker) and focused by fronting, with dia almost as an "afterthought" (sentence (240) is rather literary). On such focus fronting, see [FF-14]. Examples (241) through (245) are imperative constructions: of an intransitive verb in (241) and (242); of a transitive verb, but with greatly reduced transitivity in (243) and (244). Note the impossibility of cliticizing the Object of such impera-
tives, as per (245). Finally, (246) represents a highly typical antipassive. The context (containing a "zero" imperative, i.e. sampaikanlah, see 6.5) is a request or order, triggering the following sentence as a reply. "Typically one in which the speaker is not committing himself, and this is conveyed by the antipassive construction, with the Object suppressed. Note that "suppression" here is not the same as coreferential "deletion"; with "deletion" there is still a Ø, a genuine NP, though not a formative one; and not formative because the highly topical; by "suppression" is meant, however, that there is no NP at all; or, to the extent that we know what the Object would be, very low in topicality. Note especially that with menyampaikan in (246) the Object is suppressed not in this reading (of noncommitment of the speaker). But with the low transitivity of an antipassive, degrees are possible; in particular pesan itu in the reply of (246) would still be wellformed somewhat noncommitally; -nya, however, is out on any reading, even though active mon- transitives may take a -nya Object, for here the reply is an antipassive. (A firm commitment as a reply to (246) would be: Batlalah, akan saya sampaikan! 'I will definitely pass it on!': an ergative construction with the Object "deleted" (not "suppressed") and taking Ø form.)

A final rule obtaining for these constructions (but not, for obvious reasons, for the imperatives) is that reduplicated verbs usually connotate a plural Subject, as appears in:

(247) Semua bunga itu lalu mulai
'memutih-mutih.
'turn white.'

It is not the case that just one flower keeps turning white, but that this happens to more flowers. The plural is not invariably connotated, however, as appears from (248):

(248) Kampung itu memutih-mutih di
'antara pepohonan.
'the village appeared as white
patches through the trees.'

where kampung is clearly singular, and the "plurality" is really in that there are a number of white patches seen through the trees.

6.3 The intransitive ter- construction
There are no syntactic surprises in the ter- constructions derived from affix-
less verbs, intransitive men- verbs and precategorials. The Subject may be to the left of the verb (normally) or to its right (according to special discourse-pragmatic parameters, on which see [FF-14]). Consider:

(249) Saya terjatuh di tangga.
'I fell on the stairs.'

(250) Di depan saya terbangalah seekor singa.
'Before me there was a lion with open mouth.'

(251) Saya tergelincir di jalan.
'I slipped in the street.'

6.4 The transitive men- construction

The following rule covers all instances of this construction:

(252) The transitive men- construction has the Subject in NP form, preverbal (normally) and postverbal (rarely, according to special discourse-pragmatic parameters). The Direct Object is invariably postverbal, and may take either NP form or be encliticized to the verb as -ku '1sg', -mu '2sg/pl', or -nya '3sg/pl'. This encliticization, however, is subject to two constraints: First, that of rule (238) in negative imperatives because of their reduced transitivity; second, nonthird encliticizations are prohibited with benefactive men-[-kan] verbs, while with instrumental men-[-kan] verbs nonthird is out for animacy hierarchy reasons. Any non-Direct Object, provided it is not oblique, must also be postverbal.

This rule states various things, some of which it will be convenient to make more explicit here. The Subject is an NP, i.e. it cannot be cliticized; its sequential place is the same for the Subject of all men- verbs. Objects are two: Direct Object and non-Direct, from which only oblique Objects are excluded: both kinds of Objects must always be postverbal. As to the Direct Object, when nonaccusative and promoted, it can only be -nya, and not "nonthird" (i.e. not -ku or -mu), with benefactive and instrumental men-[-kan] verbs; and with the latter for animacy hierarchy reasons, i.e. [Human] (i.e. all nonthird clitics) cannot be instruments. See 2.5 above. Finally, the first constraint in (252), that of negative men-

imperatives, is mentioned only for completeness' sake; it fits more naturally into rule (238).

Here are some examples:

(253) Temanmu (tidak) (akan) mengunjungi.
Your friend invites/will invite/is not inviting me.'

(254) Saya menantangmu dalam hal ini.
'I challenge you in this regard.'

(255) Dia telah membaca nya.
'He has already read it.'

(256) Sindhu sedang membaca koran.
'Sindhu is reading the newspaper.'

(257) Saya akan membelikannya rokok.
'I am going to buy him some cigarettes.'

(258) Dia akan membelikamu rokok.
'He is going to buy me some cigarettes.'

(259) Dia akan membelikan aku rokok.
'He is going to buy me some cigarettes.'

(260) Belum membaca koran */(//) saya.
'I haven't read the paper yet.'

The -ku, -mu, and -nya clitics are found in (253), (254), (255), and (257), while it is prohibited in (258). This whole clause is marked as ungrammatical because, while -ku is out, the clause without -ku would not be wellformed either; the well-formed version is (259). Since the Subject is an NP, it is separable from the verb, and that is indicated only in (253). The Subject is postverbal in (260); the double slash */(//) there symbolizes a functional pause, which would be acceptable since saya is in fact an "afterthought topic"; however, the pause is optional so that saya may count as a Subject in the same clause. The Direct Object is postverbal in all instances and so is the second Object rokok in (257) and (259) obligatorily so. For examples of the instrumental men-[-kan] construction, see 2.5 (b) above; note that the oblique "Object" in those examples may, for special reasons, be preverbal.

The Subject, finally, may be at least semantically plural in case the men- verb is reduplicated, and in fact that plurality may reound in plurality also in the Object and in other constituents, as appears from:

(261) Para prajurit itu sedang men-
'The soldiers were looking
6.5 The "zero" imperative construction

For the "zero" imperative which are imperatives of transitive *men-* verbs, see Verhaar 1984, 7.0 [f]; 7.6. Here is the rule for the syntactic paradigm of these constructions:

(262) The zero imperative construction is a highly transitive construction, consisting of the verb base prefixed by zero, and a Patient NP, which is obligatorily postverbal. In earlier Malay there frequently was an Agent in immediately postverbal position (i.e., before the Patient NP), consisting of *oleh* "by" plus either an NP or cliticized -mu. The Agent has almost completely disappeared in Contemporary Indonesian, but still belongs to the receptive command of highly literate speakers. Optionally -lah is added to the verb form.

The rule characterizes the imperative as "highly transitive"; in fact, zero imperatives are ergatives and "inherently" so (see [FF-3]). The Patient Argument is an NP, not cliticizable; its position as obligatorily postverbal characterizes this construction as different from all other "passives": see 6.6 below. The *oleh* [.....] Agent, usual in earlier Malay, may still be said to belong to Contemporary Indonesian in that a number of speakers will recognize it, at least receptively, as wellformed; now it belongs to highly literate style.

Consider the following examples:

(263) *Angkat(lah) kursi itu!* 'Lift that chair!'

(264) *Kalau kursi itu, angkatlah!* 'As for that chair, lift it!'

(265) *Pujilah olehmu Allah yang Maharâhím!*

*Mercy!*

(266) *Lakukan(lah) segera tugaamui!* 'Do your job immediately.'

The Patient is seen to be postverbal in these examples (kursi itu, Allah yang Maharâhím, tugaamui); even in (264) angkat-lah may be described analytically as ang-

katlah Ø!, the zero coreferential with kursi itu. The olehmu Agent in (265) is archaic and highly literary. It comes in between the verb form and the Patient NP, and other constituents may do so also, as does segera in (266).

6.6 The sequential position of the Patient with Ø-, ku-/kau-, di-, and ter-

Before continuing with the Ø-, ku-/kau-, di-, and ter- constructions, a few notes must be devoted to the sequential position of the Patient NP in all of them; that is to say, that position may be either preverbal or postverbal, depending upon discourse-pragmatic parameters. Some examples may be considered first:

(267) *Surat-surat ini sudah kutanda- tangan.* 'These letters I have already signed.'

(268) *Kapan akan kauundang pacar saya?* 'When are you going to invite my girl friend?'

(269) *Sudah Bapak tandangani tadi.* 'You already signed that just now, Sir.'

(270) *Gedung baru itu akan dibangun tahan depan.*

*The new building will be con- structed next year.*

(271) *Dibalikkan sepeda itu, lalu diputar rodanya.* 'He turned the bicycle upside down and turned the wheel.'

(272) *Oleh sekretaris díkumukan beberapa hal mengenai prosedur beberapa hal mengenai prosedur.*

*The secretary announced the procedure.*

(273) *Kemudian terlihat olehku sesos.*

*After that I saw a body among the trees.*

(274) *Harapan seperti itu tak ter- pikirkan oleh ayahnya.*

*A hopeful prospect like that was unthinkable for his father.*

In these "passives" the Patient NP is
of zero in (267), (269) (as zero, in coreferential deletion), (270), and (274); and postverbal in all the other examples. This depends on various discourse-pragmatic parameters, one of which is the topic or focus character of the Patient NP. For such parameters see [FF-10] and [FF-14]. Some of these examples are highly likely (i.e. in almost any context) to be ergative: (268), (269), (271), (272), and (273). However, even in such ergative constructions both preverbal and postverbal position of the Patient NP are possible, depending again on what is focus and what is topic. In contrast, in passives the Patient is almost exclusively preverbal, as in (270) and (274).

The principal purpose of 6.6 is to get the variable position of the Patient NP out of the way, so that the constructions named in the title can be treated one by one without having to advert to that problem in every one of them. The above examples are taken from the following subsections, and will be presented there once again for easier recognition.

6.7 The ku-/kau- construction
The following rule holds for the ku-/kau- constructions:

(275) In the ku-/kau- constructions, the proclitics ku- 'ls' and kau- '2sg' represent the Agent, while the Patient must be an NP in either preverbal or postverbal position, depending on discourse-pragmatic parameters referred to in 6.6. The Agent can be focus only if the construction is passive, never when it is ergative.

The rule says that the Patient NP with the ku-/kau- form are NPs, i.e. they cannot be cliticized. The agentic proclitics ku- and kau-, moreover, can never be the focus of the clause in case the construction is ergative.

Here are some examples:

(276) Surat-surat ini (sudah)
'\text{Those documents I have}'
kutandatangani.
(already) signed.'

(277) Kapan (akan) kauundang painar
'\text{When you (going to) in-}'
saya?
vite/inviting my girl friend?'

(278) Kamu akan kuberitahu.
'I will let you know.'

(279) *talu kutandatangani surat
'\text{Then I was the one who signed}'
itu. [ku- emphasized]
the letter.'

(280) Imi
tah surat yang kutanda-
gani, bukan yang kautanda-
sign, not the one that you
ngani. [ku- and kau- empha-
sized']
signed.'

Note first that the Patient NP is separable from the verb by the constituents enclosed in parentheses. About position, sequentially, of that NP, see 6.6 above. Note furthermore that what makes (279) not wellformed is the stress (for emphasis; therefore, focus) on ku- (symbolized by italics); however, such stress does not make (280) ungrammatical. The reason is that (279) is an ergative, but (280) a passive. See [FF-14] for further explanations.

6.8 The "zero" construction
What is called "zero" construction here comprises all verbal constructions with the $β$-altanant paradigmatically, except for the $\text{zero}$ imperative (6.5). There are various reasons for treating the zero imperative separately; first, the Agents are different in various respects, as comparison of the present subsection with 6.5 immediately shows; second, while the Patient of the zero imperative must be postverbal, the Patient of the zero constructions dealt with here have either preverbal or postverbal position as explained in 6.6.

The following rules are relevant to the zero construction:

(281) In Standard Indonesian, the Agentive is preposed to the $β$-form of the men- verb, in "pronominal" form, such that that form is morphemically free but syntactically bound; i.e. these Agentives cannot be separated from the $β$-form. The Patient NP is in preverbal or postverbal position according to parameters referred to in 6.6. The Agentive pronouns are of various kinds: (a) "regular" pronouns such as saya, kamu, dia, kami, etc.; (b) full honorific pronouns such as Bapak, Ibu, but only used "vocatively"; (c) short honorific pronouns followed by a proper name in minimally short form, again
only used "vocatively".

(282) In Substandard Indonesian, rule (281) obtains, but with the following modifications: (a) Some appropriate adverb may be interposed between the Agentive and the $\theta$- form; (b) The Agentive may be honorific nonvocatively; (c) The Agentive may be a nonprolimal noun phrase, provided it is anaphoric.

(283) The Agentive pronoun cannot become "focus" of the construction if the zero construction is ergative, but it can if the zero construction is passive (which it always is if any of the changes (a) through (c) of rule (282) obtains).

The beginning of rule (281) merely states what has often been recorded (under various analytic devices in various grammars and as the "$\theta$-") form here) and what is more detailed in (281) is rather the itemization of the Agentives as "pronouns". Rule (282), whenever any of the changes (a) through (c) obtains, concerns Substandard constructions, which, though they are invariably rejected by careful speakers, may yet be found in considerably frequency, not only in Colloquial Indonesian, but even in written sources like newspapers or novels. Rule (283) affirms a general rule for Agentives of ergatives, one which, so far as we are aware, is valid across syntactically ergative languages, but certainly for Indonesian.

Consider the following examples:

(284) Alangkah baiknya kalau surat 'It would be wonderful if we
itu dapat kita kirimkan. could send that letter.'

(285) Kamu akan aku beritahu. 'I will let you know.'

(286) Hal itu harus dia kerjakan 'That thing he has to do
sekarang. right now.'

(287) Saya doakan supaya kamu menang 'I pray that you may win.'
nanti.

(288) Sudah Bapak tandatangani. 'You have already signed it,
Sir.'

(289) Seperti Pak Nyono (/\'Pak Pra-
'As you, Mr. Nyono(/\'Mr Pr.)
'we're ready (to do
songgup.
this).'

(290) [Ss] Yang kamu belum baca,
'What you haven't read
kamu harus baca besok.
yet, you have to read
yet, you have to read
tomorrow.'

(291) [Ss] Seperti Pak Nyono ketahui,
'As Mr Nyono knows, we
kami sangat
are ready (to do this).'

(292) [Ss] Seperti yang teman-teman
'As Atik's friends say,
Atik katakan, [...].
[...].'

[Ss] is "Substandard"; (292) is taken from Margono 1980. Examples (284) through (289) illustrate rule (281); note that the asterisked alternate in (289) is out merely because the proper name is too long, Nyono is not only "short" in absolute terms, but also a shortening of the name Sunyono, and thus is especially eligible as Agentive according to (c) of (281). Note also that the Agents in (288) and (289) are used "vocatively", i.e. to address the person. In contrast, (291) does not address the Agent, and is thus Substandard. Some careful speakers reject the (c) condition of (281) as permissible, and according to those speakers (289) would not be well-formed.

Examples (290) through (292) illustrate (respectively) the (a) through (c) properties of rule (282). As noted, most careful speakers would consider them as not wellformed; however, one may find them frequently, even in print. We have seen them often in newspapers.

As illustrations of rule (283), consider:

(293) 'Lalu aku tandatangani surat 'Then I was the one who signed
itu. [aku emphasized]
the letter.'

(294) Inilah surat yang aku tanda-
'This is the letter that I
tangani, bukan yang kamu tanda-
sign, not the one that you
tangani. [aku and kamu empha-
sized] signed.'

Note that (293) would be wellformed if aku did not receive emphatic stress. The reason why (293) with aku emphatically stressed is not wellformed is that the sentence is ergative, and Agents of ergatives cannot be "focussed" (which they
would be if emphasized). In contrast, such emphatic stress is wellformedly possible in (294), since the construction is passive, not ergative, as one would expect in a backgrounded clause; backgrounded as relative clauses would be. (On ergative and accusative constructions, see [FF-3].) Compare (293) and (294) with (279) and (280).

6.9 The di- construction with only a Patient NP

The rule for di- constructions with only one argument, i.e. the Patient NP, may be phrased as follows:

(295) The di- form of the verb, accompanied only by the Patient NP, represents two different constructions: first, a passive without an agentive NP; second, an ergative with di- both marking the ergative and serving as pronominally anaphoric agentive of third person singular or plural. In the former case, the Patient NP normally precedes the di- form and follows it only when the di- form is strongly foregrounded (in which case the di- form is likely to take the foregrounding particle -lah). In the latter case, the Patient NP either precedes or follows the di- form, depending upon discourse-pragmatic parameters referred to in 6.6 above. The ergative di- form of this construction type may also serve as an imperative.

This rule, then, cannot stay away from the distinction between ergative and passive, because in the ergative the di- prefix is pronominally anaphoric, while di- of the passive is not. This is better understood within a more complete description of ergativity, on which see [FF-3]. Here it may be said that ergative di- forms exclude any kind of nonthird Agents, so that the di- prefix practically becomes a "proleptic" marking of third person agentivity; this is even more relevant in consideration of the fact that passive di- constructions, even though they may contain nonthird Agents, yet normally have third person Agents (if any) for reasons of animacy hierarchy. On all this, see 6.11 below. Furthermore, the position of the Patient NP for the present construction obeys discourse-pragmatic strategy rules referred to in 6.6 above, in case the construction is ergative. For the position of the Patient NP with passive di- constructions of this type, its normal position is preverbal; and postverbal only when the verb is strongly foregrounded.

Note that the rule does not say anything about focusing of the Agent; since the only Agent in the present construction is the di- prefix when the construction is ergatively organized, it is as well to say here that that di- can never be focussed. Here follow some examples:

(296) Gedung baru akan dibangun
'the new building will be
tahun depan.
constructed next year.'

(297) Lalu didirikanlah lembaga
'(And) then this new institute
baru ini.
was erected.'

(298) Tertipulah dia! dikira betul!
'He was taken in [by some story]! He actually thought it
[i.e. the story] was true!'

(299) Dibalikkan sepeda itu dan di-
'He turned the bicycle upside
putar rodanya.
down and turned the wheel.'

(301) Dibalikkan! Lalu diangkat!
'Turn it around! Then lift it!'

The ergative constructions are (298) through (301). Example (298) would have to be ergative and could not be passive in whatever appropriate context. Indeed, the context is provided by the first clause dia tertipu!, for dia is anaphorically represented by pronominal di- of di-
kira. The context would mention some untrue story, and that story would be represented as coreferential zero in (analytically) $\# dikira betul$. Both clauses of (298) would be highly "punctual" (Hopper and Thompson 1980), and therefore highly transitive. For (299) one could, conceivably, have a context which would make it passive rather than ergative, but not easily, because of the postverbal position of the Patient NP's. For an ergative interpretation of (299), however, almost any context would be apposite; there would have to be reference to some person in the previous discourse, such that di- (twice) would be pronominally anaphoric. Sentence (300), again, would be ergative in any context (i.e., "inherently" ergative, see [FF-3]). The di- prefix would have to be pronominally anaphoric, unless, of course, an Agent is present (see sub 6.11, below); the identity of the Agent is suggested in brackets in the gloss. In (301) we observe the di- imperative to be somewhat milder than the zero imperative (6.5, above); milder, of course, in that second person address is avoided. The same construction may be used with the "Qualifier" supaya (as distinct from the conjunction supaya; see [FF-9]), forming "exhortatives;
6.10 The di- construction with a non-NP agentic

This construction differs from that in 6.9 above, in that there is an Agent, not in NP form but encliticized. Here are the rules covering this construction:

(302) The di- construction may contain, apart from the Patient NP, also an agentic constituent in non-NP form (apart, that is, from anaphoric di- in di- ergatives as described in 6.9 above). The position of the Patient NP is either preverbal or postverbal when such constructions are ergative, according to special discourse-pragmatic parameters referred to in 6.6; and (normally) preverbal when the construction is passive, though (rarely) it may be postverbal in case the di- passive is strongly foregrounded (in which case the di- form is likely to be marked by the foregrounding particle -lah).

(303) The agentic constituent takes the form either of agentic -nya '3sg/pl' encliticized to the di- form of the verb, or of an agentic introduced by oloh 'by' to which there is encliticized -ku '1sg', -mu '2sg/pl', or -nya '3 sg/pl'. The entire agentic introduced by oloh is (normally) postverbal, and (exceptionally) preverbal, in either case separable from the verb by an appropriate constituent. In either case the construction may be either passive or ergative, but it is likely to be passive in most contexts, and must be passive if the clitic attached to oloh is non-third (according to rule (304) below). The agentine without oloh (i.e. -nya encliticized to the di- form of the verb) is characteristic of constructions which are either ergative or passive.

(304) When the agentine is intro-
duced by oloh, non-third en-
cliticizations (i.e. -ku or
-mu) are compatible only with
a passive construction because of
certain discourse-pragmatic
constraints plotted along an
animacy hierarchy.

These rules (which have been divided under three numbers merely for convenience) state several things, some of which we will now comment on in explanation of why they are phrased as they are. Rule (302) merely states what kind of di- construction we are dealing with and notes the place of the Patient NP in them; that position of the Patient NP is the one commented on in 6.6, and needs no additional comments here. Rule (303) states that the non-NP agentine may or may not take oloh; in the former case, first, second, and third person encliticizations are possible; in the case of the latter, only -nya is possible, attached immediately to the di- form of the verb. The oloh agentives may have preverbal or postverbal position, separable from the verb in either case. It is worth noting here that earlier (in 6.1 above) we stipulated that oloh + clitic agentives do not count as NP's, even though, of course, the entire agentine constituent (i.e. including oloh) is both morphemically and syntactically free. However, the clitic itself is bound both morphemically and syntactically, and that is what counts. Furthermore, the preverbal and postverbal positions of oloh agentives are mentioned, as are also the ergative and passive characteristics of the various forms the constructions, in their various sequential positions also, may take. Neither topic can be explained here, as separate articles will be needed to deal with these discourse-pragmatic complications (see [FF-3], [FF-4], [FF-10]) in a exhaustively exhaustive fashion. Finally, rule (304) states that olohku and olohamu agentives in these constructions are found only in passive constructions, not in ergative ones.

Consider the following examples:

(305) Dipegangnya palu, lalu dilem-
'He grabbed the hammer, then
parkannya pada temannya.
threw it at his friend.'

(306) (Palu itu) dilemparkannya
'He threw it/the hammer at
pada temannya.
his friend.'

(307) Koran yang sudah dibacaannya
'The newspaper that he had
itu ternyata sudah hilang.
read turned out to have disappeared.'
In (305) we find ergative organization, in (307) and (308) accusative organization; in this case, the passive. Note that in (305) palu is coreferentially repeated, but in deleted form as zero (with its natural position between lalu and dilemparkannya), with Objects as coreferential, therefore, as is to be expected in ergative constructions. Example (306) shows that the deletion is not obligatory, so that palu itu is optional. In (307) the passive is backgrounded, as one would expect in a relative clause (yang sudah dibacaannya), and (308) is unusual in that the passive is used for foregrounding, which is the reason why it has the foregrounding marker -lah. This style is somewhat literary. Example (309) illustrates di- constructions with an oleh agentive: (309) shows that agentive as postverbal, its normal place in this case separated from the di- form by selekas mungkin 'as soon as possible'. In contrast, the oleh agentive in (310) is preverbal, which it rarely is more generally, though somewhat more usual in relative clauses. The oleh agentive in (311) (olehMu) is nonthird, which it can be only in the passive, and which requires focusing on the agentive for it to be possible even in the passive: The focus here is based on contrast (God, but not anyone else, knows these persons). Finally, (312) is one of those rare instances where oleh is used in an ergative construction (as it certainly has to here, if only because the oleh agentive is preverbal); the ergative organization is due (assuming the suitable context) to the punctuality of the action, appearing especially in lalu (the context could be one recounting successive actions, each punctual, with a high degree of affectedness of the Patient NP (see Hopper and Thompson 1980)). Finally, the encliticized agentive with -nya directly attached to the di- form is the verb ed on contrast is illustrated by dipegangnya in (305) and by dilemparkannya in both (305) and (306).

6.11 The di- construction with an NP Agentive

The rules for this type of construction may be phrased as follows:

(a) In regard to sequential order alone (i.e. without prejudice to (b) and (c)), the Agentive NP is optionally marked with oleh of immediately following the di- verb; and it is obligatorily so marked in any other sequential position, of which there are two: in mediately postverbal position, and in any preverbal position.

(b) Oleh is obligatory with nonthird personal pronouns, optional with third personal pronouns and with all full honorific pronouns, and prohibited with the "absolute" orang 'people'.

(c) Oleh is obligatory with Agentives when the entire construction is backgrounded, except for the "absolute" Agentive orang as meant in sub (b).

The pronouns dikau (rather than (ong)kau) and dia (rather than ia) must be used (if so) after oleh.

A comparison of this 6.11 di- construction with the 6.10 di- construction may introduce some comments on rules (313) and (314). The 6.10 construction has an Agentive of the form (oleh)nya; that of 6.11,
of (say) (oleh) teman saya, or (oleh) dia, or (oleh) Bapak. Prima facie, then, such constructions seem to be in perfect parallel distribution. However, more often than not, they are in complementary distribution. The reason is that the 6.10 type has an Agentive that must be anaphoric, whereas it is on the whole unlikely for the Agentive of the 6.11 type to be anaphoric, with the exception, mainly, of NP form Agentives ending in itu 'that, the' or tersebut 'the aforementioned'. Non-anaphoric NP's, however, are focus rather than topic. On the other hand, Agentives of ergative constructions cannot be focused ([FF-3], [FF-10], [FF-14]). Therefore constructions of the 6.11 type in by far the majority of cases are bound to be passive. Hence a statement to that effect in (313), with the consequence that the Patient NP is most likely to be preverbal. However, it is not impossible for some of these constructions to be ergative, as will be illustrated below.

The determinations of rule (314) are self-explanatory, except perhaps for the "absolute" orang 'people'. That is to say, orang standing alone, and not further determined, as it could be in (say) orang Jepang '(the) Japanese' (which could have oleh); the orang meant here is "impersonal", as is English (unstressed) people, and can therefore not be focused. The determinations of (315) pertain more appropriately to [FF-16], and are given here merely for completeness' sake.

Consider now the following examples:

(316) Renana ini perlu dilaksanakan 'This plan must be executed by
' (oleh) panitia tersebut. the committee (we mentioned)
just now.'

(317) Pameran semacam itu tidak 'An exhibition like that
digemari (oleh) orang.
people don't like.'

(318) Oleh sekretaris ditemukan 'The secretary then explained
berbagai hal menyengkut pro-
various things concerning the
sedur kenaikan pangkat.
procedure for promotion in
rank.'

(319) Tidak usah! Sudah dibacaan 'No need for that! He already
dia. [dia emphasized]
read that.'

(320) Surat ini akan ditandatangani 'This letter will be signed
oleh lurah dan oleh saya
by the village head and by me
selaku bupati.
as the district head.'

(321) Hal itu dikatakan Saparjo 'That statement Saparjo made
sehabis rapat Mentari.
after the Cabinet meeting.'

First, note that two of these examples could easily be ergative in the appropriate context: (318) and (321). In (318) with a preverbal (and therefore obligatorily oleh-marked) Agentive; in (312) with a postverbal Agent not marked with oleh.

In either case the Agent is uniquely identifiable, and the context is likely to contain the Agent as known: a proper name like Saparjo (in (321)) is for discourse-pragmatic purposes as good as an anaphoric pronoun. Apart from such highly conditioned instances, however, this dî- construction is likely to be passive rather than ergative in the majority of instances; examples of such passives are (316), (317), (319), and (320). The Agentive of a passive has mainly three characteristics: first, it is optional; second, if present, it contains new information (i.e. it is "focused"); third, oleh is preferably present. If the dî- construction is back-grounded (as it is in (316) where it depends on perlu), oleh must be used.

Note that the Agent of the ergative cannot be focused. Therefore, it cannot have emphasis, such as found with contrastive stress. In (319), however, dia may be stressed, showing the construction to be a passive, not an ergative. Instead of dia, other third person pronouns could be used, also stressed for contrast (beliau, or mereka, e.g.), or any (full!) honorific pronoun (such as bapak or profesor). Third person pronouns, however, are different in that they require oleh (which is unusual for the ergative) and in that they easily go against animacy hierarchy priorities.

Note that in all the passive examples above the Patient NP is preverbal; the ergative constructions may have the Patient NP in preverbal or postverbal position: the former in (321) where it is topical; the latter in (318) where it is focus, i.e. new information.

6.12 Ter- constructions
The rule for ter- constructions may be phrased as follows:

(322) The ter- construction is a passive construction. The Patient NP is either preverbal (if topical) or postverbal (if new information, focus); in the latter case the ter- verb may be strongly foregrounded, and in literary style the ter- verb may be
marked for that by -lah. Many ter- constructions, perhaps the majority, have no other constituent. Because the ter-construction is low in transitivity, an Agentive is often absent because there is no apparent Agent. However, if there is an Agentive, the Agent is typically not in control of the event signified by the ter- verb. As a consequence, an Agentive may get "neutralized" to more of a "concomitant" constituent; not marked, as is an agentive, by oleh, but by dengan 'with', or dalam 'in', virtually in parallel distribution with oleh. The Agentive (unless neutralized) usually has oleh 'by' (with rule (315) in force). The Agentive takes either non-NP form or NP form. In non-NP form, -ku 'lsg', -mu '2sg/pl', or -nya '3sg/pl' is encliticized to oleh (olehku, olehmu, olehnya). In NP form, what follows oleh may be any personal pronoun, first, second, or third person, or any full noun or noun phrase. An Agentive, if present, may take either preverbal (rarely, i.e. if topical) or postverbal (normally, i.e. if focused) position.

The most typical ter- construction is exemplified in (328): no Agentive, not even in neutralized form, and the Patient NP fronted. Example (326) comes close, but here dalam could be a neutralized form for oleh. The neutralization possibility is clearly observed in (327) (oleh/dengan). Examples (323) and (324) are rather literary if the ter- verb is marked by -lah; note that in both sentences the Patient NP is postverbal, and that it is new information, focused. Rule (322) says that the Agentive is usually introduced by oleh. In a few ter-constructions, however, oleh may be dispensed with, as e.g. in tertip angin 'blown (away) by the wind', or terbawa air 'carried by the (water) stream'.

6.13 Constructions with verbs other than men-/mempem- verbs

The verbs of this class comprise affixless verbs, ber- verbs (including circumfixed ones), and ke- verbs. Morphologically, these verbs have only one paradigmatic member, the "citation" form. Also, except for those few affixless verbs that have a measure of transitivity (1.2 above) and can therefore have Objects (only in NP form) (see 1.2 above), they are all intransitive, and thus one-place verbs. Therefore, for the purposes of description of the syntactic paradigms of all these verbs we need only a few rules, which may be phrased as follows:

(329) The Subject of intransitive verbs takes NP form only, is normally preverbal in sequential position, and is postverbal only under two conditions: first, with "presentative" verbs; second, to foreground the verb, which in that case may be marked by -lah.

(330) The Object of transitive af-
fixless verbs takes NP form and must invariably be post-verbal.

The rule says that all Subjects and Objects in this class must be NP's, i.e. cannot be cliticized. What the rules say about the sequential position of these Subjects and Objects is self-explanatory. Here are some examples:

(331) Dia jatuh.
'He fell.'

(332) Jatuh(lah) dia!
'He (actually) fell!'

(333) Saya tidak tahu.
'I don't know.'

(334) Tidak tahu saya.
'I don't know!'

(335) Mereka minum bir terus-menerus.
'They were drinking beer all the time.'

(336) Minum bir terus-menerus (/\)
'Drinking beer is all they mereka.
did all the time.'

(337) Lalu datanglah seorang rahib.
'Then there came a monk.'

(338) Pernah ada seorang raja.
'At one time there was a king.'

These examples well illustrate rules (329) and (330). The "/\" symbol symbolizes a functional pause; note, however, that in (336) it is marked as optional. In fact, clause-final position of the Subject with a transitive verb, a two-place verb therefore, is rather rare, and it is straightforward to explain that clause-final position as an "afterthought topic" (Givón 1976). The speaker may say first minum bir terus-menerus, meaning (a) certain person(s) he assumes is/are easily identified by the hearer; but then he may suddenly doubt if the speaker can identify them easily enough, and he adds mereka as an "afterthought": after a pause, of course. But then in fast speech the pause may be suppressed, and we have one clause with the Subject in clause-final position.

Presentative verbs (pretty much language-universally, see Givón 1976) are those which introduce a new topic for the first time. The verbs are those for 'be', 'come', and the like. In Indonesian such constructions take the form of (337) and (338). The Subject is postverbal; that, of course, is hardly surprising, since a "topic" introduced for the first time is, within the clause in which it is introduced, the focus, and would therefore naturally have postverbal position.

7. The "additional Argument" of inalienable possession

Under this heading we discuss constructions that have what may be called an "additional Argument" of "inalienable possession", i.e. an Argument whose referent is "inalienably possessed" by the referent of some other Argument. That other Argument, the "possessor" Argument, is the "primary topic" of the clause. Syntactically, that topical possessor Argument may be the Subject of an intransitive verb or of a stative adjective, or the Subject of a passive, or the Object of an ergative. In other words, since in regard of inalienable possession the intransitive Subject and the transitive Object are treated in the same manner, we find that the "additional Argument" as possessee follows ergative organization of syntax. We will here discuss that type of "ergativity" no further, and refer the reader to [FF-3]. Without the ergative perspective, discussion of this "syntactic inalienability" is found in Verhaar 1978.

Consider the following examples:

(339) Rumah ini */\ atapnya dibongkar.
'As for this house, its roof has been torn down.'

(340) Rumah ini dibongkar atapnya.
'Of this house the roof has been torn down.'

(341) Orang ini */\ majikannya
'As for this man, his employer-
sudah meninggal.
er has already died.'

(342) *Orang ini sudah meninggal
majikannya.

(343) Rumah ini sudah kami bongkar
'Of this house we have already
torn down the roof.'

(344) Mereka menurun semangatnya.
'Their enthusiasm is decreasing.'
[menurun emphasized]

(345) *Mereka menurun semangatnya.

(346) Ia sakit kakinya/*adiknya.
'He has a sore foot/*sick brother.'

(347) Orang itu lemah badannya/
'That man is physically weak/'
"majikannya.
"That man's employer is weak.'

(348) *Rumah ini */// bongkarlah
'Of this house, tear the roof
atapnya!
down!'

(349) *Rumah ini bongkarlah atapnya.

(350) *Saya sakit kaki saya/
'I have a sore foot.'

*Aku sakit kakiku.

(351) *Kamu angkuh hatimu.
'You are conceited.'
[i.e. 'proud of heart']

In (339) the pause is obligatory, splitting the sentence into two clauses (the first being a "truncated" clause, i.e. the "topic"), of which the second atapnya di-
bongkar has atapnya for its Subject. The referent of that Subject may be said, it is true, to be "inalienably possessed" by the referent of the topic rumah ini, but the possession relation is exemplified by the link not intraclausal, and therefore of no concern for the present study. The second clause, therefore, has only one Argument, atapnya, as its Subject, and there is no "additional" Argument. In contrast, (340) (where there is no pause) has rumah ini for its Subject, and atapnya as an "additional Argument", whose referent is inalienably possessed by the referent of the Subject (rumah ini): inalienably in the sense that, if the roof is torn down, the entire house is (in part) being torn down. There is, however, no such relation of inalienable possession between a man and his employer, so that (342) is not well formed, although, of course, (341) is, because of the obligatory pause, splitting the sentence into two clauses. What holds for the di- construction holds also for the *-construction type exemplified by (343). Curiously, however, the (zero) imperative does not allow of the same type of construction, as illustrated by (349); such a construction has to be biclausal, with an obligatory pause, therefore, as illustrated in (348).

As for intransitives, consider (344) and (345); the latter is deviant, but when menurut *is emphasized for "focus", the construction is wellformed. Close to intransitives are stative adjectives, as illustrated by (346) and (347): kaki 'one's own' foot and badan 'one's own' body', for example, being inalienably possessed, may (with anaphoric *nya) be the "additional Argument", but adik '(younger) brother/sister' or majik 'employer' cannot, as only "alienably" possessed. Note that in these constructions third person is a condition for the form of the construction: as (350) and (351) show, first and second are out.

SIMPLIES AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

| (vertical slash): to separate initial and final portions of circumfixes

/ (diagonal slash): to separate alternatives in cited data or glosses; and in formulations in the body of the text.

: (colon, in italics, at the beginning of a cited form): to mark precategorical forms.

[] (brackets): to enclose clarifications not part of the expressions in which they have been inserted; to enclose sub-divisions of digit (+ digit) divisions; to enclose semantic features; and to enclose [FF-] references (see below).

// (double slash): functional pause

comp. compare

COP copulative word, verbal or non-verbal, predicatively

[FF-n.] (double F + number, all enclosed in brackets): see below, last bibliography
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