

# THE CATEGORIAL SYSTEM IN CONTEMPORARY INDONESIAN: VERBS

John W.M. Verhaar, S.J.

Gonzaga University

## 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 categorially 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 *lalu dia lepas* 'then he got free', or *mati* in *anak itu mati seketika* '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 "bicategorical"?

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, 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 *hal 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 criterium 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 criterium 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 *hinggap* '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).

1.0 The class meant here is exemplified by *jatuh* 'to fall', *tidur* 'to sleep', *bangun* 'to rise', *tahu* 'to know', and the like. One would be tempted to call them "monomorphemic" 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 monomorphemic, 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 "precategoryals", i.e. bound lexical forms, which need affixation of some kind to have categorial membership of any kind assigned to them. Precategoryals will be treated separately in this series; see [FF-7], and Verhaar 1984: 0.3. Precategoryals are marked by a colon to the left (with the gloss, if "preverbal", without 'to'), e.g. as *:sebut* 'name', *:lihat* 'see', *:basuh* 'wash', etc.

(ii) The  $\emptyset$ -prefixed form of *mer-* (and *memp-*) verbs count as polymorphemic, simply because they are affixed, i.e. with the (paradigmatic) prefix  $\emptyset$ -; they are so considered because the  $\emptyset$ - is clearly recoverable. See Verhaar 1984: 1.1; 1.3 (a) (i), 7.0 (f), 7.6. Note that such  $\emptyset$ - 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)  $\emptyset$ -. 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 *ber-* dropping 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 [FF-8]; for reduplication syntactically as "context-sensitive", see [FF-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'; *berani* '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'; *sudi* 'to be willing [condescendingly]'; *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; [FF-4]); their sequential position as "Qualifiers" ([FF-5]; [FF-6]); their "predication" in ergative and accusative organization [FF-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.'  
*saya.*
- (4) *Kesulitan itu mau diatasinya.*  
'He wants to overcome that  
problem.'
- (5) *Kami ingin mengadakan perundingan.*  
'We [excl.] want to engage in  
negotiations.'
- (6) *Hal seperti itu tidak mungkin*  
'It is not possible that such  
*terjadi.*  
a thing will happen.'
- (7) *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*  
'Later this child will become  
  
*Presiden.*  
President.'
- (11) *Pesawat itu jatuh ketika sedang*  
'The plane fell when it prepared  
  
*bersiap-siap hendak mendarat.*  
to land.'

Some of these auxiliaries may function in some other categorial 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 "semitransitive", 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'; *ka-sih* 'to give'; *lupa* 'to forget'; *makan* 'to eat'; *masuk* 'to enter'; *minta* '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*, *minta*, *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*  
'I have to take ['drink'] medi-  
  
*sehari.*  
cine 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-*  
'I am going to eat/drink/  
  
*(\*nya)/minta(\*nya)/mohon(\*nya)/*  
request/request/remember  
  
*ingat(\*nya).*  
(\*it).'
- (18) *Saya akan memakannya/meminumnya/*  
'I am going to eat/drink/  
  
*memintanya/memohonnya/mengingat-*  
request/request/remember it.'  
  
*nya.*

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  $\emptyset$ -alternates of the ("long") *men-* forms; consider:

- (19) *Obat itu harus kamu minum*  
'That medication you have  
  
*sebelum makan.*  
to take before meals.'
- (20) *Saya selalu minum obat ini*  
'I always take this medication  
  
*sebelum makan.*  
before meals.'

In (19), it is impossible to separate *kamu* and *minum* by any other constituent; this is because *minum* in (19) is analytically,  $\emptyset$ -*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  $\emptyset$ -*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 *membilang* exists, but it means 'to count'; there is also *berbilang* 'to count', and *berbilang* may in addition be an indefinite quantifier, meaning 'some'. *Bilang*, therefore, 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 meaning, 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 following examples:

- (21) *Dia bilang "Jangan!"*  
'He said "Don't!"'
- (22) *Mereka bilang bahwa si Yem keliru.*  
'They say that Yem is mistaken.'
- (23) *Saya sudah bilang itu tadi.*  
'I already said that a moment ago.'
- (24) *Kasih (saya) obeng!*  
'Give (me) the/a screwdriver!'
- (25) *Lalu saya kasih dia seratus Rupiah.*  
'Then I gave him one hundred 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-bikin* for 'to do', as "colloquial", but it seems to be rarely used.

(c) The following verbs are conveniently 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'; *mengikuti* 'to follow'; *melupakan* 'to forget'; *memasuki* 'to enter'; *memau* 'to desire'; *menaiki* '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 affixless 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 semacam itu.*  
'The village head doesn't want anything like that.'
- (33) *Jangan naik sepeda itu!*  
'Don't use that bicycle!'
- (34) *Saya tidak percaya itu.*  
'I don't believe that.'
- (35) *Dia punya dua ratus 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 persoalannya.*  
'Our [excl.] secretary knows 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 prepositions: *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 intransitive. 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'; *benci* 'to feel turned off'; *berak* 'to defecate'; *bonceng* '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'; *hilang* 'to disappear'; *hilir* 'to go downstream'; *hinggap* 'to perch'; *hinggut* 'to sway'; *istirahat* 'to rest'; *jadi* 'to get done, to happen'; *jatuh* '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'; *mogok* 'to (go on) strike'; *mudik* 'to go upstream'; *muncul* 'to appear, to show up'; *mundur* 'to

retreat'; *muntah* 'to throw up'; *nampak* 'to appear'; *omong* 'to chat'; *pamit* 'to take one's leave'; *pangling* 'to fail to recognize'; *pasang* 'to increase'; *peduli* 'to care'; *pergi* 'to go away, to leave'; *pulang* 'to go home'; *sampai* 'to arrive'; *singgah* 'to make a short visit'; *sudi* 'to condescend'; *surut* 'to decrease'; *susut* 'to decrease'; *taat* 'to obey'; *takut* 'to fear'; *tampil* 'to come forward'; *tenggelam* 'to sink'; *terbang* 'to fly'; *terbit* 'to rise'; *terjun* 'to dive'; *tiba* 'to arrive'; *tinggal* 'to stay'; *tumbang* 'to fall down'; *tumbuh* 'to grow'; *tumpah* 'to flow out'; *turun* 'to go down'; *turut* 'to follow'.

What these verbs have in common is only that they are monomorphemic 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]'; *mengkhawatirkan* 'to worry about'; *memuntahkan* 'to vomit [something]'; *mendatangi* 'to visit'; etc.

(iii) Not all these verbs are equally current: some are Jakarta dialect, e.g. *bonceng*; 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*, *istirahat*, *kencing*, *lari*, *mandi*, and *tumbuh*, we find: *berada*, *berbangkit*, *berbatuk*, *berharap*, *beristirahat*, *berkencing*, *berlari*, *bermandi*, and *bertumbuh*. 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* forms 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 *berlari* means 'to run' just as *lari*, yet 'to run away' can only be *lari*, not *\*berlari* (e.g. *ia (\*ber)lari dari penjara* 'he escaped [ $\neq$  'distanced himself by running'] from prison'). 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-*

*ringat*).

(v) A number of other verbs in this class have *men-* forms, also intransitive, in fairly close synonymy with the *men--less* forms: next to *benci*, *berak*, *bonceng*, *hilang*, *hilir*, *hinggut*, *omong*, *su-sut*, *turun* and *turut*, we find: *membenci*, *memberak*, *membonceng*, *menghilang*, *menghilir*, *menghinggut*, *mengomong*, *menyusut*, *menurun* 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. *hinggut* 'swaying', with *menghinggut* as the (processual) verb derived from it (0). *Benci* is often rather "stative": *saya (selalu) benci (akan hal semacam itu)* 'I (always) hate (a thing like that)'; *saya benci!* 'that really turns me off!'. In contrast, *membenci* would rather mean 'to hate [a person]'. While *turun* would normally mean 'to go down [the stairs, e.g.]', *menurun* would be more characteristically used for inanimates (*jalannya 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' (*kalaupun acara ini, tidak jadi* 'as to this program, that's not going through'; *\*menjadi* would be out here). While *datang* is 'to come', *mendatang* means 'to arise suddenly', or may be an adjective (*minggu mendatang* 'this coming week'). While *jatuh* 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 monomorphemic (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  $\emptyset$ -*mulai* (which is normally the "zero" form of *memulai*), and therefore it is convenient to consider (zeroless) *mulai* as monomorphemic; there seem to be no other such forms in the language. Consider (39) and (40):

(39) *Saya selalu mulai pada huruf A.*  
'I always begin with the letter A.'

(40) *Lalu saya mulai pelaksanaannya.*  
'Then I began (the execution of) the actual job.'

In (39), *mulai* is the ("full") verb of the clause. In contrast, in (40), *mulai*, analytically, stands for  $\emptyset$ -*mulai*, with *saya* inseparable from that verb form. The noun *pelaksanaannya* 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: *mengenai* 'to hit, to affect'; *melupakan* '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): *dikenai*, *dilupakan*, *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, *memperbolehkan* '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, *mengharuskan* '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 (\*oleh 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 Arok mati. Oleh*  
'Finally Ken Arok 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 tacks 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 *membunuh*, 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* Agentive 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 cinta* '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 pilgrimage to Mecca (and become a haji)'; *senyum kambing* 'to smile (in embarrassment)'; *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*, as 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/keuntungan*; *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*  
'They were sitting around and  
*terus.*  
talked a lot.'
- (47) *Dia omong-omong terus.*  
'She kept right on talking.'
- (48) *Jangan lari-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:

(i) Verbs indicating a process: *membengkak* 'to swell'; *melebar* 'to become wider'; *memutih* 'to become white'; *membiru* 'to become blue'. Apart from being processual, these verbs are often inchoative.

(ii) Verbs signifying an essentially "punctual" event: *mendarat* 'to land'; *melaut* 'to put out to sea'; *menyeberang* 'to cross over'; *menyalak* 'to bark'; *melebur* 'to merge [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 "detransitivized" in the antipassive: a grammatical possibility.

(iv) Only very few circumfixed *men-* verbs (and no circumfixed *memper-* verbs) are intransitive: *memadai* 'to be sufficient'; *mencukupi* 'to be sufficient'. Complements of *memadai* and *mencukupi* 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' (*meninggal* itself is also 'to die'; *dunia* means 'world'); *membanting tulang* 'to slave away' (*tulang* 'bone'); *membalas budi* 'to reciprocate [a good deed]' (*budi* 'character'); *membalas dendam* 'to take revenge' (*dendam* 'revenge'); *memasang telinga* 'to listen carefully' (*telinga* 'ear'); *menyolok mata* 'to catch the eye' (*mata* 'eye'); *menggantang asap* 'to build castles in the air' (*asap* 'smoke'; the expression means literally: '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 transitive. In these expressions, however, they are intransitive, for they cannot be passivized: *\*tulang dibanting*; *\*dendam dibalas*; etc. The passive of *meninggal* is sometimes used in the sense of *meninggalkan* '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 indistinguishable from (stative) adjectives (Fokker 1951: 17): *menyenangkan* 'gratifying, pleasant'; *merugikan* 'disadvantageous, unprofitable'; *menguntungkan* 'advantageous,

profitable'; *mengherankan* 'astonishing'; *mengharukan* 'moving (emotionally)'; *menjemukan* 'boring'; *membosankan* 'boring'; *mengecewakan* 'disappointing'; *mengerikan* 'terrifying'; *mengagumkan* 'astonishing'; etc. Each of those verbs could be used (in contrast to those of [iv] above) transitively; however, when used intransitively they are mostly used as adjectival predicates, and cannot then have an Object of any kind. Consider:

- (49) *Perbuatan itu mengecewakan*  
'That act disappointed the  
*panitia*,  
committee.'
- (50) *Kelalaian saudara agak menge-*  
'Your negligence is rather  
*cewakan* (\**panitia*).  
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  
*mencukupi* (untuk kita).  
be enough (for us).'
- (54) *Caranya menyenangkan.*  
'His manner [of doing things]  
is pleasant.'

This is the place to make a note on reduplicated verbs (see also [FF-8]). They may be of two forms: *men-X-X*; and *X-men-X* ("X" standing for the base). The former type may be transitive and does not belong in this section (e.g. *membakar-bakar* 'to keep burning [something], to burn repeatedly'; *memukul-mukul* 'to hit repeatedly'; etc.). The latter type, however, comprises verbs with a variety of semantic characteristics (see [FF-1]; Verhaar 1984: 3.1), transitive and intransitive, the intransitive kind being reciprocal: *pukul-memukul* 'to hit one another'; *maaf-memaafkan* 'to forgive one another'; *tolong-menolong* 'to help one another'; etc. These verbs, of course, may be called *semantically* "transitive" (the Subject being also the Affectee), but *formally* they are one-place verbs, like all other intransitive verbs, having only a Subject. The semantico-pragmatic characteristic of these verbs, i.e. that Agents and Affectees are involved, may materialize formally in the use of the (adverb!)

*saling* (preverbally):

- (55) *Kedua penjahat itu pukul-memu-*  
'The two criminals kept hitting  
*kul 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.'  
*kan.*

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'; *mendorong* 'to push, to urge'; etc. The argument structure presents no surprises:

- (57) *Kami akan membuka pameran jam*  
'We excl. will open the ex-  
*sembilan.*  
hibition at nine o'clock.'
- (58) *Lembaga ini sedang membangun*  
'This institution is construct-  
*tiga gedung.*  
ing three buildings.'

2.3 Some transitive *men-* verbs, however, have three arguments, at least potentially. 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 constructions are instructive:

- (61) *Saya mengajari dia bahasa Arab.*  
'I teach him Arabic.'
- (62) *Saya mengajarkan bahasa Arab*  
'I teach Arabic to him.'  
*kepadanya.*
- (63) *Bahasa Latin diajar tahun depan.*  
'Latin will be taught next year.'



(64) *Adik saya diberi pisang.*  
'My (younger) brother/sister  
was given a banana.'

(65) *Pisang itu diberikan kepada  
'The banana was given to my  
adik saya.  
(younger) brother/sister.'*

In (61), *mengajari* 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 precategorials, 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 [... ] *Ø-beri* or *ku-/kauberi*) must be the dative Argument, while the Subject of *memberikan* (i.e. of *diberikan* or [... ] *Ø-berikan* or *ku-/kauberikan*) must be the accusative argument, both illustrated in (64) and (65) respectively.

Apart from *mengajar* and *memberi*, the status of three-place *men-* verbs is problematic. Consider the following constructions with the verbs *menuntut* 'to demand', *membantu* 'to help', *menyumbang* 'to contribute', *mendikte* 'to dictate', *menyokong* 'to support', *mentraktir* 'to treat [i.e. 'to stand a treat']', *menagih* 'to charge [money]', *melatih* 'to exercise, to teach practice of', *menjamu* 'to entertain (as guest(s))':

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

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

(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.*

*tion questions to us [excl].'*

(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.'*

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:

(75) *Dia menuntut ganti rugi dari  
kami. [comp. (66)]*

(76) *Mereka membantu keluarga miskin  
dengan pakaian bekas. [comp.  
(67)]*

(77) *Idhata menyumbangkan alat-alat  
permainan kepada enam sekolah.  
[comp. (68)]*

(78) *Bu Tuti mendikte(kan) soal-soal  
ujian kepada kami. [comp. (69)]*

(79) *Presiden menyokong para korban  
gempa dengan enam ton beras.  
[comp. (70)]*

(80) *Pak Yono melatih kami dalam hal  
senam. [comp. (73)]*

(81) *Mereka menjamu kami dengan ang-  
gur. [comp. (74)]*

Finally, verbs like *memanggil* 'to call'

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*  
'The teacher considers her as  
*siswa yang terpandai.*  
the brightest pupil.'
- (85) *Mereka memperlakukan saya sebagai*  
'They treat me as a consultant.'  
*penasihat.*

2.4 For "iterative" *-i* with *men-* verbs (this suffix does not occur with *memper-* verbs), 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 mencicipi masakan anak*  
'Mother tastes some of what  
*putrinya.*  
her daughter has cooked.'
- (87) *Anjingmu menjilati makanan*  
'Your dog keeps licking the  
*bayi itu.*  
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 noncausative. 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 post-verbal (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 menyembelihkannya 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 menyembelih ayam besar ini untuk saya.*  
*Untuk saya Ali menyembelih 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 difference 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 nature 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 *nonpromoted -kan* constructions (as in (92) through (94) as due to interference from Javanese (which language does indeed allow of the benefactive *-aké* construction with promotion of the benefactive Object optional). However, others are inclined to think of such constructions as genuinely Indonesian, since they also occur in other first languages in Indonesia.

According to a basic rule of sequential 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 accusative 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 menyembelihkan saya*. In contrast, with the *nonpromoted* benefactive Objects such left-extrapositions are possible, simply because they are *oblique* (i.e. marked by the preposition *untuk*), as illustrated by the second example in each of (92) through (94).

Even in the "passive" the accusative Object, in promoted benefactive *-kan* constructions, 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 bukakan pintu.*  
 [comp. (90)]  
*\*Pintu saya bukakan Bapak.*  
*\*Pintu Bapak saya bukakan.*
- (98) *Saya disembelih Ali ayam besar ini.* [comp. (91)]  
*\*Ayam besar ini saya disembelih Ali.*  
*\*Ayam besar ini disembelih Ali saya.*

The asterisked examples show that left-extrapolation of the accusative Object is deviant no matter how the other arguments are arranged sequentially. As for the nonasterisked examples, they are unproblematic only when the Agent is pronominal, while where this is not the case (as in (98)), there may be doubt as to wellformedness. 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 context.

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

- (99) *Baju baru itu saya belikan untuk ayah.*
- (100) *Pintu itu saya bukakan untuk Bapak.*
- (101) *Ayam besar ini disembelih Ali untuk saya.*

There is further the problem of coreferential deletion of the benefactive and/or accusative argument in constructions (usually ergative) in which deletion is called for in the discourse context. Consider (102) as a question that provides a possible preceding context for (103) which would be wellformed, while (104) would be only if *untuk* is used.

- (102) *Mengapa pintunya terkunci?*  
'Why is that door locked?'
- (103)  $\emptyset$  *Akan saya bukakan, Pak.*  
'I will open it for you, Sir.'
- (104) *\*(Untuk) Bapak akan saya bukakan.*

In (103), the zero represents *pintu 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  $\emptyset$  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) *kaubuatkan dulu.*  
(ii) *\*kaubuat 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) *kaubuat untuk ibumu dulu.*  
(ii) *\*kaubuatkan 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 lulus 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 kaki*  
'to fasten a chain to the foot'
- (113) *mencambukkan cemeti pada kuda*  
'to apply the whip to the horse'
- (114) *Menembakkan peluru pada lawan*  
'to shoot a bullet at the opponent'
- (115) *mencukurkan pisau pada janggut*  
'to use a razor to shave the beard'
- (116) *mengikatkan tali pada pinggang*  
'to tie a rope around one's waist'
- (117) *membelanjakan uang pada barang mewah*  
'to use one's money for luxury 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) *mencambuk kuda dengan cemeti*  
'to strike')
- (122) *menembak lawan dengan peluru*  
'to shoot')
- (123) *mencukur janggut dengan pisau*  
'to shave')
- (124) *mengikat pinggang dengan tali*  
'to secure, to tie')

However, there is no \**membelanja* to match instrumental *membelanjakan*. The corresponding noninstrumental verb is *berbelanja* '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 cemeti ia mencambuk*  
'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 cemeti*; in (126), a promoted instrumental construction, the accusative NP *pada kakinya* is fronted. For the discourse-pragmatic parameters of this fronting, see [FF-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  
  
*kan 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*:

- (129) *Presiden menginstruksikan*  
'The President has instructed  
  
*(kepada) Sekretaris 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, *persiapkan* [...]).

(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 [FF-1]. Examples:

- (130) *Usul-usul ini perlu dijelaskan.*  
'These proposals need to be explained.'
- (131) *Masukkan daging ini ke dalam*  
'Put this meat in the refrig-  
  
*lemari es!*  
erator!'
- (132) *Kami akan segera memberlakukan*  
'We excl. are going to make  
  
*peraturan-peraturan ini.*  
these rules official/obligatory immediately.'
- (133) *Jangan mengemukakan keberatan*  
'Don't mention objections like  
  
*semacam itu!*  
that!'
- (134) *Saya sudah membiasakan diri*  
'I have already accustomed

dengan adat-istiadat di sini.  
myself to what is customary  
here.'

*Menjelaskan* 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 O 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  
*lebih lanjut nanti.*  
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-*  
'We have to do all these  
*nya ini.*  
jobs.'

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

(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 wila-*  
'Troops have occupied that  
*yah itu.*  
area.'
- (141) *Si Dul sudah mengetahui hal*  
'Dul knows that already.'  
*itu.*
- (142) *Saya ingin menanggapi surat*  
'I wish to reply to your let-  
*Saudara sebagai berikut.*  
ter as follows.'

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 *\*mengetahu* (*menanggapi* does exist: 'to listen'). Other *men-|-i* verbs also lack either *men-* or *men-|-kan* "parallels": *mengawali* 'to begin' (*\*mengawal*; *\*menga-walkan*); *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 *memuat-memuatkan-memuati*; consider the following examples:

- (143) *Truk yang besar itu memuat*  
'That 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

2.6 Most *men-|-i* verbs are transitive

*men-*|-*kan*. Consider the following examples:

- (146) *Kami melampiri surat itu*  
'We [excl.] enclosed with the  
*dengan kuitansi.*  
letter a receipt.'
- (147) *Kami melampirkan kuitansi*  
'We [excl.] enclosed a receipt  
*dengan surat itu.*  
with the letter.'
- (148) *Ali melekatkan album dengan foto.*  
'Ali filled the album with  
snapshots.'
- (149) *Ali melekatkan foto pada album.*  
'Ali glued snapshots in the  
album.'
- (150) *Pesawat tempur musuh menghujani*  
'The hostile fighter plane  
*kota dengan bom.*  
rained bombs upon the city.'
- (151) *Pesawat tempur musuh menghu-*  
'The hostile fighter plane  
*jankan bom-bom di atas kota.*  
rained bombs upon the city.'

Like the verbs in (143) through (145), those in (146) through (151) are three-place verbs. If the verb is one derived with *men-*|-*i*, the locative NP is promoted to Direct Object position, whereas the accusative NP which is oblique (*dengan batubara* in (145), *dengan kuitansi* in (146), *dengan foto* in (148), *dengan bom* in (150)), follows the Direct Object NP normally, but may, for special discourse-pragmatic reasons (see [FF-14]), also be preverbal, as in:

- (152) *Dengan semua foto yang baru*  
'All the new pictures Ali  
*Ali melekatkan album.*  
glued into his album.'

Note that only structural possibilities are discussed here, in regard to verb valency and argument frame. Discourse-pragmatically, however, special contexts would justify some of them. For example, some native speakers have interpreted (152) as implying that Ali was messing around with his fotos, glue, and album, and some have interpreted (148) in the same fashion.

2.7 Most *memper-* verbs are circumfixed: with *memper-*|-*kan* or *memper-*|-*i* (2.8 and 2.9, below) and noncircumfixed

*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*  
'We [excl.] will duplicate  
*anda.*  
your typescript.'
- (154) *Rahmat telah memutuskan akan*  
'Rahmat has now decided to  
*memperistri Tuti.*  
marry Tuti.'
- (155) *Jumlah ini harus dipertiga.*  
'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*  
'I have warned you before;  
*saudara: jangan berbuat be-*  
don't do that again!.'  
*gitu lagi!*
- (158) *Di antara mereka politik se-*  
'Among them politics is often  
*ring diperdebatkan panjang*  
the subject of long debates.'  
*lebar.*
- (159) *Kedua pihak itu perlu diper-*  
'It will be necessary for the  
*temukan besok.*  
two parties to be made to  
meet tomorrow.'

Again, no syntactic surprises are present. The person/thing named by the Object NP is caused to attain the quality signified by the base.

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 Re-  
  
*Republik Indonesia memperingati*  
public of Indonesia commemo-  
  
*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 noncircumfixed) are peculiar in that they have optionally oblique accusative Objects. These may be called *Direct* Objects in that, obliquely or not, they become Subject 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-*  
'After that we have to dis-  
  
*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 comprise no more than a dozen verbs, some of which are: *menguraikan (tentang)* 'to explain'; *menjelaskan (tentang/mengenai)* 'to explain'; *memikirkan (tentang)* 'to think over'; *mengingat (akan)* 'to remember'; *mempertanyakan (tentang)* 'to discuss'; *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 [FF-8]. One such meaning entails a Subject that is at least semantically plural. Consider:

- (164) *Kambing itu dari tadi mengem-*  
'These goat(s) just now are  
  
*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-mengmbik* 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 discussion, 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 themselves are found in Verhaar 1984, 8.0



through 8.4. The *bersi-* 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 of (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 stative or nonstative. 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 berjual kuda.*  
'That farmer also sells horses.'
- (172) *Saya bercukur setiap pagi.*  
'I shave (myself) every morning.'
- (173) *Putri yang cantik itu sedang berbedak di depan kaca,*  
'That pretty girl is powdering 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.*  
'They are of the opinion that 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 berjual kuda ini* (for 'he sells this horse') would not be wellformed, since *kuda* would be definite. Note that *berjual* 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 *bahwa* [...]. 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]', stative); in (172) (*bercukur* 'to shave (oneself)', reflexive); in (173) (*berbedak* 'to powder oneself/one's face', reflexive); in (174) (*berdaulat* 'to be independent', stative); in (175) (*berpendapat* 'to be of the opinion', stative); and in (176) (*berenang* 'to swim', nonstative).

3.2 Reciprocal *ber-* 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'

*sepanjang malam.*  
*necking all evening.'*

- (178) *Baiklah nanti kita bersurat-*  
*'It would be good if we ex-*  
*suratan tentang hal itu.*  
*changed letters about that*  
*later.'*
- (179) *Mereka sudah berkirim-kiriman*  
*'They have been exchanging*  
*surat selama satu tahun.*  
*letters for a year.'*
- (180) *Lalu kedua mempelai bertukaran*  
*'Then the bride and bridegroom*  
*cincin.*  
*exchanged rings.'*

In (177) the base (*pacar*) is simple, and could in fact not be composite in any way. In (178) the base is a reduplicated form (*surat-surat*), which for our purposes must count as "simple"; it cannot take composite form. For example, *Mereka bersurat-suratan \*(sepuluh)* (for 'They exchanged ten letters') would be deviant. In (179) *berkiriman surat* consists, analytically, of *kirim surat* plus *ber-|-an*. Note that even though *:kirim* is a precategorial, *kirim surat* is a compound verb (analytically  $\emptyset$ -*kirim surat*; see 5, below), and *berkiriman surat* is equally a compound expression. A similar analysis holds for *bertukaran cincin* (180). Note that the incorporated Objects *surat* and *cincin* are excluded from definiteness: *Mereka bertukaran cincin \*(ini)* for 'They exchanged these rings' would not be wellformed, and neither would *Mereka berkiriman surat (-\*surat yang ada dalam berkas ini)* for 'They exchanged the letters that are in this file'.

Not surprisingly, the Subject NP of reciprocal *ber-|-an* verbs must be plural, at least semantically; see 3.5, below.

3.3 Nonreciprocal *ber-|-an* verbs have a connotation of 'being all over the place' or 'involving great quantities'; see Verhaar 1984, 8.2. Consider the following examples:

- (181) *Daun-daun berguguran ke tanah.*  
*'The leaves were falling on*  
*the ground.'*
- (182) *Pakaiannya berlumuran darah.*  
*'Her clothes were stained*  
*with blood all over.'*
- (183) *Burung-burung beterbangan.*  
*'Birds were flying around.'*
- (184) *Kertas-kertas itu berserakan*  
*'The papers were scattered*

*di lantai.*  
*all over the floor.'*

Like all *ber-* verbs, the ones of this class are all one-place verbs. Sometimes (though rarely) the base is composite, as in *berlumuran 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 is 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 berlung-*  
*'There were troops there,*  
*kapkan senjata.*  
*fully armed.'*
- (188) *Sesudah bekerja tiga jam, ia*  
*'After working for three hours,*  
*bermandikan peluh.*  
*he was perspiring all over.'*
- (189) *Nabi itu menampakkan diri,*  
*'The prophet appeared,*  
*bermandikan cahaya.*  
*enveloped in light.'*
- (190) *Datanglah pahlawan, bersenja-*  
*'Then came the hero, armed*  
*takan pedang.*  
*with a sword.'*
- (191) *Raja itu berpakaian 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 bertepi(kan) merah.*  
'The cloth has goldthread hems.'
- (194) *Republik Indonesia berdasar(kan)*  
'The Republic of Indonesia has  
(pada) Pancasila.  
the Pancasila for its founda-  
tion.'
- (195) *Rencana kami berpanji(kan)*  
'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 *berisi* and *berisikan* in (185) and (186); *bersendi* and *bersendikan* 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 somewhat archaic flavor: a good example of this is *berpakakan* in (191), a verb that is now known only to few speakers of Indonesian and would be used only for special 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 (Poedjosoedarmo 1970)). In a rare case a purely semantic difference seems to be associated with the difference between these verbs with *ber-* only and those with *ber-|-kan*. An example of this is *berisi air* and *berisikan air*: according to some of our informants, *berisi air* suggests that water is indeed what is normally contained in the container; 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 *berpanjikan*, between *berdasar* and *berdasarkan*, or between *bersendi* and *bersendikan*, 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 composite; 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 kebesaran*, *sendi kebudayaan yang lama*, *tepi merah*, *dasar Pancasila*, *panji 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, it may be 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 Reduplicated *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 reduplication as a morphemic process, see [FF-8]. For the *ber-|-an* verbs, see examples (177) through (184). For other *ber-* verbs, consider:

- (196) *Binatang yang menyusui dapat*  
'Mammals can swim (\*around).'  
  
*berenang(\*-renang).*
- (197) *Rumah yang beratap-atap tinggi*  
'Those 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 meaningfully 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 particular 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 member of the entire paradigm. Negatively (as noted in Verhaar 1984, 9.0), these *ke-|-an* forms as passives cannot be considered as the passives of the "corresponding" verbs with *men-|-i*. About this, more below. At this point it is convenient to present some data first, in a distinction between "adversative" (4.1) and "non-adversative" *ke-|-an* verbs (4.2) (the distinction 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.'

- (199) *Kami kehujaanan salju.*  
'We [excl.] were caught in a snow storm.'
- (200) *Ayahnya keracunan ((oleh) buah-buahan busuk).*  
'His father was poisoned (by rotting fruit).'
- (201) *Selat ini kecemaran (minyak).*  
'These straits are polluted (by oil).'
- (202) *Pembantu kedapatan tidur di lantai (oleh petugas).*  
'The janitor was found sleeping on the floor (by the guard).'
- (203) *Pusat kota ini sering kebanjiran (oleh sungai).*  
'The center of this town often gets flooded (by the river).'
- (204) *Dulu, orang sakit jiwa sering dikira kemasukan \*(setan).*  
'Formerly, the mentally ill were often supposed to be possessed by the devil.'
- (205) *Anak tetangga saya kejatuhan \*(kelapa).*  
'My neighbor's child was hit by a falling coconut.'
- (206) *Sekonyong-konyong saya keda-tangan \*(tamu).*  
'Suddenly I had (an) unexpected guest(s).'
- (207) *Puncak gunung Merapi tertutup-an \*(kabut).*  
'The peak of mount Merapi is closed in by fog.'
- (208) *Negara ini kebanjiran \*(oleh) barang-barang Jepang).*  
'This country is flooded by Japanese products.'
- (209) *Pak Marman kecurian (dompet/ radio).*  
'Mr. Marman was robbed (of his wallet/radio).'
- (210) *Saya kecopetan (dompet).*  
'I was pickpocketed (and had my wallet lifted).'
- (211) *Kakek itu kehabisan \*(tenaga).*  
'The old man had no strength any more.'

(212) *Ali kekurangan \*(darah/vitamin).*  
'Ali suffers from anaemia/vitamin deficiency.'

(213) *Dia kehilangan \*(keberanian).*  
'He lost his courage.'

A comparison with the "corresponding" *men-|-i* verbs is instructive in various regards. *Kejatuhan*, for example, may be compared with *menjatuhi* 'to let [something] fall on [something]', so that it would seem that a passive like *dijatuhi* must be close to *kejatuhan*. There are significant differences, however, between the two forms: *dijatuhi* 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 *Puncak 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 *mencuri* (\**i*) corresponding with *kecurian*, and no *mencopet* (\**i*) corresponding with *kecopetan*. 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') '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 *keraucunan* 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, here 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 "normally") "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 kelih-*  
'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 celaka!*  
this, we've had it!'
- (218) *Lalu kelihatan \*(oleh) saya/*  
'And then there appeared to  
  
*kamu/beliau[/etc.] sesosok*  
*me/you/him [HON][/etc.] a fig-*  
*tubuh di antara pepohonan.*  
ure 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) *Bahwa 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 *cuci 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 *:cuci*, *:kirim*, and *:cari* are "precategoryals" (see [FF-7]), and could therefore not occur without some prefix. Hence in these examples zero derivation is postulated: analytically, *cuci* is (not *:cuci* but) Ø-*cuci*; *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 precategoryals, it seems descriptively consistent to postulate zero prefixation as well for nonprecategoryal 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 minta*  
'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 precategoryals, 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),

though it is analyzed as  $\emptyset$ -*minta* in (229). In (230), the form is  $\emptyset$ -*tahu*, from (free) *tahu*; and similarly with *naik*, *tahan*, *mandi*, and *turun*. In the case of *turun*, an additional reason for postulating the zero ( $\emptyset$ -*turun*) is in that *turun* is intransitive ('to go down'), while the  $\emptyset$ -*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'; *mencari* 'to seek'; *membasuh* '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 morphemics 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)ia ambil*, including furthermore also the pronominal variation possible with preposed (morphemically free) pronominal agentives, 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 *memp-* 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, *memp-* verbs will not be sought out for special treatment. First, as all *memp-* 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 *memp-* 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 *memp-* verbs, *-p-* precedes the verb base. That is to say, prefixes and initial parts of circumfixes precede this *-p-*, 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 *kubaca* 'I read' is not an NP because it is a clitic: it is not free morphemically; *aku* in *aku baca* '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 *undang* (and therefore syntactically free). So is *Amin* in *panggilkan Amin!* '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 *preposed* pronominal Agentive with  $\emptyset$ - forms of transitive 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: *Pröfesor* '(you) Professor'; *Saudara* '(you) brother/friend'; *kakak* '(you) older brother/sister'; *adik* '(you) younger brother/sister'; *Ustad* '(you) Sir [i.e. Islamic leader]'; *Romo* or *Pastor* '(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) Intransitive *men-* verbs have no other paradigmatic alternates. The Subject is an NP, preverbal (normally) or postverbal (according to special discourse-pragmatic parameters). Imperatives are without Subject, and may be marked with the particle *-lah*, attached to the *men-* form if affirmative and to *jangan* if negative.
- (238) 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 menyeberanglah dia.*  
'And then he crossed over.'
- (241) *Menyeberanglah di sini!*  
'Cross over here!'
- (242) *Jangan(lah) menyeberang 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 itu kepadanya!*  
'Pass that message on to him!'
- Ya ....., saya akan menyampaikannya(\*nya/\*pesan itu).*  
'All right, ..... I may pass it 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  $\emptyset$ , a genuine NP, though not a formative one; and not formative because so 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 *only on 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 noncommittally; *-nya*, however, is out *on any reading*, even though active *men-* transitives may take a *-nya* Object, for here the reply is an antipassive. (A firm commitment as a reply to (246) would be: *Baiklah, akan saya sampaikan!* 'I will definitely pass it on!': an ergative construction with the Object "deleted" (not "suppressed") and taking  $\emptyset$  form.)

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

- (247) *Semua bunga itu lalu mulai memutih-mutih.*  
'All the flowers began to 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 precategoryals. 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 terngangalah 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) *Temammu (tidak) (akan) mengundangku.*  
'Your friend invites/will invite/is not inviting me.'
- (254) *Saya menantangmu dalam hal ini.*  
'I challenge you in this regard.'
- (255) *Dia telah membacanya.*  
'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 membelikanku 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 wellformed 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 redound in plurality also in the Object and in other constituents, as appears from:

- (261) *Para prajurit itu sedang men-*  
'The soldiers were looking

*cari-cari ahli-ahli di ber-*  
for experts in several towns.'

*bagai kota.*

### 6.5 The "zero" imperative construction

For the "zero" imperatives 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*  
'Praise the God of all  
*Maharahim!*  
Mercy!'
- (266) *Lakukan(lah) segera tugasmu!*  
'Do your job immediately.'

The Patient is seen to be postverbal in these examples (*kursi itu, Allah yang Maharahim, tugasmu*); even in (264) *angkatlah* may be described analytically as *ang-*

*katlah*  $\emptyset!$ , 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 $\emptyset-$ , *ku-/kau-*, *di-*, and *ter-*

Before continuing with the  $\emptyset-$ , *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-*  
'These letters I have already  
*tangani.*  
signed.'
- (268) *Kapan akan kauundang pacar saya?*  
'When are you going to invite  
my girl friend?'
- (269) *Sudah Bapak tandatangani tadi.*  
'You already signed that just  
now, Sir.'
- (270) *Gedung baru itu akan dibangun*  
'The new building will be con-  
*tahun depan.*  
structed next year.'
- (271) *Dibalikkan sepeda itu, lalu*  
'He turned the bicycle upside  
*diputar rodanya.*  
down and turned the wheel.'
- (272) *Oleh sekretaris dikemukakan*  
'The secretary announced  
*beberapa hal mengenai prosedur*  
several things about the pro-  
*kenaikan pangkat.*  
cedure of promotion in rank.'
- (273) *Kemudian terlihat olehku seso-*  
'After that I saw a body  
*sok tubuh di celah-celah pepo-*  
among the trees.'  
*honan.*
- (274) *Harapan seperti itu tak ter-*  
'A hopeful prospect like that  
*pikirkan oleh ayahnya.*  
was unthinkable for his father.'

In these "passives" the Patient NP is

preverbal 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-* '1sg' 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 the 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 NP's, i.e. they cannot be cliticized. The agentive 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)*  
'Those documents I have  
*kutandatangani.*  
(already) signed.'
- (277) *Kapan (akan) kauundang pacar*  
'When are you (going to) in-  
*saya?*  
vite/inviting my girl friend?'
- (278) *Kamu akan kuberitahu.*  
'I will let you know.'

- (279) \**Lalu kutandatangani surat*  
'Then I was the one who signed  
*itu. [ku- emphasized]*  
the letter.'
- (280) *Inilah surat yang kutandata-*  
'This is the letter that I  
*ngani, bukan yang kautandata-*  
signed, not the one that you  
*ngani. [ku- and kau- empha-*  
signed.' sized]

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  $\emptyset$ - alternant paradigmatically, except for the "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  $\emptyset$ - 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  $\emptyset$ - 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  $\emptyset$ -form; (b) The Agentive may be honorific nonvocatively; (c) The Agentive may be a nonprominal 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 " $\emptyset$ -" 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.)  
*wiradihardja) ketahui, kami*  
know, we are ready (to do

*sanggup.*  
this).'

- (290) [Ss] *Yang kamu belum baca,*  
'What you haven't read  
*kamu harus baca besok.*  
yet, you have to read  
tomorrow.'
- (291) [Ss] *Seperti Pak Nyono ketahui,*  
'As Mr Nyono knows, we  
*kami sanggup.*  
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-*  
signed, not the one that you  
*tangani. [aku and kamu empha-*  
signed.' sized]

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 *dikira*. The context would mention some untrue story, and that story would be represented as coreferential zero in (analytically)  $\emptyset$  *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";

see [FF-6]).

Finally, (296) and (297) are genuine passives; the *di-* prefix marks the passive without any "prolepticity" for whoever the Agent might be, let alone any anaphoricity pronominally. The Patient NP is normally preverbal (as in (296)), and is postverbal only in case the verb is strongly foregrounded as in (297), in which case the *-lah* particle is a foregrounding device.

6.10 *The di- construction with a non-NP agentive*

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 agentive 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 agentive constituent takes the form either of agentive *-nya* '3sg/pl' encliticized to the *di-* form of the verb, or of an agentive introduced by *oleh* 'by' to which there is encliticized *-ku* '1sg', *-mu* '2sg/pl', or *-nya* '3sg/pl'. The entire agentive introduced by *oleh* 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 *oleh* is *nonthird* (according to rule (304) below). The agentive without *oleh* (i.e. *-nya* encliticized to the *di-* form of the verb) is characteristic of constructions which are either ergative or passive.

(304) When the agentive is intro-

duced by *oleh*, *nonthird* encliticizations (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 agentive may or may not take *oleh*; 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 *oleh* 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 *oleh* + clitic agentives do *not* count as NP's, even though, of course, the *entire* agentive constituent (i.e. including *oleh*) 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 *oleh* 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 reasonably exhaustive fashion. Finally, rule (304) states that *olehku* and *olehmu* agentives in these constructions are found only in passive constructions, not in ergative ones.

Consider the following examples:

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

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

(307) *Koran yang sudah dibacanya itu ternyata sudah hilang.*  
'The newspaper that he had already read turned out to have disappeared.'

- (308) *Lalu didirikanlah lembaga yang*  
'(And) then that new institu-  
*baru itu.*  
tion was founded.'
- (309) *Tugas itu perlu dikerjakan*  
'That job will have to be done  
*selekas mungkin oleh semua.*  
as soon as possible by all.'
- (310) *Inilah perkara yang oleh pani-*  
'This is the matter that ac-  
*tia dianggap sudah selesai.*  
cording to the committee has  
already been disposed of.'
- (311) *Kami mendoakan juga semua*  
'We also pray for those who  
*orang yang hanya dikenal*  
are known only to You,  
*olehMu, ya Tuhan.*  
oh Lord.'
- (312) *Oleh sekretaris lalu diumumkan*  
'The secretary then announced  
*beberapa hal mengenai prosedur.*  
several things concerning the  
procedure.'

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 dibacanya*), 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 of the verb 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:

(313) The *di-* construction may contain, besides the Patient NP, also an Agentive constituent in NP form with or without *oleh* in keeping with rule (314). These constructions are most likely to be preverbal only.

(314) The Agentive marking *oleh* 'by' is obligatory, optional, or prohibited according to the following rules:

(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 mediate 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 ("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).

(315) The pronouns *dikau* (rather than (*eng*)*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) *Rencana 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 dikemukakan*  
'The secretary then explained  
  
*berbagai hal menyangkut pro-*  
various things concerning the  
  
*sedur kenaikan pangkat.*  
procedure for promotion in  
rank.'
- (319) *Tidak usah! Sudah dibacakan*  
'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 Menteri.*  
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 *di*-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 *di*-construction is backgrounded (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*). *Nonthird* 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* '1sg', *-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.

This rule, then, concurs in several ways with those obtaining for *passive di-* constructions, except that *oleh* as agentive marker is usually obligatory in *ter-* constructions, and such that the Agentive may be first, second, or third person under far fewer constraints than is the case with *passive di-* constructions. Also, as in *passive di-* constructions, the *ter-* form may be foregrounded and marked for this by the particle *-lah*. In that case the Patient NP, being new information, tends to be postverbal.

Consider the following examples:

- (323) *Kemudian terlihat(lah) olehku*  
'Then I saw a human figure  
*tubuh yang bergerak di antara*  
moving through the spaces  
*celah-celah pepohonan.*  
among the trees.'
- (324) *Olehnya terdengar(lah) nada*  
'He heard the melody of a  
*nyanyian yang mengharukan.*  
moving song.'
- (325) *Harapan seperti itu tak ter-*  
'A hopeful prospect like that

*pikirkan oleh ayahnya.*  
was unimaginable for his father.

- (326) *Saya terjerat dalam macam-macam*  
'I got entangled in various  
*kesulitan.*  
difficulties.'
- (327) *Saya tertarik oleh/dengan*  
'I was attracted by/to that  
*tawaran itu.*  
offer.'
- (328) *Beberapa lukisan terlihat di*  
'Several paintings could be  
*belakang tembok itu.*  
seen behind the wall.'

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 *tertiup angin* 'blown (away) by the wind', or *terbawa air* 'carried by the (water) stream'.

#### 6.13 Constructions with verbs other than *men-/memper-* verbs

The verbs of this class comprise affixless verbs, *ber-* verbs (including circumfixed ones), and *ke-|-an* verbs. Morphemically, 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 postverbal.

naturally have postverbal position.

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

#### 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 di-*  
'As for this house, its roof  
*bongkar.*  
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 has already died.'
- (342) *\*Orang ini sudah meninggal majikannya.*
- (343) *Rumah ini sudah kami bongkar*  
'Of this house we have already  
*atapnya.*  
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/\*a 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 *interclausal*, 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  $\emptyset$ - 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 *menurun* 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 *majikan* '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.

## Notes

\*The present paper is only a small part of a comprehensive project, for which I work in a team, to whose members I am greatly indebted. These members are: C.D. Grijns (Leiden), Russell Jones (London), Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (Princeton, Jakarta) Harimurti Kridalaksana (Jakarta), Richard McGinn (Athens, Ohio), Anton M. Moeliono (Jakarta), D.J. Prentice (Leiden), Sudaryanto (Yogyakarta), J. de Vries (Leiden). This paper owes much to all and each of them in various ways. None of them is responsible for any errors in it.

Basic data research has been done in huge amounts by the following young scholars in Indonesia, who have worked in cooperation with Bambang Kaswanti Purwo and Sudaryanto: Imran Teuku Abdullah, Anhari Basuki, Sardanto Cokrowinoto, Sigit Dwiyanto, Inyo Yos Fernandez, Tina Hartrina, Widya Kirana, Henny Kisworini, Kumini Larasati, Isti Nureni, Rustiati, Sardanto, Sikuyasti, Paul Soge, F. Sudarti, Sudaryono, Sudjarwo, Surono, Susy, F.X. Joko Triyono, Safari Undip, Sri Utami, Wasisi, Udiati Widiastuti, Bambang Widodo, Hesty Widayastuti, I Dewa Putu Wijana, Anselma Wiwiek, Yakub. A number of the 150 or so data research tasks they have done have been a fruitful source for several parts of the present paper.

## SYMBOLS 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 precategory forms.
[ ]	(brackets): to enclose clarifications not part of the expressions in which they have been inserted; to enclose subdivisions 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, predicately
[FF-n.]	(double F + number, all enclosed in brackets): see below, last bibliography

- [HON] honorific
- [LOC] locative
- [Ss] Substandard
- \* (X) (asterisk outside parentheses): to symbolize that whatever X stands for is obligatory, not optional; if "\*" (X)" opens a sentence, the symbol is ambiguous, as between: [a] the entire sentence, with the "X" as optional, as deviant; and [b] the sentence as deviant only without "X". Only [b] is relevant here (e.g. example (104)).
- (\*X) (asterisk inside parentheses): to symbolize that whatever X stands for is forbidden in this context
- (X) (parentheses): to mark whatever X stands for as optional in this context

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following items are selective. I have used many publications over the years, and am not conscious any more of a number of them; in any case much that is traditionally noted in the literature has been redone by original research (see asterisk note). Some positions taken in this paper are in opposition to what may be found in the literature, but I have not referred to them, to keep this study as noncontroversial as possible.

- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono  
1980a "The Semantic Structures of the Adversative *ke-*|-*an* Verbs in Indonesian" In: Dardjowidjojo 1980b: 178-197.

- 1980b *Some Aspects of Indonesian and Javanese Linguistics*. Honolulu: Department of Indo-Pacific Languages, University of Hawaii.

- Fokker, A.A.  
1951 *Inleiding tot de studie van de Indonesische syntaxis*. Groningen and Jakarta: J.B. Wolters.

- Givón, T.  
1976 "Topic, Pronoun, and Grammatical Agreement" In: Li (ed.) 1976: 149-188.

- Hopper, P.J. and Thompson, S.A.  
1980 "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". *Language* 56: 251-299.

- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang  
1983 "The Verbal 'Aspect': a Case of the Indonesian 'Passives'". In *Pacific Linguistics*, C-77: 239-260.

- 1984a *Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

- 1984b "Indonesian Benefactive-*kan* Constructions" [unpublished paper].

- Li, Charles N. (ed.)  
1976 *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press.

- Margono  
1980 *Masalah Predikat dan Pelaku dalam Kalimat Pasif dalam BI*. Jakarta: Pusat pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa (Laporan Penelitian ILDEP).

- Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo  
1970 *Javanese Influence on Indonesian*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.

- Simatupang, M.D.S.  
1983 *Reduplikasi Morfemis Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Jambatan.

- Verhaar, John W.M.  
1978 "Syntactic (In)Alienability in Indonesian". In: Wurm and Carrington (eds) 1978: 317-325.

- 1984 "Affixation in Contemporary Indonesian". [this volume].

- Wurm, S.A. and Carrington, Lois (eds)  
1978 *Second International Conference in Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings. Fascicle 1: Western Austronesian*. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, The Australian National University.

#### FORTHCOMING ARTICLES IN THE PRESENT SERIES

(referred to in the "[FF]" references in the present paper; assignments to specific authors have not yet been made, but the papers themselves have been decided on).

- [FF- 1] "Morphemic Derivation in

	Contemporary Indonesian".	[FF-11]	"Semantic Neutralization in the Syntax of Contemporary Indonesian".
[FF- 2]	"Verb-and-Argument Structure in Contemporary Indonesian".		
		[FF-12]	"Structure of the Predicate in Contemporary Indonesian: Serial Verb Constructions".
[FF- 3]	"Ergativity and Accusativity in Contemporary Indonesian".		
		[FF-13]	"Structure of the Predicate in Contemporary Indonesian: Verbal and Nonverbal".
[FF- 4]	"Discourse Pragmatics in Contemporary Indonesian: Deixis".		
		[FF-14]	"Discourse Pragmatics in Contemporary Indonesian: Topic and Focus".
[FF- 5]	"Sequential Order and Government in Contemporary Indonesian".		
		[FF-15]	"The Categorial System in Contemporary Indonesian: Nouns".
[FF- 6]	"'Qualifiers' and the 'Placement Principle' in Contemporary Indonesian".		
		[FF-16]	"The Categorial System in Contemporary Indonesian: Pronouns".
[FF- 7]	"The Categorial System in Contemporary Indonesian: precategoryals".		
		[FF-17]	"Nonaffixational Morphemic Processes in Contemporary Indonesian".
[FF- 8]	"Morphemic Reduplication in Contemporary Indonesian".		
		[FF-18]	"The Categorial System in Contemporary Indonesian: Prepositions".
[FF- 9]	"The Composite Sentence in Contemporary Indonesian: Coordination and Subordination".		
		[FF-19]	"The Categorial System in Contemporary Indonesian: Adverbs".
[FF-10]	"Discourse Pragmatics in Contemporary Indonesian: Topicalization Strategies".		

\* \* \*