SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC WELL-FORMEDNESS

Marmo Soemarno

1. Introduction

In the early works of transformational grammarians such as Chomsky (1957), sentence well-formedness was defined primarily on the basis of its syntactical behavior. The now classic sentence "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously" immediately reminds us of what was meant by grammaticality or syntactical well-formedness which every student in linguistics painstakingly learned to distinguish from syntactic well-formedness. With the publication of, among others, Schachter (1964), Katz and Fodor (1960), and Katz and Postal (1964), major revisions were introduced to the theory of transformational grammar. The revised theory which is now known as the Aspects model or the Standard theory is elaborated in Chomsky (1965). The new theory considers sentences such as the classic sentence above deviant in terms of its syntactical selectional features, and abstract symbols such as IMP, NEG, and WH are used to express sentence relations. These abstract symbols represent some semantic information, but their use should be supported by some syntactic as well as semantic justifications. What is considered syntactic justification consists primarily of the statement of co-occurrence restrictions, such as the ones given by Klima (1964) for NEG. In addition to these abstract symbols, syntactical features are also used to explain the non-well-formedness of sentences such as:

(1) *My sister is the father of two.

And to account for the discrepancy in (1), selectional features to constrain the co-occurrence of sister and father are specified.

McCawley (1968) questions the appropriateness of syntactic selectional restrictions defined in Chomsky (1965) and proposes that the incompatibility in sentences such as (1) be explained by a more general semantic concept known as 'presupposition.' McCawley's proposal has been adopted in the current works of generative semanticists such as Lakoff (1971), but linguists such as Kuroda (1969) and Jackendoff (1972) maintain that the appropriateness of syntactic selectional restrictions can be demonstrated.

The general status of syntactic and semantic explanation in linguistic description across languages is the framework within which this paper discusses the behavior of some imperative sentences in Javanese, Indonesian, and English. I choose imperatives because the analysis of English imperatives that most transformational grammarians accept is comparatively well formulated and rich in its use of syntactic and semantic justifications. Furthermore, recent discussion on the status of 'presupposition' such as Fillmore (1969) and Garner (1971) is illustrated by some imperative sentences.

As a starting point, the simplest form of imperatives in Javanese and Indonesian are presented in the next section to develop a framework for the discussion of more complex constructions, which will be used to demonstrate not only that 'presupposition' should be included in the linguistic description but for languages such as Javanese, 'presupposition,' and probably other semantic information, seem to determine the structures of certain sentence constructions.

It should be pointed out at the outset that Javanese is my first language, Indonesian second, and English third, so I have better insights and intuition with regard to Javanese than Indonesian and English. In some cases, when I do not have a clear intuition about Indonesian sentences, I mark the beginning of the Indonesian sentences with a question mark. In some other cases, I choose not to include any Indonesian sentences at all in order to avoid confusion as a result of differences in my judgement of grammaticality from that of the reader.

2. Simple Intransitive Imperatives

Simple intransitive imperatives normally allow an optional deletion of the second person subject (kowé in Javanese and kamu, engkau, or saudara in Indonesian), and the affixation of an imperative marker (a in Javanese and optional lah in Indonesian), as in:

(2) (Kowé) lunga - (Saudara) pergila(lah) - Go.
(3) (Kowé) mlaku - (Saudara) berjalan(lah) - Walk.

Lunga and pergila in (2) are unaffixed verb roots, but in (3) the root for mlaku is jaku, and berjalan is jalan. A plausible analysis of simple imperatives in Javanese and Indonesian may posit an underlying sentence whose form can be roughly represented as:

(4) second person (VM) Root
   S
   NP
   VP
   IMP

The abstract symbol IMP has a semantic content similar to the one for the phrase 'I command you' or 'I request to you,' and in addition to the availability of the overt markers a in Javanese and lah in Indonesian, IMP can also be justified syntactically by stating that IMP provides a co-occurrence restriction statement to disallow the occurrence of words such as mba = hampa = almost, as in:


The second person subject is justified from its availability in the surface structure, as well as the behavior of reflexive pronouns and nominals.

Compare:

(6) a. Welasana awakmu dowe - Kasihanilah dirimu sendiri - Pity yourself.

(7) a. Sing alon oléhmu mlaku - (Make your walk
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Although sentences in (6) are transitive imperatives, it seems reasonable to assume that a unified analysis should provide the same account for both transitive and intransitive imperatives as far as the deep subject structure is concerned. Sentences in (6) show that only the second person reflexive can occur in imperatives and those in (7) that the nominalizing possessive that can occur in imperatives is only the second person.

To account for the restriction that imperatives cannot occur with time adverbs indicating past, Klima (1964) proposes that the underlying form of imperatives in English contains the modal will. This proposal is widely accepted, although Kiparsky (1965) claims that there are other modals that are qualified to be modals of imperatives, and Lees (1964) claims that IMP is the imperative modal whose phonetic realization is zero. Javanese and Indonesian also disallow imperatives with past time adverbs, as evidenced from:

\[(8)\] a. Lungaa saikii. - Pergilah sekarang. - Go now.
b. Lungaa sésuk. - Pergilah besuk. - Go tomorrow.

It is obvious that a and lah are imperative markers. The question is: are they modals? Before answering that question, it should be noted that past time is also expressed by tense in English, so the choice of will automatically disallows past tense as well as past time adverbs. On the other hand, Javanese and Indonesian do not have tense as such, only adverbs of time. The three languages, however, have aspect markers and none allows aspects in the surface structures of imperatives. For instance, compare (9) and (10):


As stated above, there are syntactic as well as semantic justifications for English to assume the obligatory deletion of will in (10c). One semantic evidence for the occurrence of will in the underlying form is the ambiguity of sentences such as:

\[(11)\] You will go.

Sentence (11) can be an assertion or a command. If it is a command, an imperative tag can be added. Compare:

\[(12)\] a. You will go, won't you.
b. You will go, will you.

\[(13)\] Go, will you.

However, the evidence for the existence of will in the underlying English imperatives based on tags is slightly weakened by the peculiar behavior of tag imperatives. Fraser (1973; p. 302) observes that "not only are the meanings ... different, but (the imperative tags) fail to correspond with the ordinary tag question transformation which effects a polarity change ...".

There are at least two reasons to assume that the non-completive aspects arep and akan do not occur in the underlying sentences of imperatives in Javanese and Indonesian, respectively. First, there is no syntactical evidence such as tags in English, and that is already noted as questionable even for English. Second, sentences such as (14) are not semantically ambiguous in Javanese and Indonesian, so there is no semantic justification to support the existence of the aspect morphemes in the deep structures.

\[(14)\] Kow arep lunga. - Kamu akan pergi. - You (go-noncompletive.)

One logical (but not necessarily non-controversial) analysis is to assume that IMP is an adverb that cannot co-occur with past time adverbs. Thus, at some point, we need a rule of the form:

\[(15)\] ADV $\rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{Past} \\
\text{IMP (non-past)} \end{cases}$

Semantically, (15) makes sense, as far as the time of the action is concerned, and the absence of modal or aspect in imperatives is not unique, since other types of sentences can occur without modal and/or aspect marker. For example:


The adverbial nature of the IMP is evidenced by its function as the marker (i.e. modifier) of verbs. Roughly it has the meaning of "the action has to be done by the second person at some non-past time." At this point, the reader should consider the proposed adverbial analysis of IMP fairly tentative. I will provide stronger justifications in the near future, but differences in opinion with regard to the nature of IMP will not significantly distort the issue at hand.

3. The So-called Adverbs

Let us now consider the behavior of imperatives that contains what most Javanese and Indonesian grammarians call adverbs. We can start by observing the following sentences:

\[(17)\] a. Lungaa rana. - Pergilah ke sana. - Go over-there.
b. Lungaa menyang Bali. - Pergilah ke Bali. - Go to Bali.
c. Rana. - Ke sanalah. - *To overthere.

\[(18)\] a. Lungguha ana kéné. - Duduklah di sini. - Sit here.

The above sentences might lead one to conclude that imperative markers can be attached to adverbs as well as verbs, except "manner" adverbs in (19). The "exception" in (19) actually indicates the need for a better analysis, which properly reflects the general behavior of the imperative markers. If we assume that an imperative marker can optionally be attached to the adverb, we implicitly claim that in sentences such as (17c) there is a verb in the underlying form that is deleted. Such claim is semantically unjustified. What is being overlooked is that adverb-like phrases such as the ones used in (17) and (18) are actually verb phrases. The appropriate English translation for (17c) is "Be in the direction of 'there'," and for (17d) it should be "Be in the direction of Bali," and so on. The claim made by Becker and Arms (1969) with regard to prepositions such as menyang in (17b) makes sense. They claim that "... verbs and prepositions may be surface realizations of the same abstract semantic categories." -- p.1. If we adopt this analysis, sentences such as (17c) are regular imperatives containing verb-phrase, and the imperative marker is attached to the verb. The underlying form of (17c) should look like:

Furthermore, the proposed analysis automatically explains the ungrammaticalness of (19b) since banter and cepat are not verbs, as evidenced from the following:


The Indonesian and English sentences in (19c) are well-formed only if they are given the interpretation of a presupposed verb. In other words, they can only be used as short forms of Walk fast, Run fast, and so on.

Let us turn to imperatives which specify the manner a particular action has to be done. Observe the following:

a. Bocah kiwi mlaku banter. - Anak itu berjalan cepat. - The child (did a fast walk (?!)).
b. *Bocah kiwi mlaku sing banter. - *Anak itu berjalan yang cepat. - *The child walks which is fast (?!).
c. Bocah kiwi oléhé mlaku (= mlakumé) banter. - Anak itu berjalannya (?) cepat. - The child (his walk is fast).
d. *Bocah kiwi oléhé mlaku sing banter. (---read with no emphasis on oléhé mlaku) - *Anak itu berjalanannya yang cepat. (---read with no emphasis on berjalanannya). - (The child - his walk - which is fast.)

The above shows that Javanese expresses the manner in which an action is performed by nominalizing the verb and describing the attribute of the nominal. I try to reflect this fact by giving a nominalized verb in English (such as his walk) and an adjective (such as is fast) in the gloss. It becomes more and more difficult to find the corresponding English sentences that can reflect the meaning as well as the construction used in Javanese. Sentences in (22a-d) show that sing-phrase containing words such as banter cannot occur in declaratives, unlike sing-phrase in sentences such as:

(24) Adiku sing arep lunga. - Adik saya yang akan pergi. - My brother is the one who will go.

The sing-phrase in (24) is a nominal predicate, but sing-phrases in (22) - (23) are not nominal predicates, nor are they relative clauses, such as the one in:

(25) Adiku sing arep lunga wis mangan. - Adikku yang akan pergi sudah makan. - My brother who will go has eaten.

Horne (1961; p. 350) fails to see the difference when she states that relative clauses consisting sing plus an adjective are used to modify verbs, with the meaning of "in the manner of (what is expressed by the adjective)," such as Ngomonga sing alon. (= *Bericeralah yang pelan = The imperative form of 'talk' + sing + slow.) That the sing-phrases in sentences such as (23b) is not a relative clause is obvious from the fact that it does not modify a noun. Furthermore, it is different from relative clauses as well as predicate nominals in that it cannot be questioned. Compare:

(26) a. Q: Adimu sing endi? - Adikmu yang mana? - (Your brother is the one who is which (?!))
   A: Sing arep lunga. - Yang akan pergi. - The one who will go.
   b. Q: *Mlaku sing pive? - *Berjalanlah yang bagaimana? - (My walk is the one that is how (?!))
   A: *Sing banter. - *Yang cepat. - (The fast one)

Predicate nominals such as (26a) is distinguished from relative clauses such as the first sing-phrase in (26b) by the permutability of the predicate nominals. Compare:

(26a) Adimu sing endi?  ==> Sing endi adimu?
Adiku yang mana?  ==> Yang mana adiku?

(26b) Adimu sing endi sing arep mangan?  ==> *Sing endi adimu sing arep mangan? (Note: read without a pause between sing endi and adimu.)
Adiku yang mana yang akan makan?  ==>
*Yang mana adikmu yang akan makan? (Note: the pause is after adikmu.)

(23b) Mlakua sing banter.  =⇒ *Sing banter mlakua.  

To explain the nature of sing-phrases in (22) and (23), the reason for their occurrence in imperatives (23) but not in declaratives (22), the occurrence of a question word in (26a) but not in (26b), and the permutability of (26a) and (26b) but not (23b), we must consider the semantic content of these sentences. I believe that pure syntactic explanation is bound to be inadequate.

Sing-phrases in (22) and (23) are focused constituents that express the new information. New information expressed by sing-phrases (implying that they are not the only phrases used to express new information) specify some characteristics of something that is known to the speaker and the hearer, i.e., something that constitutes the presupposition of the sentence. Let me clarify the point by describing the semantic information of each of the sentences in (22) and (23) and by showing the relationship between the semantic content and the structure of the sentence. Sentence (22a) is an assertion that contains all new information. I will, for the present, ignore the information that is contained in the article of a noun-phrase which I claim in Soemarmo (1970) involves presupposition. Sentence (22b) contains a focused constituent sing banter = yang cepat and since focusing can be done only if a presupposition is available, the sentence is non-well-formed because bocah kuwi mlakua = anak itu berjalan does not express any presupposition only new information. Sentence (22c) contains not only a focused constituent banter but also two topics at different levels: bocah kuwi and olhidh mlakua. The second topic contains a presupposition that the child walks, and the new information is the adjective banter = cepat. Sentence (22c) can be represented by a tree diagram (27) below. I include nodes topic, presupposition, and so on for the purpose of exposition. Whether these nodes should be explicitly indicated depends on the theory to which one subscribes.

(27)

Topicalization is accomplished by copying or normalizing a presupposed element. Notice that the semantic content of the sentence (22c) forces the sentence to have the structure (27) which specifies the presupposition of the sentence. It should now be obvious why (22d) is non-well-formed. It has a structure similar to (27) but the adjective is also topically-ized and the presupposition contains no adjective that can be copied or nominalized.

Sentence (23a), an imperative, contains all new information, namely to walk at a fast speed. The surface form consists of a compound verb. The Indonesian sentence seems to reflect this fact better in that the imperative marker lah is attached to berjalan cepat, instead of just berjalan. To me, *Berjalalan cepat is ungrammatical. Sentence (23b) contains a focused sing-phrase that expresses new information which specifies the speed of the walk. It has the structure (28) but the topicalized surface subject is deleted.

(28)

The sing-phrase in (23) is a nominal predicate at the lowest sentence, and the first nominal (i.e., the subject) in that sentence is deleted. What appears in the surface is the main verb mlakua = berjalan = walk, so the V and the S cannot be permuted, because they are not subject and predicate. This explains the non-well-formedness of *Sing banter mlakua = *Yang cepat berjalanan.

Sentence (23c) is non-well-formed due to the non-focused banter = cepat = fast which can not specify the presupposed adjective, in contrast with (23d) which has the following structure:

(29)

The tree (29) stated that it is presupposed that the second
person is walking or will walk (which is the topic of the presupposition) and that the event is happening at some speed (symbolized as $\bowtie$). The presupposition that the second person is walking or will walk at some speed is the topic of a sentence whose comment contains a specification of the speed. This specification has to be expressed by making $\bowtie$ the topic and the nominal predicate sing-phrase the comment of a sentence. Sentence (23c) is non-well-formed because banter = cepat = 'fast' is the comment of the entire presupposition 'the second person walks at some speed.' To specify the speed, i.e. fast, we must make 'at some speed' (symbolized as $\bowtie$) the topic of a sentence, and (23c) does not contain that. The surface form (24d) is derived by deleting the topicated subject and all elements dominating $\bowtie$. So, we have a nominal subject topic and a nominal predicate comment which can be permuted. Thus, Sing banter ol€hmu mlaku = ?Yang cepat berjalanmu is well-formed.

4. Presupposition

Linguists are currently debating whether the behavior of sentences in a language should be explained in terms of semantic notions such as presupposition. The reader is referred to Fillmore and Langendoen (1971) for a sample of this debate. Part of the problem is that the term is used differently by different linguists. Fillmore defines presupposition as conditions which must be satisfied for a sentence to function as an assertion, question, command, and so on. This definition is the closest to my use of the term in this paper.

The Javanese cases such as (22) - (29) above, and some more below, seem to show that the well-formedness of some sentence constructions is crucially determined by their semantic content. Javanese needs to nominalize the verb to overtly reflect the semantic property, namely presupposition, of that phrase. In other words, the "happiness conditions" stated in Austin (1962) and the "normal input and output conditions" stated in Searle (1969) must be satisfied by overt sentence constructions in Javanese.

Structures such as (27) - (29) explicitly reflect the semantic content in that their projection rules (within the framework of Katz, 1972) are compatible with the projection rules for presuppositions given by Langendoen and Savin (1971; p. 57):

.... presuppositions of a subordinate clause do not amalgamate either with presuppositions or assertions of higher clauses; rather they stand as presuppositions of the complex sentence in which they occur. If either an assertion or a presupposition contains a variable which stands for a subordinate clause .... then it follows that variable is replaced only by the assertion of the subordinate clause.

The implications of the inclusion of the notion 'presupposition' for research in language acquisition and language teaching is discussed in Soemarmo (1974/75).

5. Negative Imperatives

Further evidence for the determining role of presupposition in the well-formedness of sentences can be found in the behavior of negative imperatives. Observe the following:


b. Aja mlaku. - Jangan berjalan. - Don't walk.


(32) a. Ol€hmu mlaku sing banter. - Berjalanmu yang cepat. - (Make) your walk fast.

b. *Ol€hmu mlaku aja sing banter. - ?Berjalanmu jangan yang cepat. - (Don't (make) your walk fast.)


Sentences (30a and b) carry all new information. There is nothing presupposed by the speaker. On the other hand, (31a) contains a presupposition that an action can be performed at some speed, and the command specifies the action (i.e. walk) and the degree of the speed (i.e. fast). The structure of (31a) was given in (28). The negative imperative aja = jangan in (31b) negates the presupposed action mlaku = berjalan = walk, so the happiness condition is violated and the sentence is non-well-formed. The structure of (32a) was given in (29).

Notice that (29) presupposes that the addressee is walking or will walk at some speed, and the command specifies the speed. The negative imperative in (32b) contradicts the specification, thus the sentence violates the happiness condition. However, (32c) is well-formed because the negative imperative negates the degree of the fastness of the action; i.e. its intensifier. In other words, the command restricts the extent to which the speed of the action to be performed, namely not excessive.

It seems that to some extent English requires a similar constraint, since (33a) is allowed but not (33b):

(33) a. Don't walk too fast.


Similarly, Javanese and Indonesian allow (34a) but not (34b):


6. Passive Imperatives

Javanese, Indonesian, and English provide some interesting contrasts with regard to the behavior of passive imperatives:

i. Javanese requires the topicalization of a specific object, Indonesian does not allow non-specific interpretation of the non-topicalized object, and English simply uses different articles.8


b. Bukakan lawang kuwi. - Bukalah pintu itu.

The topicalization of specific objects in (35a) results in passive constructions. So, the literal translation of the Javanese and Indonesian sentences in (35b) is "The door (will) be opened (by you)."

ii. All three languages allow the negation of (35a - b), even for Indonesian, whose positive counterpart (35a) is
ill-formed.

(36) a. Aja mbukak lawang. - Jangan membuka pintu. - Don't open a door.
    b. Aja kok bukak lawang kuwi. - Jangan kamu buka pintu itu. - (Will not be opened by you - the door)

iii. Suggestive imperatives (the corresponding English constructions are the let-imperatives) are available in a complete set in Javanese and English, but I am not too sure about Indonesian.

    b. Aku tak mbukak lawang. - ?Biarlah saya membuka pintu. - Let me open the door.
    c. Dewèkè bén mbukak lawang. - Biarlah dia membuka pintu. - Let him/her open the door.

(38) a. Lawang kuwi mbok kok bukak. - ?Pintu itu hendaklah engkau buka. - ?The door should be let opened by you.
    b. Lawang kuwi tak bukaké. - ?Pintu itu biarlah saya buka. - Let me open the door. (in passive form).

English also uses the why don’t you constructions such as Why don’t you open the door and Why don’t you let him open the door to express (37) and (36). These sentences are used when the speaker suggests to the addressee that the speaker, the addressee, or the third person(s) perform an action.

Syntactically, the constructions in (37) and (38) are straightforward and symmetrical. However, the symmetry is disturbed when the sentences are negated. Observe the negation of (37):

    b. Aku tak mbukak lawang. => Aku tak ora mbukak lawang.
    c. Dewèkè bén mbukak lawang. => Dewèkè bén ora mbukak lawang.

Similarly, observe the negation of (38):

(40) a. Lawang kuwi mbok kok bukak. => Lawang kuwi mbok aja kok bukak.
    b. Lawang kuwi tak bukaké. => Lawang kuwi ora tak bukaké.
    c. Lawang kuwi bén dibukak dewèkè. => Lawang kuwi bén ora dibukak dewèkè.

Notice that aja, a negative imperative, is used in (39a) and (40a), while the others use ora, a non-imperative negative. The contrast between aja and ora (jangan and tidak in Indonesian) can be shown by comparing (40a–b) below, and (41a–d):

(41) a. Kowé ora mbukak lawang. - Kamu tidak membuka pintu. - You do/did not open the door.
    b. Kowé aja mbukak lawang. - Kamu jangan membuka pintu. - (You don’t open the door.
    c. Lawang kuwi ora kok bukak. - Pintu itu tidak kamu buka. - The door was not opened by you.
    d. Lawang kuwi aja kok bukak. - Pintu itu jangan kamu buka. - Don’t open the door. (in passive form)

Again, only semantic consideration can satisfactorily explain the requirement for the negative imperatives aja and jangan in suggestive imperatives with second person as the suggested doer of the activity. We should recognize the following semantic dichotomous pairs:

(42) a. Imperative × Prohibitive.
    b. Suggestive × Preventive.

A sentence can be an imperative, prohibitive, suggestive, or preventive, as well as suggestive-imperative, preventive-imperative, and possibly preventive-prohibitive but not suggestive-prohibitive, because the last one constitutes an internal contradiction. In (39a) and (40a), the positive sentences are suggestive-imperative sentences, and the negative ones are preventive-imperatives. In (39b–c) and (40b–c), the positive sentences are suggestive sentences, and the negative ones are preventives. Sentences such as (43) below are non-well-formed because they constitute suggestive-prohibitive containing an internal contradiction.

(43) *Aku tak aja mbukak lawang. - *Biarlah saya jangan membuka pintu. - *(Let me -- don’t (let) me open a door.)

6. Adjectival Imperatives

The last case I would like to discuss is the well-formedness of imperatives containing adjectival phrases. This type of imperative is referred to in Stockwell, et al. (1973) as the 'wish imperatives.' My intuition about Indonesian with regard to adjectival imperatives is so vague I choose not to include the Indonesian sentences in this section. The Javanese adjectival imperatives can be represented by the following sentences:

(44) a. Kowé kendel. - You are brave.
    c. Sing kendel. - Be brave.

    b. *Aja sing kendel. - *Don’t be brave.
    c. Aja kendel-kendel. - Don’t be too brave.
    d. Aja kemendel. - Don’t act brave.

The requirement for the sing-form in (44c) is consistent with the focus-presupposition and topicalization discussed in section 3 above. The negative imperatives in (45) are well-formed only if they express the presupposition that the addressee is or will be brave to some degree. (45a) is not allowed because kendel is not a verb. (45b) negates the new information which shares some presupposition with the underlying sentence, and so the negation denies the presupposition and the happiness condition is not met. (45c) and (45d) express the presupposition that the addressee is or will be brave to a certain degree. (45c) commands the addressee to limit the degree of his bravery, while (45d) also expresses
the presupposition that the addressee is not brave, and the sentence prohibits the addressee to act brave. Fillmore (1969) claims, I think correctly, that in English, sentences such as (46) and (47) have the same presupposition, namely, the door is not open.

(46) Open the door.

(47) Don't open the door.

This seems to imply that (48) and (49) also have the same presupposition: the addressee is not brave.

(48) Be brave.

(49) Don't be brave.

Javanese does not allow the corresponding (49) because if we presuppose that the addressee is not brave, the only thing he can do is to act or pretend to be brave. Either (49) is a paraphrase of Don't pretend to be brave, or adjectives such as brave are considered the property of an individual (as is tall) in Javanese, but they are not in English. Rex Moser (personal communication) pointed out to me that brave in (50) below denotes a temporary behavior but it is a permanent attribute in (51):

(50) He was brave at the Battle of Waterloo.

(51) He is a brave soldier.

The distinction, I think, is lost when the phrases occur in imperatives:

(52) Be brave at the Battle of Waterloo.

(53) Be a brave soldier.

Both (52) and (53) presuppose that the addressee is not brave. If this is correct, I do not see any plausible syntactical explanation for it.

7. Summary and Conclusion

A partial analysis of imperatives in Javanese (and to a lesser extent Indonesian) is presented in this paper to illustrate the currently unsettled status of semantic notions such as 'presupposition' and their role in syntactic descriptions. The more constructions we observe the more evidence is the role of 'presupposition' in determining not only the happiness condition but also the sentence well-formedness. It is not yet clear to me what the total implication of this exercise, particularly with respect to the currently available competing theories in transformational grammar. One thing obvious seems to be that Katz (1972; p. 363) is correct when he says:

When scientific fields undergo the change from description in terms of ordinary terminology to description in terms of technical terminology, distinctions arise that mark off parts of the fields that have not been satisfactorily demarcated previously. The separation of syntax and semantics rests on just such a distinction.

Ohio University

FOOTNOTES

1. I am grateful to my colleague Rex Moser for reading the draft of this paper and making comments and corrections in my English usage. Errors, however, are my own.


3. Examples are given in Javanese, Indonesian, and English. Sometimes only Javanese and English are given. In some cases where only Indonesian and English are used, the Indonesian sentence will be marked by (IND).

4. Kowé and saudara in (2) and (3) are not vocatives. However, Thorne (1966) argues that you in English should be analyzed as the vocative of the definite article. There do not appear any evidence which indicates that the analysis can be applied to Javanese and Indonesian.

5. Javanese and Indonesian allow more than one aspect markers in a sentence to express proximity time relations. See Soemarso (1976).

6. See Jackendoff (1973), for an opposing view concerning the status of prepositions in general. He claims that "Prepositions must . . . be accorded the right to a small but dignified syntactic category of their own." p. 355.


8. See Soemarso (1975) for the use of the terms specific and non-specific in Javanese and Indonesian.

9. The pedagogical implications of this study and the study of presupposition in general are discussed in Soemarso (1974/75).
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