# TRANSITIVE BARE VERB STEMS
# IN SPOKEN JAKARTA INDONESIAN[1]

Fay Wouk
Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics
University of Auckland

This paper looks at the use of bare verb stems in Spoken Jakarta Indonesian. It attempts to determine whether they are best classed at actor-trigger, patient-trigger, or as a separate category within the voice system. Sociolinguistic, syntactic, and discourse evidence are considered, and it is argued that transitive bare verb stems can best be analyzed as a subtype of actor-trigger with a slightly different discourse function.

## INTRODUCTION

Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (hereafter SJI), and most other colloquial varieties of Indonesian, differ from the standard language in the use of verb morphology. In Standard Indonesian, as in most other Western Austronesian languages, voice marking consists, not of an opposition between an unmarked (active) and a marked (passive) clause type, but rather of an opposition between marked clause types, where the verb morphology can be used to identify the semantic role of the syntactically most active NP, the one accessible to such syntactic processes as relativization, topicalization, and clefting. This type of voice system has traditionally been called a focus system by Austronesianists, and the clause types referred to as e.g. actor focus, patient focus, instrumental focus. In this paper the term focus will be avoided, as it has functional implications which are not appropriate to the use of voice in Austronesian languages (Wouk 1984). Instead, the term trigger will be used for the most accessible NP of the clause, and the two main clause types found in Indonesian will be referred to as actor-trigger (AT) and patient-trigger (PT). Actor and patient are here used as cover terms, not as semantic primitives. The most accessible NP of an AT clause is likely to be an actor, but this is not necessary. Likewise, the most accessible NP of a PT clause is not always a patient. Not all transitive verbs in Standard Indonesian take the trigger prefixes, although the majority of them do. This study is restricted to those verbs which can co-occur with trigger morphology.

Standard Indonesian is generally considered to have a two-way clause division, between AT and PT. There have been arguments for a more complex opposition, which I will discuss below. Here I give the simplest analysis. In Standard Indonesian AT verbs are prefixed with *meN-*, and PT verbs are either prefixed with *di-*, or preceded by a clitic pronoun, or by an independent pronoun, name, kin term or title which has been syntactically cliticized to the verb so that no lexical material (such as auxiliaries) can intervene. Evidence for syntactic cliticization comes from the fact that this construction is restricted to pronouns and terms of address, but is not available for ordinary noun phrases. SJI differs from Standard Indo-

nesian in having two AT prefixes and a wider range of pronouns and kin terms available for syntactic cliticization in PT constructions, and in allowing a third option for most transitive verbs. In SJI, verb stems with no transitive prefix are common in environments where a prefix, clitic or syntactically cliticized element would be required in Standard Indonesian. This third alternative raises a number of questions. Is it indeed a third option, a third clause type with an independent function? Or is it a subtype of either AT or PT, and if so, of which? In this paper I will present sociolinguistic, syntactic, and discourse evidence to bear on these questions, to show that transitive bare verb stems can best be analyzed as a subtype of AT with a slightly different discourse function.

## 1   TRANSITIVE VERB MORPHOLOGY OF SJI

Most transitive verbs in SJI co-occur with the affixes of the trigger system, and individual instances can be classified as either AT or PT, based on their morphological form. The affixes used in the trigger system of SJI are *meN-* (1), *N-* (2), and *di-* (3). Verbs with *meN-* or *N-* prefixes are AT; those with *di-* are PT. Unlike *meN-* and *N-*, *di-* does not also occur with intransitive roots.

(1)   T:   *na:h,   kalo   interior   design   tuh   me-rencana-kan   bagian   ruang   dalam-nya.*
           well   if   interior   design   hat   *meN*-plan-*kan*   section   space   inside-GEN

      T:   Well, in interior design you design the interior.

(2)   B:   *dari   dulu   dulu   remaja   selalu   ya   yang,*
           from   before   before   youth   always   yes   REL

      S:   *iya,*
           yes

      B:   *yang   ng-urus   deh   gitu   ya.*
           REL   *N*-arrange   EMPH   like[2]   yes

      B:   it's always been the young people yeah who,

      S:   yeah,

      B:   who like run things and all that yeah.

(3)   S:   *jadi, (.75)   seperti:   apah, (.75)   apa   itu   kenangan yang   ngga   bisa   di-lupa-in*
           so   like   what   what   that   souvenir   REL   not   can   *di*-forget-*in*

           *tu   lapangan   badminton   tuh,*
           that   field   badminton   that

      S:   so, (.75) (it's) like what, (.75) what is It a souvenir that can't be forgotten about that badminton field,

In SJI, unlike in Standard Indonesian, *di-* is not restricted to clauses with third person singular actors, but is also found with third person plural, and sometimes with first and second person actors. If *di-* is not present, the verb may occur without a prefix, but with a preverbal agent clitic. There are two clitic pro-

---

[2] Gitu in colloquial Indonesian is used in the same sense that like is in certain dialects of American English, as a hedge or filler (e.g. "It was like totally awesome.")

nouns, *ku-* (1st person) and *kau-* (2nd person), although these forms, which are used only between intimates or for the low status speaker in relationships of unequal status, do not occur in my data. More sociolinguistically neutral constructions use a free-standing pronoun or unmodified term of address that can be argued to be syntactically cliticized (4). Instances of verbs with *ku, kau,* and syntactically cliticized pronouns or terms of address are generally considered PT.

(4) S: *ada    rumah  kosong,  ya  udah    akan  saya  kontrak,*
       exist   house  empty,  yes  already  will  I     rent

     S: there's an empty house, ok then I'll rent (it),

When a pronoun or term of address is syntactically cliticized to the following verb root, other elements, such as modals and negative markers, which normally precede the verb, will come before the syntactically cliticized element instead. In (4) the pronoun immediately precedes the verb root, and the modal in turn precedes the pronoun.

In Standard Indonesian, the root is always either prefixed or has a pronoun cliticized to it. In SJI, the situation is rather different, in that transitive bare verb stems are also common, with first, second and third person actors (5). In such cases either the actor is a full NP (which cannot syntactically cliticize), or is not overtly mentioned, or the pronoun is separated from the verb by an intervening element such as a modal, showing that it is not cliticized, as in (5). From the standpoint of morphology it is not possible to label these forms either AT or PT. It is constructions of this type that are investigated in this paper.

(5) Y: *mereka  juga  perhitung-kan, (.25)  apa:  untuk (.75)  sirkulasi  uang  itu  kan,*
       they    also   count-*kan*      what  for          circulation  money  that  AGRMT

     Y: they also calculate for, (.25) what: for (.75) the circulation of money you know, (standard form: *memperhitungkan*)

In some cases in SJI, sequences of pronoun + verb stem appear without any modal or other intervening element (6).

(6) E: *saya  buat  deh     formulir  gitu.*
       I     make  EMPH  form    like

     E: I filled out the form. (standard form: *membuat*)

Due to lack of evidence, it is impossible to determine absolutely whether the pronoun is cliticized to the stem or not. Such cases could be analyzed as a PT form consisting of a syntactically cliticized pronoun plus verb stem. However, they could equally well be analyzed as a free-standing pronoun and a transitive bare verb stem. It is thus not clear from the morphology whether these instances should be classified as PT, or as bare verb stems. There were 57 cases of this type. In the analysis which follows, 31 of those unclear cases were assigned to the transitive bare verb stem category on grounds that are detailed below, while the remaining 26 were not included in the analysis.

The bare verb stem construction is a common one. In the data set used for this paper, containing 450 transitive clauses, there were 141 PT clauses, 126 AT clauses, and 157 bare verb stems (126 clear cases, plus the 31 unclear cases mentioned above.)

## 2  PRIOR STUDIES

### 2.1  Prior Syntactic Studies

There has been relatively little discussion of the use of transitive bare verb stems in Indonesian, partly because they are not found in the standard variety. Thus pedagogical grammars of the language, such as Sarumpaet (1966), Singgih (1977), and Dardjowidjojo (1978) do not mention them at all. Winstedt (1927) mentions the existence of the transitive bare verb stems, and opposes the nasal prefix (AT) to no prefix or *di-* (PT) as follows: "As opposed to the simple ground form of the verb which lays stress on the act, fact, event or condition, derivatives in [*meN-*] always express the activity, the tendency, the direction, the movement towards an act, fact, or event and condition to which endeavor goes". The majority of the more recent syntactic studies do not mention transitive bare verb stems; those that do are not in agreement as to their nature.

Tchekoff (1980)[3] proposes that Indonesian has three types of transitive clauses: active, characterized by *meN-*, passive, characterized by *di-*, and "voice neutral", characterized by a pre-verbal patient, a pronominal agent and a transitive bare verb stems. The voice neutral thus includes non-third person PT clauses and a subset of transitive bare verb stems, those associated with pronominal agents and a particular word order. Tchekoff does not consider cases with a post-verbal patient, by far the commonest type of clause with a transitive bare verb stem in actual speech. Cartier (1976 and 1979) bases her work on Tchekoff's, and also argues that Indonesian has three transitive clause types. Her active and passive are identical to Tchekoff's. Her third category, the ergative, is characterized by a verb with a cliticized agent pronoun or a transitive bare verb stem and a post-verbal patient. Thus, like Tchekoff, she combines some clearly PT clauses and some transitive bare verb stem clauses (but not the same subset as Tchekoff's) in a single category.

Chung (1976, 1978) argues that Indonesian has four types of transitive clauses. She distinguishes two passives, a canonical passive with *di-*, and an object-preposing one with an initial patient, and a pre-verbal agent, usually (but not always) either phonologically or syntactically cliticized to the verb. She presents a number of syntactic arguments to show that these object-preposing forms should be considered syntactically passive. All these arguments take the same form; a syntactic process is proposed, shown to apply to subjects but not objects, and then shown to apply to the patient in the object-preposing forms. She also distinguishes two actives, one with *meN-*, the other with no prefix, and AVP order. In her classification she does not distinguish between transitive bare verb stems whose agents are either not present or are clearly not syntactically cliticized to the verb and those for which syntactic cliticization is indeterminate. She argues that the fourth type is active on the basis of intonational and syntactic similarities with *meN-* clauses, again using as evidence syntactic processes that are restricted to subjects.

Chung's intonational argument deserves detailed description, since it is unique to her; she is the only researcher I am aware of who has considered intonation in relation to trigger choice. According to this argument, active clauses with *meN-* have a single intonational peak, which falls on the last major constituent. Canonical passive and object preposing clauses, on the other hand, have two intonational peaks, one on the preverbal patient, and a second on the verb. Passives with a post-verbal patient have a single intonational peak, falling on the verb, while the post-verbal patient bears low pitch. The clauses with transitive bare verb stems that she classifies as active have the intonational pattern of *meN-* actives, with a single rise on the last major constituent. This is a very interesting argument, but its potential value is severely restricted, since the intonation patterns Chung cites are those of full clauses uttered in isolation. In natu-

---

[3]This work was not published until 1980, but was first presented in 1976, and provides the basis for Cartier's work, which was however published first. I therefore begin my discussion with Tchekoff.

rally produced speech full clauses (with two overt arguments) are relatively rare (Du Bois 1987), and clauses consisting only of a verb would presumably all have the same intonation pattern, a single rise on the verb. Further complications are introduced by recent studies on the grammar of conversation which focus on the relationship between intonational patterns and syntactic structure in naturally occurring speech. This body of work looks at intonation units (hereafter IU), which may be defined as "a stretch of speech uttered under a single coherent intonational contour" (Du Bois et al. 1993). IUs are often clauses, but can be both smaller and larger than a single clause (Ono and Thompson 1995). When larger, they typically involve some sort of clause combining; when smaller, they reflect both cognitive and interactional constraints on production (Ono and Thompson 1995). These constraints give rise to prosodic clusters of multiple IUs, which consist of an integrational unit (containing at least a predicate, and ending with final intonation), preceded by one or more anticipatory units (IUs with non-final intonation, usually but not always NPs), and/or followed by one or more supplemental units (also with final intonation) (Ewing 1999). For this reason, the intonational argument that Chung proposes cannot be applied directly to naturally produced speech in the absence of a much more careful study of the intonation patterns of spoken Indonesian.

The weakness of Chung's classification is that of all the criteria presented, only the intonational one can unambiguously identify an indeterminate verb form as active or passive. In the absence of intonational evidence the status of a clause remains ambiguous. Her belief that there are four clause types, rather than two (active and passive) seems to be based on the formal (morphological) differences rather than on any syntactic or functional differences between the two actives or the two passives.

Thomas (1978, 1979) also divides Indonesian transitive clauses into four types, but they are four quite different types from those of Chung, namely actor focus, goal focus, referential focus, and instrumental focus. This framework is much closer to that generally offered for a Philippine type language than most analyses of Indonesian. He considers *meN-* actor focus and *di-* with no suffix goal focus, *di-* with the suffix *-i* referential focus, and *di-* with the suffix *-kan* instrumental focus. He points out that verbs with cliticized actor pronouns (*ku-* and *kau-*) are formally and functionally parallel to verbs with the *di-* prefix, and concludes that they should be considered goal focus. He further argues that certain clauses with transitive bare verb stems are goal focus because in those clauses the auxiliary precedes a free-standing pronoun or a term of address which in turn precedes the verb; in other words, the actor appears to be syntactically cliticized to the verb just as it is in clauses containing the clitic pronouns *ku-* and *kau-*. He then goes on to claim that all clauses with transitive bare verb stems are goal focus, although he presents no evidence in support of extending this analysis to clauses whose actors are clearly not cliticized to their verbs, or whose cliticization status is indeterminate. He also suggests that clauses which contain an actor followed by an auxiliary followed by a transitive bare verb stem should not be considered actor focus clauses with the prefix omitted, but rather goal focus clauses with "incorrect placing of the auxiliary", but again presents no evidence for this claim.

Verhaar (1978) distinguishes five clause types: an active with the prefix *meN-*, and four passives: the *di-* passive, the *ter-* passive,[4] pronominal passives (verbs with cliticized agents) and the zero passive (transitive bare verb stems ). Verhaar's zero passive category includes only those clauses which are acceptable in Standard Indonesian, those with preposed objects or clearly syntactically cliticized actors. His system thus excludes most clauses with transitive bare verb stems in natural speech.

Kana (1986) examines Chung's argument that there are two passives, canonical (*di-*) and object-preposing, both of which are formally passive and two actives, one with a *meN-* prefix and one with no

---

[4]*Ter-* is a prefix used to form non-volitional agentless passives.

prefix. She compares four types of clauses, canonical passives, object-preposing, and two types with AVP word order, one with a clearly cliticized actor, the other with a clearly non-cliticized actor. She concludes that canonical passives and object preposing passives are syntactically passive, since the patient in both is accessible to a variety of syntactic processes, while the actor is not, and that there is no reason to consider them separate clause types. She includes non-preposing clauses with cliticized actors in this group on the basis of the morphological similarity with object-preposing. She argues that clauses with no prefix and AVP word order where the actor is not clearly cliticized are formally active, because when the auxiliary is present it intervenes between the actor and the verb, and the actor but not the patient is accessible to a variety of syntactic processes. According to Kana, then, there are two transitive clause types in Indonesian, active and passive, each of which has more than one corresponding morphological form.

## 2.2 Prior Discourse Studies

Most of the discourse oriented work on Indonesian does not discuss the use of transitive bare verb stems, for the reason that the studies were based on written texts of Standard Indonesian in which such forms are not found. A notable exception to this state of affairs is found in the work of Kaswanti Purwo, which examines highly colloquial written data taken from popular novels.

Kaswanti Purwo (1983) contrasts the discourse functions of transitive bare verb stems and verbs affixed with *di-*. He concludes that the crucial variable for choice between the two is one of narrative vs non-narrative. According to his analysis, *di-* verbs occur in narrative contexts, and can be utilized for foregrounding, while transitive bare verb stems occur in non-narrative contexts and cannot be foregrounded. Since foreground is associated with high discourse transitivity, and background with low transitivity (Hopper & Thompson 1980), this analysis suggests that *di-* verbs are higher in transitivity than are transitive bare verb stems. Kaswanti Purwo (1986) proposes an opposition between verbs with *meN-* on the one hand, and verbs with *di-* or no affix on the other. He suggests that the distinction is partly aspectual, partly pragmatic. *MeN-* verbs are telic, durative and narrative; non-*meN-* verbs are atelic, punctual and performative. The aspectual difference that Kaswanti Purwo mentions is familiar from transitivity studies, and suggests that *meN-* verbs are lower in transitivity than transitive bare verb stems and *di-* verbs. In neither study does Kaswanti Purwo specifically address the question of the status of transitive bare verb stems, but one may conclude from the two studies that he sees them as forming a third category, neither AT nor PT, but rather something that can be opposed to both, with AT being low transitivity, PT high transitivity, and transitive bare verb stems intermediate in transitivity.

## 2.3 Summary of Prior Studies

The most striking fact that emerges when comparing the works of the authors reviewed above is that they are, in many ways, not comparable. The types of clauses with transitive bare verb stems under consideration, and the criteria for their categorization differ widely. For Tchekoff and Cartier, the main relevant criterion is the actual morphological marking on the verb, for Chung and Kana the main criteria are syntactic tests. Verhaar and Tchekoff consider only those transitive bare verb stems with clearly identifiable cliticized actors. Most other authors consider a much wider variety of clause types. As a result of these, and other, differences in theoretical orientation, the conclusions reached vary widely. Tchekoff and Cartier, arguing from morphological marking, both conclude that transitive bare verb stems are a category separate from either AT or PT, although Tchekoff's neutral verbs would be considered clearly PT in most analyses. Chung and Kana, arguing from syntactic behavior, conclude that transitive bare verb stems with syntactically cliticized actors are PT, while those without syntactically cliticized actors are AT. Verhaar, also using syntactic arguments, considers transitive bare verb stems PT, but like Tchekoff, he restricts his

data to those with syntactically cliticized actors, so in actuality his conclusion is in agreement with Chung and Kana for the data he covers. Thomas, on the other hand, considering all clauses, concludes that all those with transitive bare verb stems are PT. Finally, Kaswanti Purwo, arguing from discourse function, shows that there are significant differences between AT, PT and transitive bare verb stems. It is clear from this lack of consensus that more work is needed in this area to tie up the many loose ends present.

## 3  SOCIOLINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

The data considered in this section comes from a 90 minute discussion among three male speakers, all of whom have met previously, and who have come together for the express purpose of discussing a particular topic. The speakers are all native speakers of Indonesian, born and raised in Jakarta; thus the speech they produce is representative of SJI.  For approximately 30 minutes they converse freely. They then turn to the suggested topic of discussion, in this case sports in Indonesia. Having interpreted their task as holding a debate, rather than as having a conversation, they begin to speak in a quite formal style, using formulaic expressions which approximately translate as "thank you for this opportunity to speak" to introduce their turns. However, they very quickly return to normal turn-taking and a more colloquial style of speech. Several times in the course of the next 40 minutes they remind themselves or each other of the "assigned task", and return to formal style for short periods, only to slip back into free conversation a short while later. Towards the end of the conversation, they notice that the tape is running out and realize that they have not properly discussed the topic. The last part of the tape is devoted to the topic, and a formal style is maintained throughout this section.  This particular tape, unlike the rest of my data, thus contains continuous register shifts between more formal and more colloquial speech, and provides an opportunity to compare the use of transitive prefixes in the two speech styles. The results proved most informative.

Data relating to the presence, absence, and form of prefix in formal and informal speech are shown below in Table 1.

Table 1    Verb Affixes in Formal and Informal Speech

|  | Bare Stem | *di-*/clitic | *meN-* | *N-* | *Total* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Formal | 28 (16%) | 46 (22%) | 72 (60%) | 5 (7%) | 151 (27%) |
| Informal | 145 (84%) | 156 (78%) | 48 (40%) | 65 (93%) | 414 (73%) |
| *Total* | 173 | 202 | 120 | 70 | 565 |

By far the largest effect of register is on the use of *meN-*, as Table 1 shows.  Although only 27% of all clauses (151 of 565) are found in formal register, fully 60% (72 of 120) of the occurrences of *meN-* are found there. Or, looking at the data in the other direction, 48% (72 of 151) formal register verbs had the *meN-* affix, while only 11% (48 of 414) of the informal register ones did.  If, then, formal register makes the use of *meN-* more likely, it must, by the same token, make the use of one or the other of the other three forms (no affix, *di-*/clitic, *N-*) less likely.

The effect of register on the use of *di-*/clitic forms proved to be statistically insignificant; in each register they constitute approximately 30% of all clauses. However, register has a strong effect on the use of both *N-* and transitive bare verb stems. In formal register, where *meN-* is common, they are relatively rare, while in informal register, where *meN-*  is less common, they occur more frequently. For example, there are 70 instances of *N-* in the data set.  If register had no effect on its use, then we would expect 19 of them to occur in formal register. We actually find only 5.  For the transitive bare verb stems, we would expect to find 46 in formal register, but we only find 28.

This analysis suggests that the transitive bare verb stems, *meN-*, and *N-* types, moving as they do in appreciable concert, may have something in common, perhaps a similarity of function, such that when there is a shift in register they can replace each other without disturbing the discourse structures of the text.

The direction of movement – the greater frequency of *N-* and transitive bare verb stems in informal register, and *meN-* in formal register – can be readily explained by examining the history of SJI. It is a koine dialect, with Betawi, Standard Indonesian, Chinese Malay, Javanese, and Sundanese as its most significant source varieties (Wouk 1999). *MeN-* is found in Standard Indonesian, which is associated with more formal circumstances, while *N-* and the transitive bare verb stem construction are found in Betawi (Wallace 1977), which is associated with less formal circumstances. (As noted previously, transitive bare verb stems are found in Standard Indonesian, but only with a limited number of lexically determined roots, unlike Betawi and SJI, where virtually any transitive root can occur as a bare verb stem.)

It is not surprising that *N-* should alternate with *meN-* in this way, as they are cognate morphemes, with similar functions in their two source varieties, marking AT verbs (for a description of the function of *N-* in Betawi see Wallace 1977). Thus when they were borrowed into SJI, they may have been borrowed with their original similar functions, and the similarity recognized by the speakers of SJI. Alternatively, their phonological similarity (nasals which undergo homorganic assimilation) could have been recognized, or perhaps both a phonological and a functional similarity were perceived. Since they came from two varieties which had very different social status, the combination of a perceived similarity of form and/or function together with the discrepancy in social status, may have provided the impetus for giving these prefixes the added function of marking register on transitive verbs (Wouk 1999).

It is less immediately obvious why transitive bare verb stems would alternate with *meN-* rather than with *di-* in marking social register. Arguments have after all been advanced in favor of considering all transitive bare verb stems PT (Thomas 1978, 1979). The fact that this alternation seems to exist is evidence that transitive bare verb stems might be more appropriately considered AT, like verbs affixed with *meN-* and *N-*.

## 4 SYNTACTIC EVIDENCE

There are a number of arguments based on grammatical criteria which suggest that transitive bare verb stems are AT verbs. Both can be used in actor-headed relative clauses (7 and 8); also both can be used with reflexives (9 and 10), and both can be used intransitively (11 and 12). On the other hand, PT verbs cannot be used intransitively, with reflexives, or in actor-headed relative clauses.[5]

(7)　D: *kadang-kadang yang nge-jodoh-in,　dia juga yang nge-rusak-in.*
　　　　 sometimes　　 REL　*N*-matchmake-*in* 3SG also REL　*N*-wreck-*in*

　　　D: sometimes the one who fixes you up is also the one who wrecks it.

(8)　D: *saya seneng gitu ama dia dia juga seneng ama saya eh adik-nya*
　　　　 I　　like　 like　 with him he also like　　 with me　 eh younger:sibling-GEN

　　　　 *itu yang bikin rusak*
　　　　 that REL make wreck

---

[5]It is true that patient-headed relative clauses can contain verbs preceded by agent pronouns for which cliticization is difficult to determine due to lack of an intervening element. These verbs could conceivably be considered either bare verb stems or PT. However, clearly transitive bare verb stems never occur in patient-headed relative clauses, nor do PT verbs occur in actor-headed relative clauses. It is to the behavior of clearly transitive bare verb stems that this section refers.

D: like, I like him, he likes me too hey it's his little sister who wrecks things

(9) T: *suami    saya  suka  men-dekat-kan    diri  ke agama*
     husband  my    like  *meN*-close-*kan*  self  to religion
    T: my husband started to become religious

(10) T: *itu    saya  bates-in  diri    terus,        hanya  ber-gaul        biasa,*
      that   I     limit-*in*  self   continuously  only   ber-associate   ordinary

     T: then I controlled myself the whole time, only had ordinary friendships

(11) I: *kaka kaka      itu   mau  pulang   ke situ,   daripada   saya    be-rebut,       rumah  satu,*
      older:sibling    that  want go:home  to:there   rather     I       *ber*-struggle  house  one

      *mendingan udah    deh    biar-in  saya  ng-ontrak,  udah    sana  tempat-in aja*
      better        already  EMPH   let-*in*  I     *N*-rent    already there place-*in*  just

     I: my older brothers and sisters wanted to go live there, rather than fighting (over it), there's only one house, ok then I'll rent, you just go live in (the house)

(12) S: *kita  kerja  sendiri,  apa    masak  masak  sendiri*
      we    work   self      what   cook   cook   self

     S:  we do our own work, what do our own cooking

## 5 DISCOURSE DISTRIBUTION

In this section I examine the discourse distribution of clauses with the three types of verbs under consideration (AT, PT and transitive bare verb stems), and show that, just as syntactic and sociolinguistic evidence link AT and transitive bare verb stems, so does their use in discourse. I will consider the order of the major constituents of the clause, constructions with verbs of cognition and speaking, discourse transitivity, and the topicality of the two direct arguments, showing that for most of these factors, transitive bare verb stems are more like AT than PT.

### 5.1 Constituent Order

The order of the three major constituents, actor, verb and patient, in clauses with transitive bare verb stems proved similar to word order in AT clauses, and quite different from word order in PT clauses. Table 2 gives the relative frequency of pre- and post-verbal As and Table 3 the relative frequency of pre- and post-verbal Ps for clauses with AT, PT and transitive bare stem verbs in all of the transitive clauses with overt arguments found in 19 naturally occurring narratives taken from my corpus.

Table 2 Position of Actor

|            | preV A | postV A | total overt As |
|------------|--------|---------|----------------|
| AT         | 46     | 0       | 46             |
| Bare stem  | 81     | 1       | 82             |
| PT         | 3      | 18      | 21             |

Table 3 Postion of Patient

|            | preV P | postV P | total overt Ps |
|------------|--------|---------|----------------|
| AT         | 1      | 66      | 67             |
| Bare stem  | 17     | 101     | 118            |
| PT         | 36     | 16      | 52             |

Overt actors tend to precede AT verbs and transitive bare verb stems, while overt patients tend to follow them. In PT clauses on the other hand, overt actors are more likely to follow the verb, and overt patients to precede it.

## 5.2 Verbs of Cognition and Speaking

Evidence from the same 19 narratives concerning verbs of cognition and speaking which take a clausal complement also shows a similarity between AT and transitive bare verb stems. These clausal complements are non-referential, according to Du Bois' (1980) definition of non-referential noun phrases as those that do not speak of an object as an object. Such clausal complements in most cases thus do not introduce or refer to an object which the speaker then expects the hearer to keep track of. Therefore one would not expect to find them with PT verbs, as PT verbs have been shown to occur mainly with identifiable patients, while AT verbs occur freely with unidentifiable and non-referential ones (Wouk 1996). And this indeed seems to be the case. These narratives contained 11 clearly AT clauses of this type (10% of all AT clauses), and only 4 (2.6%) such clearly PT clauses. Two of the latter had non-referential actors, and thus PT morphology was grammatically conditioned. This left only two (1.3%) cases of clauses with clausal complements where morphology was based on speaker choice that had PT morphology. These speakers then clearly preferred AT to PT when they had a choice to make. It is then of some interest with respect to the basic question addressed here that of the 145 clauses with clearly transitive bare verb stems, 21, or 15%, took a clausal complement. Again we see a similarity to AT verbs, and not to PT verbs.

However, there remained 31 clauses with verbs of speaking and cognition and clausal complements where the nature of the verb (PT or transitive bare verb stem) was structurally indeterminate. I therefore looked for other criteria on which to classify those 31. They were restricted to four verb roots. All occurrences of those roots in the corpus are tabulated in Table 4, and divided into four categories: verbs of indeterminate affixation type and each of the three affixation types under discussion. Additionally, in each cell of Table 4, the number of instances which occur with clausal complements is given.[6]

Table 4 Verbs of Cognition and Speaking

|  | Indeterminate | Bare Stem | AT | PT |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *bilang* | 18 (18 clausal) | 12 (8 clausal) | 0 | 2 (1 clausal) |
| *pikir* | 11 (11 clausal) | 3 (3 clausal) | 3 (1 clausal) | 0 |
| *minta* | 1 (1 clausal) | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| *rasa* | 1 (1 clausal) | 2 (1 clausal) | 7 (4 clausal) | 1 |

Almost all (29 of 31) of the uncertain cases contained either the root *bilang* 'say' or the root *pikir* 'think', with a single case each of *minta* 'request' and *rasa*, 'feel'. Of these four roots, two, pikir and rasa cannot cooccur with PT morphology unless a suffix (either *–in, i* or *-kan*) is affixed to the verb. A third, *minta*, when used with PT morphology, can only take the requestee as trigger, not the request; thus it cannot take a clausal complement when PT. The 13 previously indeterminate cases with these three verbs must, for grammatical reasons, therefore now be considered transitive bare verb stems. When added to the 21 clearly transitive bare verb stems with clausal complements mentioned above, this brings the number of transitive bare verb stems with clausal complements up to 34, or 23% of all such verb stems.

---

[6]The number of clausal complements listed for each affix type in Table 4 is not the same as the number of clausal complements listed for each affix type in the preceding paragraph. This difference occurs because in the preceding paragraph all verbs with clausal complements are included in the totals. The table only lists a subset of those verbs, the ones which occurred in clauses where it was not certain whether the verb were **bare verb stems** or PT.

The remainder of the cases (18) contain *bilang*, which is quite common with transitive bare verb stems (12 cases) and relatively rare with identifiably PT verbs (2 cases). I conclude that these clauses are transitive bare verb for three reasons: first, because the patient is non-referential; second, because where affixation is determinate *bilang* proves to be much more frequent with transitive bare verb stems than with PT verbs; and third, because unlike other verbs of speaking and cognition in the corpus, *bilang* has a distinct PT form but does not have a distinct AT form. When used to mean 'say' it does not co-occur with either *meN-* or *N-*. Thus, the only way to use *bilang* without making it PT is to make it a transitive bare verb stem. Since I knew that these clauses were actually similar to clauses with transitive bare verb stems, and differed from PT clauses in the same significant ways as clauses with transitive bare verb stems, I felt justified in classifying all clauses with *bilang* as transitive bare verb stems.

Based on this classification, it seems that of 67 clauses with verbs of cognition and speaking and clausal complements, the majority are either AT (11 instances) or transitive bare verb stems (52), while only a very few are PT (4). Again we see the transitive bare verb stems patterning with AT verbs.

## 5.3 Discourse transitivity

This section continues the consideration of the discourse distribution of all three clause types with respect to discourse transitivity. The data under consideration consists of 17 naturally occurring narratives produced on a variety of occasions by 8 different speakers, 5 female and 3 male. The speakers are all native speakers of Indonesian, born and raised in Jakarta; thus the speech they produce is representative of SJI. Some of these narratives are basically monologues, with little or no feedback from the listeners, while others are told more interactionally, involving questions and answers, discussion and digressions. These sections were chosen to provide the basis for a study of discourse transitivity because it is much easier for an outsider to a conversation to determine such crucial indicators of discourse transitivity as the eventiveness or non-eventiveness of an utterance, and the referentiality of a referent, when there is a plot which can be followed. Additionally, studies of discourse transitivity have traditionally been restricted to narratives, and some measures of discourse transitivity, such as foreground and background, can only apply to narratives. All clauses containing potentially transitive verbs (verbs which could take two arguments in the form in which they were used) were included in the data base.

Discourse transitivity, as defined by Hopper and Thompson (1980) involves a number of parameters, some having to do with the A, some with the O,[7] and some with the verb. These are: number of arguments, kinesis, aspect,[8] punctuality, volitionality, affirmation, mode, agency, affectedness of O, and individuation of O. In Wouk 1996 I show that discourse transitivity is relevant to the distinction between AT and PT in SJI with respect to punctuality (also an aspectual distinction, that between eventiveness and non-eventiveness), mode and individuation of O.

Specifically, for each of these, PT showed a statistically significant association with higher transitivity values, and AT with lower ones. Kinesis, volitionality, affirmation, agency, and affectedness of O proved to be distributed independently of trigger choice. While punctuality, mood and referent individuation are not obligatorily formally marked in Indonesian, it proved possible to apply universal semantic definitions of these phenomena. This was not the case for telicity, and thus the data were not considered further with respect to this aspectual distinction.

---

[7]Note that where I follow Comrie (1989) and use the terms A and P to refer to the two direct arguments of transitive clauses, Hopper and Thompson follow Dixon (1979) and use A and O.

[8]Hopper and Thompson use the cover term aspect to refer to one particular type of aspectual distinction, that of telicity.

## 5.3.1 Discourse transitivity and individuation of O

Because individuation of O has proved to be a key determining factor in choice between different verb forms in so many Austronesian languages (Wouk 1986), and strongly influences trigger choice in SJI, I compared transitive bare verb roots with both AT and PT in terms of three factors that relate to this parameter of discourse transitivity: referentiality, animacy, and syntactic form of patient. Referential status and animacy of patient are two sub-parts of individuation of O as described by Hopper and Thompson. In terms of referential status, patients are classified as non-referential, referential (but not identifiable), and identifiable. However, for Austronesian languages in general, and for SJI in particular, the important comparison is not a three way one, but a two way one between those which are identifiable, and are associated with PT, and those which are not, and are associated with AT. In terms of animacy, patients are classed as animate and inanimate. Syntactic form is not one of aspects of individuation described by Hopper and Thompson, but is indirectly related to it, as syntactic form tends to reflect identifiability (Du Bois 1980). In terms of syntactic form, patients are classified as noun phrase, pronoun or zero anaphora.

The data with respect to the topics of referentiality, animacy and syntactic form of patient are presented in Tables 5–7, using the categories described above. It should be noted here that the latter two topics (Tables 6 and 7) both correlate with referentiality (Table 5). Non-referential and unidentifiable patients tend to be inanimate and expressed as full nouns; while identifiable patients tend to be animate and expressed with zero anaphora.

Table 5   Referentiality of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Non-referential | 46 (45%) | 2 (2%) | 84 (54%) |
| Unidentified | 16 (16%) | 11 (12%) | 28 (19%) |
| Identifiable | 40 (39%) | 75 (86%) | 42 (27%) |

Table 6   Animacy of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Animate | 33 (32%) | 58 (66%) | 29 (17%) |
| Inanimate | 69 (68%) | 30 (34%) | 127 (83%) |

Table 7   Syntactic Form of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| NP | 50 (49%) | 15 (17%) | 103 (66%) |
| Pronoun | 13 (13%) | 12 (13%) | 14 (9%) |
| Zero | 39 (38%) | 61 (70%) | 39 (25%) |

In Table 5 we see that AT and bare stem patients are quite likely to be non-referential, and somewhat less likely to be identifiable. PT patients, on the other hand, and generally identifiable, and are almost never non-referential. Table 6 shows that AT and bare stem patients are more likely to be inanimate, while PT patients are more likely to be **animate**. (The very high inanimacy level of bare stem patients is due to the high frequency of clausal complements with this form. Table 7 shows that AT and bare stem patients are more likely to be full NPs, while PT patients are most likely to be zero anaphora. The basic message of these tables is perhaps best summarized and conveyed by comparing the eight numbers in the bare stem column with the corresponding ones in the AT and PT columns (Table 8):

Table 8   Correlations Among AT, PT, and Bare Stem

|            | AT   | PT   | Bare stem |
|------------|------|------|-----------|
| AT         |      | --   |           |
| PT         | -    | 0.27 | --        |
| Bare stem  | 0.91 | 0.19 | --        |

The correlation of 0.91 between AT and bare verb stem means that 83% (0.912) of the variation in one can be explained in terms of variation in the other: or, more fairly here, in terms of variation in some third, causal, factor that effects both of them. In the other two correlations (AT with PT and bare stem with PT) the variation in the first explains only 7% and 4% respectively of the variation in the second, values which are insignificant considering the small number of cases. The message, then, is clear. With respect to referentiality, animacy, and syntactic form, the patients of transitive bare verb stems differed from PT patients in the same ways that AT patients differed from PT patients. They were consistently less likely to be referential and individuated, with the same corollary differences in animacy and syntactic form.

### 5.3.2  Discourse transitivity and characteristics of the clause

This pattern of extensive similarity between the patients of transitive bare verb stems and AT verbs does not extend to the clausal variables of mood, punctuality, and timeline (Tables 9-11). In Table 9 clauses are classified as either of two moods, indicative and irrealis. In Table 10 clauses are classifed as either eventive, which corresponds to a positive value for punctuality, or non-eventive, which corresponds to a negative value. In Table 11 all clauses are classified as being either on the timeline of the narrative (that is, foreground) or off it (that is, background. It should be noted that due to the non-linear, interactional nature of conversational narratives, and the frequency of digression and interruption, all clause types are more frequently off the timeline than they are on it. The important point is the relative frequency of the correlation for the different clause types, not the absolute frequency of any one type.

Table 9   Mood

|            | AT        | PT        | Bare Stem  |
|------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Indicative | 67 (57%)  | 70 (80%)  | 125 (79%)  |
| Irrealis   | 50 (43%)  | 18 (20%)  | 34 (21%)   |

Table 10  Punctuality

|             | AT        | PT        | Bare Stem  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Eventive    | 34 (30%)  | 59 (67%)  | 102 (60%)  |
| Non-eventive| 84 (70%)  | 29 (33%)  | 68 (40%)   |

Table 11  Timeline

|      | AT        | PT        | Bare stem  |
|------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Off  | 90 (76%)  | 46 (52%)  | 99 (58%)   |
| On   | 28 (24%)  | 42 (48%)  | 71 (42%)   |

In Table 9 we see that PT and bare stem clauses are very likely to be indicative, whereas AT clauses are relatively evenly divided between the two categories. In Table 10 we see that PT and bare stem clauses are somewhat more likely to be eventive than non-eventive, while AT clauses are quite a bit more likely to be non-eventive. In Table 11 we see that PT and bare stem clauses are on the time line approximately

twice as often as AT clauses are. These data are now analyzed in Table 12, in the same manner that the data for individuation of O were analyzed.

Table 12 Correlations among AT, PT, and Bare Stem

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| AT | – | | |
| PT | -0.08 | – | |
| Bare stem | 0.12 | 0.98 | – |

Here the correlation between PT and bare stems is high, while the other correlations are low. Thus, in contradistinction to all the previous data, we find that when it comes to the related variables of mood, punctuality, and timeline, transitive bare verb stem clauses look much more like PT clauses than AT ones, being more likely to be indicative, eventive, and on timeline; that is, to be associated with higher transitivity. This "exception", far from presenting a problem, may in fact be helping to tell us what has actually been happening in the development of SJI, and will be discussed further below.

We find a typical clause with a transitive bare verb stem (the root *dapat*) in R's second turn in (13). The clause is indicative, eventive and on the timeline, but the patient is not identifiable.

(13) R: *kebetulan bapa saya yang nama-nye keluar, jadi me-menang-kan gitu.*
     coincidentally father my REL name-GEN come: out so *meN*-win-*kan* like

    S: *ye ye.*
     yes yes

    R: *dan sebetulnye juga bapa saya dapat rumah, di komplek Pe dan Ka di Cilandak.*
     and really also father my get *house in complex P and K in Cilandak*

    R: as it happened my father's name came out, so he won like.

    S: yes yes.

    R: and actually my father got a house in the Dept.of Education complex in Cilandak.

## 5.4 Topicality

Relative topicality of the two direct arguments of the clause is measured in two ways in this section, in terms of continuity, and of grammatical role of last mention. Only continuity of patient is considered here, not continuity of actor, because while continuity of patient proved to distinguish AT and PT (Wouk 1994), continuity of actor did not. Following Givón (1983, 1994), continuity of patient is calculated via the metric of referential distance (recency of last mention), and shown in Table 13. Three categories are distinguished: mention in the immediately preceding clause, mention further back than the immediately preceding clause, and no prior mention. Again this is a three way distinction, but the most relevant comparison is a two-way one between high topicality (mention in the immediately preceding clause) and moderate or low topicality (mention further back or no prior mention).

Table 13 Continuity of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| No prior mention | 62 (61%) | 13 (15%) | 113 (72%) |
| Early mention | 26 (25%) | 33 (37%) | 21 (14%) |
| Preceding clause | 14 (14%) | 42 (48%) | 22 (14%) |

Table 13 shows that the patients of transitive verb stems, like the patients of AT verbs, are relatively discontinuous, and thus lower in topicality. They are more likely to either be first mentions or to be men-

tioned more than one clause back than in the immediately preceding clause. Patients of PT verbs, on the other hand, are relatively continuous, and higher in topicality.

Topicality can also be measured, for participants which are not being mentioned for the first time, by looking at the grammatical role of that participant in its prior mention. Prior mentions are classed as: subjects of intransitive verbs; triggers (actor of AT, patient of PT) or non-triggers (patient of AT, actor of PT) of transitive verb; or other (oblique arguments). In all cases, the most likely prior mention was as an S, which is hardly surprising, since the ratio of transitive to intransitive clauses in the data was approximately 1:4. However, when the prior mention occurred in a transitive clause, interesting differences appeared between AT and PT clauses. Since this metric distinguished AT and PT with respect to both actors and patients, prior grammatical status of both actors (Table 14) and patients (Table 15) is discussed here.

Table 14  Prior Grammatical Status of Actors

|             | AT         | PT        | Bare Stem  |
|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|
| Subject     | 60 (61%)   | 35 (44%)  | 84 (53%)   |
| Non-trigger | 10 (11%)   | 28 (35%)  | 12  (7%)   |
| Trigger     | 28 (29%)   | 14 (18%)  | 59 (37%)   |
| Other       | 2 (3%)     | 5 (3%)    |            |

Table 15  Prior Grammatical Status of Patients

|             | AT        | PT        | Bare Stem  |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Subject 17  | (46%)     | 37 (51%)  | 15  (35%)  |
| Non-trigger | 9 (24%)   | 4  (5%)   | 14  (33%)  |
| Trigger     | 11 (30%)  | 31 (44%)  | 14  (33%)  |

Looking at Tables 14 and 15, we see that the actors of both AT and Bare Stem constructions are much more likely to be triggers than non-triggers in their previous use, while the actors of PT clauses are quite likely to have been non-triggers the last time they appeared. Additionally, the patients of PT clauses are quite unlikely to have been non-triggers the last time they were mentioned, while the patients of AT and bare stem clauses were just as likely to be non-triggers as to be triggers. In other words, the trigger of a given clause was more likely to have been trigger in its prior mention, than was the non-trigger, and for transitive bare verb stems this was the actor.

The topicality data with respect to the three verb forms are then summarized in Table 16.

Table 16  Continuity Correlations among AT, PT, and Bare Stems

|           | AT     | PT     | Bare Stems |
|-----------|--------|--------|------------|
| AT        | –      |        |            |
| PT        | -0.10  | –      |            |
| Bare Stem | 0.95   | -0.28  | –          |

In Table 16 the correlation between AT and bare stem is high, while the other correlations are low. So here we go back to the pattern of bare stem behaving as if it were AT, while PT, as always, seems to have little, if anything, to do with either.

This latter aspect of the data deserves further comment. Although bare stems behaved like AT with respect to the factors presented in Tables 5-7 and 13-15, and like PT with respect to the factors presented in Tables 9-11, AT and PT were basically independent of one another. The overall correlation between AT and PT was a negligible 0.19. This tells us that the variation in AT frequencies must in general be controlled by factors other than those controlling PT frequency; in other words, AT variation is random with respect to PT variation. If it were otherwise, if it were a matter of choice between AT and PT based on a

single set of criteria, then we would expect to see strong negative correlations (values closer to -1.0) between the two, and this is not the case.

## 6   CONCLUSION

The bulk of the evidence presented in this contribution is consistent with the hypothesis that in SJI transitive bare verb stems are best seen as AT. The arguments in favor of this hypothesis involve grammatical, sociolinguistic, and discourse variables. The grammatical evidence is the fact that they share syntactic constraints with AT verbs, being able to occur intransitively, with reflexives, and in actor-headed relative clauses, unlike PT. The sociolinguistic evidence in favor of considering transitive bare verb stems AT is the fact when in formal speech the percent of transitive bare verb stems decreases, the percent of PT remains basically the same, but the percent of AT rises to match the decrease in transitive bare verb stems. Looked at the other way, the greater likelihood of finding *meN-* in formal register decreases the likelihood of finding transitive bare verb stems there, but has little or no influence on the presence of PT forms.

Discourse analysis shows that the word order patterns which are common with transitive bare verb stems are those commonly found with AT, not those commonly found with PT, and the same is true with respect to clausal complements. The discourse evidence also shows that with respect to referentiality, animacy, and syntactic form, the patients of transitive bare verb stems differed from PT patients in the same ways that AT patients differed from PT patients. They were consistently less likely to be animate, referential and individuated, with the same corollary differences in syntactic form. In other words, AT patients and transitive bare verb stem patients showed low discourse transitivity values, while PT patients showed high values. Investigation of topicality showed that patients of both AT and transitive bare verb stem clauses were low in topicality, when measured in terms of discourse continuity, while patients of PT clauses were high in topicality. Finally, AT and transitive bare verb stem actors were more topical than their patients, when prior function was considered, while in PT clauses patients were more topical than actors.

The combination of discourse, grammatical and sociolinguistic evidence in favor of classifying transitive bare verb stems as a subset of AT clearly outweighs arguments in favor of classifying transitive bare verb stems as PT on the basis of a similarity in the three related parameters of aspect, mood and timeline.

Considering the transitive bare verb stems as a subset of AT verbs then explains a great deal of the variability in their usage. That it doesn't explain all of it is however hardly surprising, given the complex history of SJI, and the paucity of previous studies of this form. I would therefore like to suggest that, just as the use of *meN-* and *N-* allows for a distinction in level of transitivity within AT (Wouk, this volume) when there is a departure from lower transitivity along the parameters of patient status, so too the use of transitive bare verb stems allows for a distinction in level of transitivity within AT when there is a departure from lower transitivity along the parameters of aspect. It seems that SJI has taken the verbal system of Standard Indonesian, with its correlation between AT (*meN-*) and lower transitivity and between PT (*di-*) and higher transitivity, added forms from Betawi (*N-* and transitive bare verb stems), and carved out individual niches within AT for these added forms.

# REFERENCES

Cartier, Alice. 1976. "Une langue a double construction objective et ergative: l'indonesien." *La Linguistique* 12, 99–130.

Cartier, Alice. 1979. "De-voiced transitive verb sentences in Formal Indonesian." In: F. Plank (ed.) *Ergativity: Towards a theory of grammatical relation*, 161–183. New York: Academic Press.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. "Stem Sentences in Indonesian." In: S. Wurm & L. Carrington (ed.), *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings*, 335-365. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology.* (second edition) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cooreman, Anne, Barbara Fox and Talmy Givon. 1984. "The Discourse Definition of Ergativity." *Studies in Language* 8.1, 1–34.

Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1978. *Sentence Patterns of Indonesian.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Dixon, R, M. W. 1979. "Ergativity." *Language* 55, 59–138.

Du Bois, John. 1980. "Beyond Definiteness: the trace of identity in discourse". In: Chafe, Wallace (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*, 203–274. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Du Bois, John . 1987. "The discourse basis of ergativity." *Language* 63, 805–855.

Du Bois, John, Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino, and Susanna Cumming. 1993. "Outline of discourse transcription." In: Edwards, Jane and Martin Lampert, (eds.), *Talking data: Transcription and coding methods for language research*, 45–89. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fox, Barbara. 1987. *Discourse structure and anaphora: Written and conversational English.* Cambridge studies in linguistics, 48. Cambridge: University Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1983. *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1994a. *Voice and Inversion.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1994b. "The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion." In: Givon, T. (ed.),*Voice and Inversion* , 3–44. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1980. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse." *Language* 56:2, 251–299.

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1983. "The verbal aspect: a case of the Indonesian Passives." In: A. Halim, L. Carrington and S. Wurm (eds.), *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol 4. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1986. "The presence and absence of *meN-*: The Indonesian transitive verbs." In: P. Geraghty, L. Carrington and S. Wurm (eds.), *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 159–170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

McCune, Keith. 1979. "Passive Function and the Indonesian Passive." *Oceanic Linguistics* 18, 119–170.

Ono, Tsuyoshi and Sandra Thompson. 1995. "What can conversation tell us about syntax." In: Davis, Philip, (ed.), *Alternative Linguistics: Descriptive and Theoretical Modes*, 213–271. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Sarumpaet, J.P. 1966. *The Structure of Bahasa Indonesia.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Singgih, Amin. 1977. *Learning Bahasa Indonesia Without Teacher.* Jakarta: Erlangga.

Tchekoff, Claude. 1980. "The economy of a voice-neutral verb: An example from Indonesian." In: P. Naylor, (ed.) *Austronesian Studies: Papers from the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, 71–81.Ann Arbor: Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia 15.

Thomas, Michael R. 1978. "Unmarked Verbs in Indonesian." *NUSA* 6, 7–10.

Verhaar, John W.M. 1978. "Passive in Indonesian." *NUSA* 6, 11–19.

Wallace, Steven. 1977. "Voice, Mode or Aspect? The Semantics of Verbal Prefixes in Jakarta Malay." In F. Van Coetsem and L. Waugh (eds.), *Cornell Contributions in Linguistics*, Vol 2, 151–178. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Winstedt, R. O. 1914. *Malay Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolff, John U. 1980. *Beginning Indonesian*. Ithaca: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.

Wouk, Fay. 1984. "Scalar Transitivity and Trigger Choice in Toba Batak." In: P. Shcachter (ed.),*Studies in the Structure of Toba Batak* . Los Angeles: UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 195–219.

Wouk, Fay. 1986. "Transitivity in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian and Proto-Austronesian." In: S. Wurm and L. Carrington (eds.). *The Proceedings from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics* . Canberra: Australian National University Press, 133–158.

Wouk, Fay. 1996. "Voice in Indonesian discourse and its implications for theories of the development of ergativity." *Studi.s in Language*. 20:2, 361–410.

Wouk, Fay. 1999. "Dialect Contact and Koineization in Jakarta, Indonesia." *Language Sciences* 21, 61–86.

Wouk, Fay (this volume) "Nasal transitive prefixes in Spoken Jakarta Indonesian." *NUSA* 53, 24–28.

Appendix: Transcription Conventions

Punctuation reflects intonational patterns, not syntactic structures. A period represents falling intonation, a comma represents a slight fall, and a question mark represents a rise. Spelling generally follows Standard Indonesian orthography. However, when there is more than one pronunciation of a word in colloquial speech, the spelling reflects the pronunciation used. Pauses between words or syllables are represented within parentheses, by the length of the pause, which is measured in conversational beats, e.g. (.25) for a quarter of a beat. A conversational beat is derived by counting one-one thousand, two-one thousand etc. during a pause, in time to the rhythm of the conversation, four-one thousand being one beat.

The following abbreviations are used in glossing the transcriptions:

| | |
|---|---|
| EMPH | emphatic particle |
| REL | relative clause marker |
| AGRMT | agreement seeking particle |
| 3SG | third person singular |
| GEN | genitive marker |

Table 1   Verb Affixes in Formal and Informal Speech

| | Bare Stem | *di-*/clitic | *meN-* | *N-* | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Formal | 28 (16%) | 46 (22%) | 72 (60%) | 5 (7%) | 151 (27%) |
| Informal | 145 (84%) | 156 (78%) | 48 (40%) | 65 (93%) | 414 (73%) |
| Total | 173 | 202 | 120 | 70 | 565 |

Table 2   Position of Actor

| | PreV A | PostV A | Total overt As |
|---|---|---|---|
| AT | 46 | 0 | 46 |
| Bare stem | 81 | 1 | 82 |
| PT | 3 | 18 | 21 |

Table 3   Position of Patient

| | PreV P | postV P | Total over Ps |
|---|---|---|---|
| AT | 1 | 66 | 67 |
| Bare stem | 17 | 101 | 118 |
| PT | 36 | 16 | 52 |

Table 4   Verbs of Cognition and Speaking

| | Indeterminate | Bare StemAT | PT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *bilang* | 18 (18 clausal) | 12 (8 clausal) | 0 | 2 (1 clausal) |
| *pikir* | 11 (11 clausal) | 3 (3 clausal) | 3 (1 clausal) | 0 |
| *minta* | 1 (1 clausal) | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| *rasa* | 1 (1 clausal) | 2 (1 clausal) | 7 (4 clausal) | 1 |

Table 5   Referentiality of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Non-referential | 46 (45%) | 2 (2%) 84 | (54%) |
| Unidentifield | 16 (16%) | 11 (12%) | 28 (19%) |
| Idenfifiable | 40 (39%) | 75 (86%) | 42 (27%) |

Table 6   Animacy of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Animate | 33 (32%) | 58 (66%) | 103 (66%) |
| Inanimate | 69 (68%) | 30 (34%) | 127 (83%) |

Table 7   Syntactic Form of Patient

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| NP | 50 (49%) | 15 (17%) | 103 (66%) |
| Pronoun | 13 (13%) | 12 (13%) | 14 (9%) |
| Zero | 39 (38%) | 61 (70%) | 39 (25%) |

Table 8   Correlations Among AT, PT, and Bare Stem

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| AT | – |  |  |
| PT | -0.27 | – |  |
| Bare stem | 0.91 | 0.19 | – |

Table 9   Mood

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Indicative | 67 (57%) | 70 (8)% | 125 (79%) |
| Irrealis | 50 (43%) | 18 (20%) | 34 (21%) |

Table 10   Punctuality

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Eventive | 34 (30%) | 59 (67%) | 102 (60%) |
| Non-eventive | 84 (70%) | 29 (33%) | 68 (40%) |

Table 11   Timeline

|  | AT | PT | Bare Stem |
|---|---|---|---|
| Off | 90 (57%) | 46 (52%) | 99 (58%) |
| On | 28 (24%) | 42 (48%) | 71 (42%) |

Table 12  Correlations among AT, PT, and Bare Stem

|          | AT    | PT   | Bare Stem |
|----------|-------|------|-----------|
| AT       | –     |      |           |
| PT       | -0.08 | –    |           |
| Bare stem| 0.12  | 0.98 | –         |

Table 13  Continuity of Patient

|                  | AT       | PT       | Bare Stem  |
|------------------|----------|----------|------------|
| No prior mention | 62 (61%) | 35 (15%) | 113 (72%)  |
| Early mention    | 26 (25%) | 33 (37%) | 12 (7%)    |
| Trigger          | 28 (29%) | 14 (18%) | 59 (37%)   |
| Other            | 2 (3%)   | 5 (3%)   |            |

Table 14  Prior Grammatical Status of Patients

|             | AT       | PT       | Bare Stem |
|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Subject     | 60 (61%) | 35 (44%) | 84 (53%)  |
| Non-trigger | 10 (11%) | 28 (35%) |           |
| Trigger     | 28 (29%) | 14 (18%) | 59 (37%)  |
| Other       | 2 (30%)  | 5 (3%)   |           |

Table 15  Prior Grammatical Status of Actors

|             | AT       | PT       | Bare Stem |
|-------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| Subject     | 17 (46%) | 37 (51%) | 15 (35%)  |
| Non-trigger | 9 (24%)  | 4 (5%)   | 14 (33%)  |
| Trigger     | 11 (30%) | 31 (44%) | 14 (33%)  |

Table 16  Continuity Correlations among AT, PT, and Bare Stems

|          | AT    | PT    | Bare Stem |
|----------|-------|-------|-----------|
| AT       | –     |       |           |
| PT       | -0.10 | –     |           |
| Bare stem| 0.95  | -0.28 | –         |