

J. V. Dreyfuss

This paper presents several alternative analyses of the ber-/meN- and di- prefixes in Indonesian. The first is an Intransitive/Transitive analysis, the second is an Active/Stative analysis, and lastly I present a case role analysis which I will argue, leaves a smaller residue than either of the other analyses. My method of presentation is Goldilocks like in that I present first a theory which is too hot, then one which is too cold, and lastly my own theory, which if not just right, seems to cover the data more completely than the other two.

TRANSITIVE/INTRANSITIVE ANALYSIS

A tempting analysis for meN-/di- and ber- has meN- as a so-called "active-transitive prefix", di- being one of its passive counterparts, and ber- as an "intransitive", or "intransitivizing" prefix. Beginning with ber-, it does seem to be the case that the majority of ber- forms occur in one-argument clauses at least on the surface. Even forms such as (1) and (2) where in the English translation we can isolate a direct object we can argue that Indonesian invites a one-argument analysis by incorporating the semantic direct object into the verb stem:

- (1) Saya ber-sepeda.
'I bicycle.' or 'I own a bicycle.'
- (2) Perempuan itu ber-anak.
'That woman gave birth.' or 'That woman has a child.'

What is semantically and syntactically an object in English becomes syntactically and morphologically a verb in Indonesian in these examples.

There are several examples of ber- forms which appear to be transitive. A couple of examples follow as in (3) and (4):

- (3) Dia ber-tanam padi.
'He plants rice [habitually, or generically].'
- (4) Pemerintahan ini ber-dasar-kan agama.
'This government is based on religion.'

I argue that sentences of (3) and (4)'s type are only superficially transitive. In fact neither (3) nor (4) has a passive counterpart. So truth-conditionally, (5) is not equivalent to (3) (although it is grammatical) and (6) is unacceptable:

- (5) Padi di-tanam-nya.
'Rice was planted by him.'
- (6) *Agama di-dasar-kan (oleh) pemerintahan ini.
'.....'

Topicalization or Clefting of the putative syntactic direct object in (3) will produce an unacceptable counterpart in (7):

- (7) *Padi yang dia ber-tanam.
'It is rice that he plants.'

Under normal circumstances the object in (3) cannot be free-

ly quantified as (8) is meant to illustrate:

- (8) Dia ber-tanam (*dua, *batang) padi.
'He plants (*2, *stick) rice.'

We see that with respect to three syntactic operations: Passive, Topicalization, and Quantification, the putative direct object in (3) seems to be inaccessible. We argue therefore that what we have in sentences like (3) is a case of object incorporation. The object seems glued to the verb. Sentences of this sort we may call "derived intransitives". Thus it appears that the hypothesis that ber- serves to mark intransitives is still an accurate statement, whether underlying or derived.

In Classical Malay we have (what to me are) several perplexing examples first pointed out by Winstedt (1913) where ber- and meN- seem to be used interchangeably as in (9), where both ber- and meN- apparently may be followed by direct objects with qualifying adjectives (neither the ber- nor the meN- plus Direct object seems generic):

- (9) Maka sultan Mansur Sjah memberi titah pada bendahara menyuruh berbuat istana.... Maka orang Ungaran berbuat istana besar dan orang Tunkal membuat istana kecil.... (Sejarah Melayu p. 153)

As my understanding of the classical text is less than sufficient and given the possibility of scribal errors in such texts I leave the question open as to what was or what were the classical distinctions between meN- and ber-. If anyone reading this paper can shed any light on this mystery I, for one, would be most grateful.

To this point then, we have shown that at least in the modern system, ber- occurs only in Intransitives on the surface. Sentences like (3) prove to be intransitive as what initially looks like a direct object proves to be inaccessible to various syntactic operations such as Passive, Topicalization, and Quantification.

What then about meN- and di-? In most accounts meN- and di- are said to be related derivationally, di- being the so-called passive equivalent in (10b) and (11b) to meN- sentences (10a) and (11a):

- (10a) Mus me-mukul dinding itu.
'M. hit that wall.'
- (10b) Dinding itu di-pukul (oleh) Mus.
'That wall was hit by M.'
- (11a) Dia men-jalan-i jalan.
'He walked the road.'
- (11b) Jalan di-jalan-i.
'The road was walked [by someone].'

There is some problem in equating the passive in Indonesian with an English type passive. For one thing passive type constructions occur much more frequently in Indonesian than they do in English. In fact, it seems that there are several syntactic templates in Indonesian which may be called

structurally or typologically passive, or passive like. Note in the following examples (12) - (14) that there is together with a morphological change in the verb an entity up front which is semantically patient and an entity following the verb which is more or less semantically agent:

- (12) Buku itu di-bawa (oleh) Ali.
'That book was brought by Ali.'
- (13) Saya ter-tarik (oleh) orang itu.
'I was attracted by that person.'
- (14) Rumah ini ke-jatuh-an pohon.
'This house was fallen on by a tree.'

As Soenjono Dardjowidjojo pointed out in his 1974 paper entitled, "Passives as Reflections of Thought; an example from Indonesian", this perponderance of "passive" forms wants explaining. We seem to have a cline of agentivity represented in (12) - (14) with a fully responsible agent in (12), an accidentally involved agent in (13), and in (14) an agent whose destiny is controlled only by nature.

As many have spoken to, there is in Indonesian culture a considerable amount of attention paid to the THOU or OTHER. One's behavior in almost any Indonesian cultural context seems greatly shaped by the perceived needs of the other. Ego, or agent non-involvement seems traditionally, at least, to be an Indonesian cultural ideal. It should not be particularly surprising therefore to find the grammar of Indonesian mimicing or mirroring Indonesian Phenomenology in diminishing or lessening the clout of ego or agent and promentizing or highlighting the role of patient or other in the many passive forms. Relatively subtle distinctions from an English point of view involving levels of ego or agent involvement seem to be morphologically marked in Indonesian in these various passives illustrated above.

Both the frequency and elaboration of the various passive forms in Indonesian brings up the question of derivational primacy. Which is more basic: the meN- or the di- and other passive forms? Which is derived from which? A second problem in equating Indonesian passives to an English type passive is that there is a lack of meaning equivalence between the active and passive forms and this fact is morphologically marked in the passive; but not in the meN- or active form. One quick example of non-equivalence truth-conditionally between a ter- and a meN- is illustrated in (13b) and (13c) where in (13b) accidental agentivity is morphologically explicit, marked by the ter- prefix, and in (13c) the volition of the agent is ambiguous:

- (13b) Mereka ter-ganggu (oleh) anak itu.
'They were disturbed by the child [+ accidentally].'
- (13c) Anak itu meng-ganggu mereka.
'That child disturbed them [+ accidentally].'

A third problem in equating di- forms with an English type passive is that in traditional Malay, word order was apparently freer than it is today. A baffling example from Warisan Prosa Klasik (p. 92) illustrating this point follows in (15):

- (15) Maka oleh Hanuman di-palu-nya bahu Indrajit dengan kayu.
'Then by Hanuman was hit by him the shoulder of Indrajit with wood.'

Note that not only does the agent Hanuman precede the di- verb but it appears to be marked redundantly in both the di- prefix (a reduced 3rd person agent-personal communication from A.L. Becker) and by the -nya suffix on the verb also marking the same 3rd person agent. The logical object in (15) follows the verb just as it would normally in a meN- sentence. What motivated the syntax of (15) is beyond any analysis I can presently offer. Comments or suggestions would be most welcome on this point.

This section on di- and the other passive forms has discussed several of the problems we encounter both semantic and syntactic in talking about "passives" in Indonesian, and therefore in associating them derivationally to the active meN- form

Returning to meN- we find that the majority of meN- prefixed verbs occur in two or more argument (i.e. transitive) constructions. Typically the agent coded entity comes first and the second argument immediately follows the verb. There are, however, a considerable number of one argument clauses marked by meN-. A few examples follow illustrated by (16) - (21):

- (16) Saya me-rasa sakit.
'I feel sick.'
- (17) Barometer itu sedang me-nurun.
'That Barometer is falling.'
- (18) Saya mengantuk.
'I'm sleepy.'
- (19) Dia meng-inap di hotel itu.
'He stayed overnight in that hotel.'
- (20) Teman-ku meng-anggur bulan ini.
'My friend is out of work this month.'
- (21) Mereka me-nangis sepanjang malam.
'They cried the whole night long.'

Sentences (16) - (21) are illustrative of what seems to be a significant residue to the claim that meN- marks transitivity. That is, although the majority of meN- verbs occur in transitive clauses (i.e. two or more arguments) there is a considerable residue of intransitive clauses marked by meN-.¹

To this point then we have seen that while ber- does seem to occur in intransitives only, whether underlying or derived, the evidence concerning meN- as marking transitivity is inconclusive. We have also observed that there are problems in relating derivationally, the meN- or so-called active form, to the di- and other so-called "passive" forms.

STATIVE/ACTIVE ANALYSIS

A second possible analysis for these three prefixes has ber- marking a stative function, and meN- and di- marking event or action functions in the grammar. The second half of this generalization does seem to be the case most of the time. MeN- and di- do seem to mark events rather than states. Illustrative of this difference in function is (22a) and (22b):

- (22a) Kapal itu ber-cat merah.
'That boat was painted red [+ state].'

- (22b) Kapal itu di-cat merah.
'That boat was painted red [+ event].'

This difference in function is more clearly seen when adverbial modification is added as in (22c) and (22d). The state focus with ber- is ungrammatical while the di- or event focus sentence is o.k.:

- (22c) Kapal itu ber-cat merah (*dengan hati-hati).
'That boat was painted red with care.'

- (22d) Kapal itu di-cat merah dengan hati-hati.
'That boat was painted red with care.'

Note that the English counterpart to both a and b above would be the same as in (23):

- (23) That boat was painted red.

Thus Indonesian makes a morphological distinction between event and stative focuses where English does not.

There are several examples of meN- occurring in what appears to be stative constructions. The following examples (24a) and (24b) were given me by professor Samsuri of IKIP Malang:

- (24a) Saya me-rasa sakit.
'I feel sick.'

- (24b) Saya be-rasa sakit.
'I feel sick.'

Samsuri tells me (personal communication) that (24a) or the meN- form tends to be used by younger people in his experience and that the ber- by older people. He suggests jokingly that perhaps older people are more stative than younger people. I suspect there may well be some truth to his evaluation of the difference between (24a) and (24b). It may well be that sickness or bad health appears to be more temporary from the point of view of youth, and more generic or timeless when viewed from an elderly person's point of view. Two levels of stativity would thus be marked here, one a temporary stativity marked by meN- as opposed to a longer lasting state marked by ber-.

A more serious problem for the ber- as stative marking and di-/meN- as event function marking analysis is that there exist many ber- motion or action verbs. I will list a few as in examples (25) - (28), and leave the question open as to how a stative function analysis could be preserved for ber-:

- (25) Saya ber-lari ke pasar kemarin.
'I ran to the market yesterday.'
- (26) Saudara akan ber-jalan ke rumah saya besok.
'You will walk to my house tomorrow.'
- (27) Mereka sedang ber-belanja sekarang.
'They are shopping now.'
- (28) Baru saja dia ber-henti.
'He just stopped.'

There is also some residue of meN- occurring in what appears to be functionally stative clauses. I repeat (24a) here and add a few more to the list:

- (24a) Saya me-rasa sakit.
'I feel sick.'

- (29) Rupa-nya, wanita itu mengantuk.
'Apparently, that woman is sleepy.'

- (30) Bapaknya meng-anggur tahun ini.
'His father is out of work this year.'

Perhaps Samsuri's suggestion that there may be contrasting levels of stativity is a fruitful road to research with meN- statives.

In summary then, it appears that the majority of meN- and di- forms are functionally active while the majority of ber- forms are functionally stative. However, there is a significant residue of ber- forms which are used in functionally active clauses, and a somewhat smaller corpus of examples of meN- forms that are stative, to some degree at least.

SEMANTIC CASE ROLE ANALYSIS

In this final section I argue that a meN- or a di- prefix on a verb with no other affixes indicates that there is an entity in the clause that is semantically coded as patient or experiencer. I argue that the agent in such clauses is actually more dispensable than the patient/experiencer. My arguments for the above are based on intransitive meN- clauses and di- clauses where these prefixes are the only affix on the verb.

Secondly, I argue that ber- provides us with less certain semantic case role information. The single argument of ber- marked clauses may be agent, as in (25) - (28), or patient, as in (22a), or semantically of mixed case, as is the case in reciprocals where each participant is semantically both an agent and a patient. Even in examples such as (3) where we seem to have both an agent and a patient which are separately distinguishable for case roles (Dia ber-tanam padi. / 'He plants rice [+generic]'); I argue that case role information is backgrounded informationally as what seems to be important in (3) is a general description of the man in question not a statement about his participation in some local event. I suspect that the lack of syntactic prominence for the patient entity in sentences like (3) (i.e. it cannot be moved or quantified) correlates with the fact that the case role of patient is presupposed and not asserted informationally. Thus, I argue that whether or not the patient entity in a clause is syntactically prominent correlates with whether or not case role information is primary in the clause; when the patient entity lacks such prominence as in (3) case role information (although clear) seems to be backgrounded to some other clausal function such as characterizing an individual beyond a particular event.

Let us first look at single argument meN- and di- clauses where these affixes are the only affix on the verb. Sentences (16) - (21) are a fair sampling of intransitive meN- clauses. It seems to be the case that of these examples only (19) is not clearly a patient or experiencer in its case role. In none of these examples is an agent referentially recoverable. The generalization that I am claiming here is that with regard to intransitive meN- clauses, the single argument more often than not is patient/experiencer rather than agent in its case role, and that this fact informs us that in Indonesian, patient is a more primacy case role category than is agent.²

It is important to note that transitive meN- clauses do not decide the issue as we cannot tell which of the two noun entities is being tokened by the meN- prefix. It is my impression

that many researchers in Indonesian have been fooled by the proximity of the agent NP to the meN- prefix in transitive clauses, and have called the meN- an "actor" indicating prefix.³ I suspect that the appellation "actor" is meant to cover the semantic case role ambiguity for the entity immediately preceding a meN- form. That is, although an entity coded for agent typically precedes a transitive meN- clause, the entity in an intransitive meN- clause is more often patient or experiencer in its case role and it too immediately precedes the meN- prefix. It seems as if there are various problems in using "actor" as a semantic case role category as it is not necessarily equivalent to agent as in (16) - (18), (20), and (21). "Actor" seems to have a wider semantic domain than do other case role categories such as Locative, Instrument, Agent, Patient, Benefactive...etc. Investigators who use "actor" as a case role category seem to mean that the actor entity is sometimes an agent and sometimes a patient or experiencer. "Actor" seems to me to be a fudge or a hedge semantically.

In my analysis of meN- I claim that meN- signals the fact that there is an entity in the clause which is semantically patient or experiencer⁴ although that entity need not come immediately before the meN-. Thus I make no claims about word order in terms of where that entity will be located.

Now, the claim I make is testable. We have only to look at intransitive meN- clauses to decide the issue. Transitive meN- clauses where meN- is the only verbal affix always have a patient entity which is referentially recoverable.⁵

There is a class of intransitive meN- clauses which may be described as inchoative in that the single noun entity changes its state as a result of being impinged upon, usually by nature. Several examples follow:

- (31) Pada musim ini bunga-bunga semua-nya menguning.
'This time of year all the flowers turn yellow.'
- (32) Baju saya sudah mengering.
'My shirt has already dried.'
- (33) Laut Caribe membiru sesudah hujan.
'The Carribbean sea becomes blue after it rains.'

In these above examples we have a single entity which is patient to some natural force. Examples (16) - (21) provide us with what seems to me to be a typical sample of intransitive meN- clauses. As noted before, only (19) seems to be an exception to the generalization that the single entity in intransitive meN- clauses where meN- is the only verbal affix will be patient/experiencer in its case role.

There are other exceptions to my generalization as well. Several that I have found follow:

- (34) Saya menari.
'I dance.'⁶
- (35) Saya menyanyi.
'I sing.'
- (36) Saya melompat dari pohon kelapa itu.
'I jumped from that coconut tree.'

My claim therefore, has to be weakened as there are exceptions. Restated, I claim that where meN- is the only affix there will be without exception an entity which is patient in its case role in transitive clauses and in a majority of cases

in intransitive clauses.

It seems to me therefore that an entity whose case role is patient or experiencer more frequently co-occurs with meN- (when meN- is the unique affix) than does an entity whose case role is agent. It is in this sense that I claim that the case role of patient is morphologically more primary than is the case role of agent in Indonesian.

Where di- is the only verbal affix, there is without exception a syntactically prominent entity whose case role is patient. In fact the agent is often not recoverable, referentially.⁷ Thus, it seems that systematically, an entity whose case role is patient is more indispensable than an entity whose case role is agent where we have either a di- or a meN- as the only verbal affix.

Ber-, I argue, gives less certain case role information than does meN- or di-. We find single argument ber- motion verbs like 'run, walk, stop, swim, and shop', where the single argument seems agent in its case role. We find as well single argument ber- clauses like (22a) where the case role seems more patient like than anything else. We find as well a few generics or occupationals like (3) where we have ber- occurring in a clause with both an agent and a patient although case role information seems secondary to the fact of general characterization of the person involved. Ber- also occurs in clauses where entities are of mixed or of more than one case role semantically. Reciprocals are commonly formed by reduplicating the verb stem and suffixing an -an to the verb and prefixing the verb with ber-.⁸ A couple of examples follow:

- (37) Jon dan Mus ber-pukul-pukul-an.
'J. and M. were hitting each other.'
- (38) Anak yang dua itu ber-kejar-kejar-an.
'Those two children were chasing e.o.'

Reciprocals are heartland examples where each participating entity is both an agent and a patient with respect to the other.

Ber- is also used in simulfactive clauses (personal communication-pointed out to me by Professor Anton Moeliono) where we seem to have a sharing of the agent role; or a diffusion of responsibility among various participants as in the following two examples:

- (39) Tati dan Mustafa ber-datang-an.
'T. and M. came together.'
- (40) Kami berdua ber-jual-an sayur-sayur-an di pasar kemarin.
'We two sold vegetables at the market yesterday.'

Ber-, I argue, is a question raiser in terms of case role information. Its presence in a clause tells us something like 'suspend judgement' as to what case role relationships will obtain.

It is interesting to note that while the verbal suffix -i may occur with both meN- and di-, it can never co-occur with ber-. Ber- seems to deny morphological elaboration of case role information and this particular co-occurrence constraint seems to bear witness to this fact. MeN- and di-, on the other hand, function to foreground or assert case role information.

From a cursory examination of old Malay texts such as the Hikajat Petani, now being worked on by Danielo Ajamiseba at Michigan, and sections from Warisan Prosa Klasik I have found a tendency that ber- verbs come most frequently in the

beginning of the text. Generics, existentials and statives abound in the beginning of such texts. It is as if ber- serves the function of populating the world in these texts, setting out the actors or characterizing them in some general way so that later in the text they may participate in specific or time bound events more fully elaborated by meN- and di- verbs. Thus, if this road of investigation bears any fruit, it would appear that not only is case role information being promentized by meN- and di- but not by ber-, but that the use of these prefixes correlate with different text strategies as well; the ber- indexing the script or ballpark of discourse⁹, and the meN- and di- marking the instantiation of the script in some specific event.

SUMMARY OF ALL THREE ANALYSES ALA GOLDBLOCKS

A. Transitive/Intransitive analysis: hypothesis plus short discussion

1. meN- signals transitivity (i.e. at least two syntactically prominent entities.)
2. di- and other passive forms are derivationally related to meN- forms
3. ber- signals intransitivity

Discussion:

While it is true that ber- occurs in intransitives only whether underlying or derived, it is not true that meN- occurs only in transitives. In fact, there is a considerable residue of intransitive meN- forms.

There are several problems involved in relating the several passive forms in Indonesian to meN- derivationally: (a) di- and the other passives occur much more frequently than do passive structures in English; this raises the problem of derivational primacy. (b) There is often non-equivalence truth conditionally between the various passives and the meN- form of the same verb as various levels of agentivity seem to be distinguished morphologically in the passive forms but not in the meN- or 'active form'. (c) Word order evidence often fails to distinguish di- form from meN- forms; for example, a di- clause as in (15) may have a preceding agent and a logical direct object which follows the verb, as is the case with meN- verbs normally.

B. Stative/Active¹⁰ analysis: hypothesis plus short discussion

1. meN-/di- Both meN- and di- signal event or action focuses
2. ber- signals stativity

Discussion:

While it is true that most meN- and di- forms occur in functionally active clauses, there is some residue of meN- forms which appear in functionally stative clauses. Perhaps, Samsuri's suggestion that meN- marked statives may contrast with ber- statives; meN- indicating a more temporary stativity than ber- statives may bear fruit. This area remains to be researched in greater detail. Now, while ber- often occurs in functionally stative clauses there is a considerable residue of ber- action or motion verbs such as 'walking (ber-jalan)', 'running (ber-lari)', 'swimming (berenang)', etc.

C. Semantic case role analysis: hypothesis plus short discussion

1. both meN- and di- when only affix, signal patient/experi-

encer's presence in the clause. That entity is syntactically prominent.

2. ber- backgrounds case role information. Case role information cannot be predicted when ber- occurs.

Discussion:

In transitive meN- or di- clauses there is without exception a syntactically prominent patient/experiencer entity when meN- or di- is the only affix. In intransitive meN- clauses there is in a majority of cases a patient/experiencer entity when meN- is the only affix. If we assume that meN- marks the presence of an agent in the clause we will have a much larger residue of intransitive patient only clauses than if we assume that meN- marks a patient's presence. If we argue that meN- marks transitivity we will also have a much larger residue than if we assume a patient signalling function for meN-. This paper argues for the case role analysis based only on its having a smaller residue than either of the other two analyses discussed.

Ber- clauses seem not to be constrained by particular case role requirements. We find agent only clauses (such as 'walk, swim, run...etc. '), and patient only clauses (such as 'painted'...). We find as well ber- marked generics or occupationals where we have both an agent and a patient in the clause although the patient is generic. It is suggested that the lack of syntactic prominence for the patient entity in ber- marked clauses (i.e. it cannot be passivized, topicalized, or quantified) correlates with the fact that case role information is of a secondary nature in such clauses (i.e. 'backgrounded')¹¹.

While meN- and di- may co-occur with the -i suffix ber- may not. This co-occurrence constraint suggests that ber- seems to deny a morphological elaboration of case role information while meN- and di- do not.

It is suggested that meN-, di- and ber- may have served textual functions in the classical Malay system. Ber- seems to occur most frequently at the very beginning of texts and meN- and di- come later only after the text has first been contextualized. It is suggested that ber- may have had the textual function of 'setting the stage', or of 'populating the world' meN- and di- coming later on in the text their functions being to elaborate or instantiate the general 'script' information first introduced by ber- verbs.

University of Michigan/IKIP Malang

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the following people for their help and encouragement throughout the various rewrites of this paper; A. L. Becker, P. Hook, C. Driver, I. Sihombing, N. Achmad, P. Henry, P. Naylor, J. Grima, S. Djawanai, J. Lawler, C. Pville, A. Moeliono, J. Verhaar, S. Chung and many others. To them all I offer my thanks, and particularly to my Indonesian Friends I hope I have not tortured your language too much in my analysis. All errors are of course my responsibility alone.

NOTES

1. One fact supporting a Transitive/Intransitive analysis with meN- marking transitivity is that in Imperatives transitive verbs lose the meN- prefix while intransitive verbs retain it. This fact was originally pointed out to me by Sandra Chung and John Verhaar.

2. My point here is that patient/experiencer is morphologically more primary than is agent. I base this generali-

zation for Indonesian on the fact that in di- clauses (where di- is the only affix) an entity whose case role is patient is obligatory where the agent is not, and in meN- clauses (where meN- is the only affix) a patient/experiencer is statistically present more of the time than is an agent.

3. Michael Thomas in his papers for both The Second International Austronesian Conference (held in Ann Arbor in May, 1976) and the Hawaii L.S.A. Austronesian Symposium (August, 1977) equates meN- to 'Actor Focus', by which he seems to mean sometimes agent and sometimes experiencer.

The tradition of using the term "Actor Focus" to designate a semantic/case role category is not original with M. Thomas. Philippine Linguists have traditionally referred to the Mag-/Nag-, and -um- affixes as "Actor Focus" affixes. The Philippine Linguists Paz Naylor, Otnes...etc.) have also intended the term to cover both agents and experiencers.

4. In meN- transitive clauses the patient typically follows the verb assuming no -kan nor -i suffix, and in meN- intransitives the patient/experiencer typically precedes the verb.

5. In normal conversation (i.e. not elicited sentences) there are data such as saya me-mukul 'I hit...' where although an object or patient of the 'hitting' is not mentioned it is known to both participants in the conversation. So, in a conversation which began with the question 'Who was hitting that guy?' the answer 'I hit' becomes contextualized and therefore understandable even without the patient on the surface. The point here is, however, that even in such cases as these, the patient is referentially recoverable.

6. John Grima here at the University of Michigan tells me that in Thai languages the verbs 'sing', and 'dance', are transitive. So we have Thai sentences which are of the form 'sing a song', and 'dance a dance'. It is remotely possible that such was the form in Malay at some earlier period but I have not found any evidence for this as yet.

7. There are many examples of di- sentences where the agent is not recoverable. An analogous example from English: 'Apparently, this cake was eaten', has no recoverable agent referentially, although some agent is abstractly needed.

8. There is a second strategy for forming reciprocals which seems to have less general application. This other reciprocal strategy has a reduplicated verb stem with a meN- prefix on the second half. One example follows:

- (i) Saya dan dia surat-me-nyurat.
'He and I write letters to each other.'

I have no particular insights to share regarding the 'V meN- V' reciprocal forming strategy and would welcome comments on this form.

9. These observations about ber-/meN- and di- as serving textual functions is offered tentatively here. Thorough research on this question remains to be done.

10. Professor Anton Moeliono informs me that Samsuri himself does not use the contrast 'Active/Stative', but rather 'Transient/Stative'. Since I am not debating the relative merits of one term with the other here I have nothing to say about this difference in terms. I assume the difference in

terms here is not crucial to any of the arguments discussed.

11. Talmy Givon has argued in various articles that SVO is a preferred word order in languages which lack case marking systems. His point is that word order often assumes the burden of keeping case role information clear when case marking systems fall apart. We note that in the English sentence,

- (ii) 'He's a rice-planter.'

normal English word order which has objects following verbs is suspended just in case the object is generic in import. We note that the incorporated object in (ii) is inaccessible to various syntactic operations such as clefting, relativization, and passive. I argue that in such cases as (ii) represent the normal English word order which functions to keep case role information clear is suspended just in those cases where case role information is not being asserted; that is, case role information is already clear in (ii). The point of (ii) is to characterize this person beyond a particular event just as (3) does in Indonesian. In both the Indonesian and the English examples of Object incorporation there is a lack of syntactic prominence for the object NP which corresponds to a generic sense to the utterance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abdullah bin Abdulkadir Munsji. 1952. Sedjarah Melaju. Penerbit Djanabatan. Djakarta.
- Adjamiseba, Danielo. 1977. Seminar Discussion on Old Malay Text Building Strategies. (personal communication).
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1974. "Passives as Reflections of Thought", in Northern Illinois University's Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Fokker, A.A. 1960. Sintaksis Indonesia. J.B. Wolters.
- Givon, Talmy. 1976a. "On the VS Word Order in Israeli Hebrew: Pragmatics and Typological Change", in P. Cole (ed.) Papers in Hebrew Syntax. North Holland Press.
- , -----, 1976b. "The Change from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatic Connection", in Charles Li (ed.) Syntactic Change. (to appear).
- Osman, M.T., and Sham, A.H. (eds.). 1975. Warisan Prosa Klasik. Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka. Kuala Lumpur.
- Postal, Paul. 1977. "Antipassive in French". (to appear).
- Samsuri. (personal communication).
- Schachter, Paul and Otnes, Fe. T. 1972. Tagalog Reference Grammar. University of California Press.
- Slametmuljana, Dr. 1969. Kaidah Bahasa Indonesia. Arnoldus.
- Thomas, Michael. 1976. "Verb Affixes and Focus in Bahasa Indonesia", a paper presented at Austronesian Conference in Ann Arbor, May 1976.
- , -----, 1977. "Indonesian's Unmarked Verbs", a paper presented at Hawaii Austronesian Conference, Summer 1977.
- Windstedt, R.O. 1913. Malay Grammar. Oxford.

* * *