MEN-, DI-, AND BER—THREE ANALYSES

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/Static 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.
'He 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) Dia 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 freely quantified as (8) is meant to illustrate:

(8) Dia ber-tanam (*dua, *hatang) 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 preplexing 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 . . . (Seja.ah Mel.ayu 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 an pohon.
   'This house was fallen on by a tree.'

As Soenjono Dardjovidjo pointed out in his 1974 paper entitled, "Passives as Reflections of Thought: an example from Indonesian", this preponderance 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 mimicking or mirroring Indonesian Phenomenology in diminishing or lessening the clout of ego or agent and prominence and 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-conditionality 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 Klasis (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 menganguk.
   'I'm so sorry.'

(19) Dia meng-nap di hotel itu.
   'He stayed overnight in that hotel.'

(20) Teman-ku meng-anggap bulan ini.
   'My friend is out of work this month.'

(21) Mereka me-nangis sepantjang 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-.

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 c. 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 ber-pulang.
   'That boat was sailed back [+] event.'
(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 KIP 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 their 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 affxes 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 these examples only (19) is not clearly a patient or experiencer in its case role. In none of these examples is an agent referential 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 primary case role category than is agent.

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 the 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 cover 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 mean 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 experiencer 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.

There is a class of intransitive meN- clauses which may be described as inchoative in that the single noun entity
always changes its state as a result of being impressed 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 meningar.
"My shirt is already dried."

(33) Laut Carribean membrum sesudah hujan.
"The Carribean 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 above, 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 of them I have found follow:

(34) Saya menari.
"I dance."2

(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 experience more frequently co-occurs with meN-
(with 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

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.
As I have mentioned, an entity whose case role is patient is more indisputable 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 occupational like (3) where we have ber-
occuring in a clause with both an agent and a patient although
case role information seems secondary to the fact of general
classification of the person involved. Ber- also occurs in
clauses where entities are of mixed of more than one case role semantically. Reciprocals are commonly formed by
re-duplicating the verb stem and suffixing an -an to the verb and prefixing the verb with ber-. 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 simulative clauses (personal communication-pointed out to me by Professor Anton McEllon) where we seem to have a sharing of the agent -oleg or a diffusion of responsibility among various participants as in the following two examples:

(39) Iati dan Mustafa ber-dating-an.
"T. and M. came together."

(40) Kami berdua ber-jua-lan 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 text such as the
Hikajat Petani, now being worked on by Danielo Aulenseba
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 are bound 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 promenitized 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 discourse and the meN- and di- marking the instantiation of the script in some specific event.

SUMMARY OF ALL THREE ANALYSES ALA GOLDILOCKS

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 when the underlying or derived is, it is not true that meN- occurs only in intransitives. 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 of 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- 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. Static/Active analysis: hypothesis plus short discussion
1. meN-/di- Both meN- and di- signal event or action focuses
2. ber- signal's 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 static 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 static clauses there is a considerable residue of ber- action or motion verbs such as 'walking (ber-jalan)', 'running (ber-lari)', 'swimming (ber-renang)', etc.

C. Semantic case role analysis: hypothesis plus short discussion
1. both meN- and di- when only affix, signal patient/experiencer'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 signaling 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 occupationally 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').

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.
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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, Ootanes... 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 in his paper 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) S:ya dan dia surai-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 Zioellino informs me that Samsuri himself does not use the contrast 'Active/Static', but rather 'Transient/Static'. 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.
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INDONESIAN'S UNMARKED VERBS

Michael R. Thomas

1. Introduction

In a previous discussion of the Indonesian focus system (Thomas 1977) it was shown that the transitive sentences in this language may be divided into four overtly marked types - Actor Focus (AF), Goal Focus (GF), Referent Focus (RF), and Instrument Focus (IF) according to the following verbal affixes:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{men + verb} & \quad \text{AF} \\
\text{di + verb} & \quad \text{GF} \\
& \quad \text{+ } \emptyset \\
& \quad \text{+ i} \\
& \quad \text{+ kan} \\
\text{RF} & \quad \text{IF}
\end{align*}
\]

1.1. Focus, as used here, is a sentence level, overt marking system whereby the predicate undergoes derivational affixation to specify one of a restricted number of semantically based facts of the happening. Typically, Indo-European speakers tend to subdivide (on the basis of supposedly universal semantic considerations) each overtly marked facet, or focus, into additional unmarked 'categories'. These commonly include: actor/agent, goal/object/patient, temporal/spatial specificity, and instrument/motivation/beneficiary/etc., etc. Since these subdivisions are not overtly marked in Austronesian languages they are, strictly speaking, not syntactic features and for that reason will not be considered a functional part of the focus system, whether or not they do exist on a 'deep-sea' level. Additionally, the focus process itself involves neither topicalization nor emphasis, but the establishment of an equational relationship between the focused verb and one of its associated NP's. Thus, focal elements do not simply assign a syntacto-semantic role to the in-focus (equated) NP, as is true for case markers, they specify the semantic orientation of the VP-NP pair that have been syntactically equated. In light of the foregoing, let us examine the following Indonesian sentences.

(1) Heru men-(tulis)-Ø surat kepada Muti.
AF Heru AF write GF letter to Muti.
'Heren wrote a letter to Muti.'

(2) Heru men-(tulis)-1 buku Muti.
AF Heru AF write RF book Muti.
'Heren scribbled in Muti's book.'

(3) Heru men-(tulis)-kan surat untuk Muti.
AF Heru AF write IF letter for Muti.
'Heren wrote a letter on behalf of Muti.'

Sentences (1), (2), and (3) are actor focus examples in which, as in most cases, attention has been drawn to the in-focus NP (Heron) by preposing. As will be seen in further examples, the in-focus NP need not necessarily be the one which is emphasized or topicalized through some other syntactic device such as preposing. Additionally, it is seen that Indonesian has a dual or secondary focus capability for AF sentences, in which non-Actor Focus (-AF) NP's are indicated by the simultaneous use of one of the -AF suffixes. This double focus marking seems rather rare in terms of the system's characteristics in other Austronesian languages, and many indicate recent change from the more common and more symmetrical systems such as are found on Taiwan and in the Philippines (compare Ferrell 1974, and Naylor 1975).

Indonesian's non-Actor Focus sentences reveal a different pattern, as shown below.

(4) Surat itu di-[tulis]-Ø (oleh) Heru kepada Muti.
GF letter that -AF write GF by Heru to Muti.
'The letter was written by Heru to Muti.'

(5) Buku Muti di-[tulis]-i (oleh) Heru
RF book Muti -AF write RF by Heru.
'Muti's book was scribbled in by Heru.'

(6) Surat itu di-[tulis]-kan (oleh) Heru untuk Muti.
IF letter that -AF write IF by Heru for Muti.
'The letter was written by Heru on behalf of Muti.'

In the above -AF sentences attention is drawn to the in-focus NP's 'book' and 'letter' through preposing, as is true of the actor NP in examples (1), (2), and (3). The prefix di- has replaced the +AF affix, and the exact orientation of the VP-NP pair is specified by the verbal suffix.

It will be noted by those familiar with other focus languages that the construction markers (sometimes erroneously referred to as case marking particles) which normally distinguish in-focus from non-focal NP's are lacking in Indonesian. While non-focal NP's may be identified when used in prepositional phrases, the situation is quite different from one in which each NP is regularly marked, and necessitates heavier reliance on context for identification of the in-focus noun phrase. Indonesian may be in the process of compensating for this lack of overt construction markers, however, by the increasingly common use of verb stems such as oleh dan untuk in extended forms directly analogous to Indo-European prepositions. This usage in turn tends to obscure the basic focus organization and lead some investigators to force Indonesian's focus-based verbal system into a case mold.

With the foregoing as an introduction to the regular appearance of the focus system, the remainder of this study will be concerned with sentences which do not conform to the above pattern with regard to the affixation of transitive verbs. Specifically, this paper will examine sentences in which the verb is not prefixed to show +AF or -AF.

2. Focus and Unmarked Verbs

(7) Anjing itu Arman panggil.
AF dog that Arman call
'Arman called the dog.' or
'The dog was called by Arman.'

In (7) anjing has been preposed for emphasis, but since the verbal prefix is lacking it has been previously considered debatable whether it is also the in-focus NP. In transnational terms, that is, the question asked here is whether sentences such as (7) are derived from type (8) or type (9)
In sentence (11) it is seen that the in-focus NP is not necessarily the NP to which attention is drawn, since ‘Black Dog’ has not been preposed. Thus, the difference in sentences (10) and (11) is not one of focus, but one of emphasis. That this de-emphasis of the focal NP is not only possible in sentences in which the verb is prefixed by the first person pronoun, but also occurs when the third person pronoun is used is shown in (14) where ‘debt’ follows the verb.

(14) Akan di- bayar-

dengan apa hutang-mu?

will 3sg pay GF with what debt 2sg poss.

‘With what will your debt be paid?’

In light of the foregoing, it seems likely that the prefixed forms of the first and third person pronouns serve as non-

focal actors, while their independent counterparts, saya or aku, and dia may function as focal actor NP’s in a way which is analogous to their use in other Austronesian languages.

2.2. For consideration of the second person cases lacking the meN-prefix, we now refer to sentence (12). Here, a form of the second person pronoun (engkau) has been used in a way seemingly identical to the first and third person examples in section 2.1. If kau is also considered non-focal in (12), then can it be said to act as a bound form as in the case of the first and third person pronouns? If kau is being used as a bound form then it should not allow intercession between itself and the unmarked verb to which it is attached, as is true for the prefixed pronouns. From an examination of sentence (15) we see, in fact, that its separation results in only a marginally acceptable sentence (there may be exceptions to this non-insertion rule, however, as will be seen in the summary).

*Kau akan kebut -kan dia.

2sg will startle IF him

The picture emerging from this analysis is that there exist bound forms of the Indonesian pronouns which when pre-

fixed to the transitive verb indicate that the actor is not in a focal relationship. In other words, the prefix di- is not THE non-actor focus marker, as it was previously described, because there is no ‘-AF marker.’ Di- is simply one of several pronouns which when prefixed to the verb indicate that the actor is not focused. It does differ from the other forms, however, in being used automatically, and redundantly, when no other bound pronoun occurs or is appropriate. It is this tendency to place the non-focal actor in third person, as well as the fact that di- preffix is no longer recognized as a short form of the 3sg dia by native speakers, which led to the erro-

neus identification of di- as the non-Actor Focus marker.

With this in mind, we may now ask whether Arman in sentence (7) behaves as a bound form, as does the pronun in sentence (9), or an independent form, as in (9). If it is a bound form then its position immediately before the verb should be obligatory, which may be tested as was kau in (12) and (15). Indeed, as with kau, Arman may not be separated from the unprefixed verb, as is shown by the unacceptability of (16).

*(16) Anjing itu Arman akan panggil-

dog that Arman will call GF

The conclusion of this analysis is, therefore, that sentence (7) is derived from -AF sentence (9) in which the third person pronoun prefix di- has been supplanted by Arman, with
the non-focal actor NP in both cases bound to the verb. The Indonesian Focus System, then, may be outlined as follows: in Actor Focus sentences the position of the pronoun may vary, depending on the desired emphasis, but the verb must be marked with the +AF prefix meN- in GF, RF, and IF sentences the non-focal actor (personal pronoun or name) is bound to the verb, whether or not it is currently recognized as a prefix, and any variation in its position results in an ungrammatical expression.

3. Summary

The type of sentence analyzed in this paper, that is, one without the obvious focus trappings of more common forms, has hindered exploration of the semantic aspects of its use by Indonesian speakers. Even those who cling tenaciously to the dichotomous classification of Indonesian sentences according to the IndoEuropean active and passive model have had considerable difficulty in dealing with this type. Tchekhoff's conclusion that sentences such as (7) are neutral as to voice was itself, I believe, motivated by this dissatisfaction with the previous active/passive descriptions (Tchekhoff 1977). Faced with such a choice for the above constructions she concluded on the basis of semantic considerations that they were neither active nor passive. While I agree with her position on the inadequacy of the earlier model, I do not agree that investigation must remain in the semantic realm because of insufficient syntactic evidence to evaluate the verb phrase-noun phrase relationships in these sentences. That these relationships are discernable syntactically has, I believe, been amply demonstrated here.

3.1. A second area in which a focus analysis of this sentence type has the potential for greater explanatory power is in terms of the different volitional connotations in sentences with and without the +AF prefix. It has been noted by Indonesian speakers that there are different implications for (17) and (18) below, which I have tried to reflect in the glosses.

(17) Dia nggak lihat-Ø.
3sg not see GF
'He did not happen to see (it).'

(18) Dia nggak me-lihat-Ø.
3sg not AF see GF
'He could not see (it).'

It seems clear that in light of the preceding analysis the non-volitional connotation of (17) is due to its being in Goal Focus rather than in Actor Focus, as is (18). It is quite consistent that AF sentences should carry volitional implications while their -AF counterparts could remain non-specific in terms of volition. 4

3.2. It should also be pointed out that the analysis of this sentence type in a focus framework may necessitate a revision of our concepts of Indonesian "grammatical errors". The cases which come to mind are those described by Becker (1977) for example, as those in which the meN- prefix has been lost. These cases may in fact not be errors because of the prefix's deletion, but rather the bound form of the pronoun may have been used with an unprefixxed verb in a sentence in which the actor is not focal. The "error" in this construction may really be the intercessation of a modifier or auxiliary between a bound actor and its verb.

*(19) Aku akan pakul-Ø ular itu.
1sg will hit GF snake that
'I will hit the snake.' or
'The snake will be hit by me.'

Thus, (19) is not an incorrect statement of the Actor Focus sentence Aku akan memukul ular itu, but of the Goal Focus sentence Akan kumpul ular itu in which a modifier, 'will', has been incorrectly inserted between a bound form of the pronoun and the verb. A possibility that should be explored at more length, however, is that a small class of words including modifiers such as 'will' above and perhaps negatives as in (17), existed which could be placed between a bound actor and its unprefixxed verb, so that (19) is, or was at one time, a perfectly acceptable GF sentence. The fact that it may now be considered an error may be the result of hyper-correction.

3.3. In conclusion, it is through the use of the focus system as an organizational framework for a transformational analysis that semantic problems of voice, aspect, volition, and grammatical errors may be approached most fruitfully. Our insights into Austronesian languages will be greatly enhanced if the basis for our work is a coherent and systematic study of their overt syntactic systems. It is from the concreteness of syntax that the much needed naturalness of constraints must come if our conclusions are to escape the level of truisms.

FOOTNOTES

1. For an examination of the distinctions between topic and focus in Ilocano, see Schwartz (1976).
2. Claude Tchekhoff has commented perceptively on aspects of this construction in a previous paper (Tchekhoff 1977).
3. There is some discussion of the universality of this tendency for pronouns to become tacticized to the verb in Givón (1976).
4. I thank John Wolff for pointing this out, and have used his examples as sentences (17) and (18).
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The verbal passive in Indonesian is good hunting ground for linguists. There is very little in Indonesian verbal passives that is readily comparable to verbal passives in Indo-European languages, at least from the point of view of morphology, perhaps not even very much so from the point of view of syntax. Inversely, (synchronic) comparisons with local vernaculars in Indonesia which are related to Indonesian itself are highly useful, but I have so far not done much of a comparing job, due to my ignorance of much in that area. In general we seem to be entering here a world not very much recognized so far by linguists.

Not that the passive in Malay/Indonesian has not been discussed before. But most of the publications concerned suffered from the linguistic defects of their time. Still, there is at least a veritable wealth of material, and some good insights here and there, and I wish to express my debt to those sources in general here. I must here mention also two recent articles by Chung, "On the subject of two passives in Indonesian" (Chung 1976a) and "An object-creating rule in Baha sa Indonesia" (Chung 1976b), which I find hard to evaluate: on the one hand Chung's use of syntactic criteria opens up new approaches to Indonesian grammar very much worth pursuing further; on the other hand in some cases complicated syntactic operations are invoked to prove things much more easily established by very simple nomorphemic operations. (Also, the grammaticality of a number of the examples, some of them crucial for the theory developed, must, in my opinion, be questioned.)

Several kinds of verbal passives may be distinguished in Indonesian: (1) passives of men- verbs; (2) ke-/an passives; (3) monomorphemic passives. -- Passives of men- verbs are here assumed to belong to one and the same paradigm in each case, and to comprise: (a) di- passive; (b) zero passive; (c) ku- and kau- passive; (d) ter- passive. -- (1), (a) is exemplified by dibaca, (b) by kami baca (or imperative bacak), (c) by kubaca and kau(kaca) and (d) by terbaca; (a) may be called the "canonical" passive (after Chung 1976a), (b), by analogy, the "noncanonical" passive, (c) the "pronominal" passive, and (d) the "eventive" passive. -- No, (2) is exemplified by kelihat, kehubihan, etc., and (3) by verbs like lupa, kenakan, or tampak.

I shall not be concerned with ke-/an passives, which, though interesting in themselves, have little bearing on matters raised by the other varieties of passive. I shall have little to say on monomorphemic passives, and therefore most of what follows will not concern the paradigmatic members of transitive men- verbs.

Passivization of men- verbs

A huge number of Indonesian verbs begin with men-; I follow tradition in calling them "prenasalized". Though some words opening with men- are nouns (menyeluruh, melalai kan, e.g.), and though men- also characterizes a limited, slightly productive list of intransitive verbs (such as menyelam, menyelak, mendekat, membelu, membesar, etc.), most verbs with men- are transitive (though often there need not be an object). These are highly productive, and account for the majority of men- verbs in Indonesian.

The men- form of these transitive verbs I consider as the "first member" of the paradigm in each case. This is for descriptive convenience rather than for reasons of principle; paradigmatic rules are unordered, in contrast to derivational rules. Lexicographers freely choose their "canonical form" from verbal (or other) paradigms. Of course, in the ordered sequence of derivational steps, it is the men- form of derived verbs, and not any other member of its paradigm, that is the result of derivation. This is also my (merely practical) reason for picking the men- form as the first member of each paradigm. This does not, it should be noted, imply that actives are somehow more "basic" than passives in the Indonesian verb. I shall have some more comments on this in a moment.

Purely morphemically the active men- forms have three paradigmatic variations: with -ku, -mu, and -nya. These simple changes (functional ones, for object) would not be important for the topic of the present paper if not for a complication, which I may introduce by way of a question. Are passive forms like dimikan, kikikan, kaumukan, dimakanyak passives of monomorphemic mikan, or of prenasalized memakan? The answer must be that they are not forms of mikan, but of memakan, for Saya memakannya is grammatical while *Saya makannya is not. Thus, the possibility of -nya as a functional suffix is a test to (*strong) transitivity. We shall come across this vi o makan, and a few others, once more below.

The di- passive

Formation of the di- passive is simple; men- is replaced by di-, cancelling any morphophonemic changes caused by the prenasalization: membun- dibun; menyangka - disangka; and so forth. A striking feature of the di- passive is that it can be accompanied only by a (postposed) third person agenteive, bound (-nya) or free (orang itu), nonperiphrastic (as in the examples just now), or periphrastic (olehnya; oleh orang itu). First and second person agentives make the sentence ungrammatical (*Buku itu dibaca oleh saya), but "honorific" pronouns (Bapa, Bu, Saudara, etc.) count as third person; for third personhood of these forms there is also another test: their "vocative" forms (Pak, Bu, etc.), which are socially equivalent to second person, as postposed agents with di- passives, make the sentence ungrammatical ([...]

*sepeti sudah dikatakan Pak, etc.). Contrary to grammarians who claim that first and second person postposed agentives with di- passives may be grammatical (McDonald and Soemjono 1967: 235; Chung 1976a, b), I claim that such passives are never used, unless, highly exceptionally, for very clearly identifiable reasons.

An interesting feature is the di- passive without a following agentive cor.titute where we evidently do not have the kind of "impersonal" passive in which the agent is irrelevant. The agent has then been mentioned before. For example Dikiranya betul (where -nya is anaphoric) may be paraphrased as Dikira betul, Diujat rodanya may, in context, be a paraphrase of Dijatirnya rodanya. So far as I have been able to verify provisionally, the -nya agentive is obligatory only when there is a successiveness of actions, as in Dipegangnya...
The following evaluation is wholly my responsibility, though it is in large part based on van den Bergh’s ideas just mentioned. Opposition (1) accounts for the ungrammaticalness of *Di situ ada empat kursi-kursi, though Di situ ada kursi-kursi is all right, the difference being due to the preciseness (determinedness) of empat. Opposition (2) would account for why it would be rather hard to find a suitable context for *Buku sepeti itu sudah lama ma dibelinya, while Buku itu dibelinya would suit many kinds of obvious contexts; I suggest that one reason is that sudah lama [mau] entails a duration (of the desire to purchase the book), which is not easily compatible with a di-passive. (Certain contexts, of course, may result in a neutralization of the determined/undetermined opposition.) The oppositions (3) and (4) present greater problems, once more because neutralizations of oppositions (1) and (2) may not be so very rare, for example because, for some reason or other, the object to a men-verb may have to have initial position, which requires change of active into passive, as the order *OV in Indonesian is invariably ungrammatical (when the object is yang, whose position is always initially fixed, the verb must always be passive). Similarly, a reduplicated form may be the only way to make plurality (which, though it is not signified by reduplication, is nevertheless implied) inhabitable. However, (5) may be the closest explanation for the extremely low frequency (in my observation) of passives of verbs with a reduplicated base, and of the proportionately high frequency of their men-forms; ditimbang-timbang, for example, as compared to membeli-beli. It is hard to come up with an example explained by no. (4), but a striking feature of objects is that they frequently need no determiner when used with men-forms (Saya membeli baku), whereas the "same" nominal constituent in initial position (so that the passive must be used) can rarely do without a determiner (*Buku sudah baku, vs Buku itu sudah saya beli, which is undoubtedly all right). I would ascribe the need for a determiner here to initial position due to topicalization, but Bambang Kaswanti Purwo has pointed out to me that something is to be said for the hypothesis that a nominal constituent without determiner with passives is, more generally, quite less likely than with men-forms. Further research is badly needed here.

The zero passive and the nominal passive

In a sentence like Buku itu sudah saya baca, one might superficially be tempted to consider baca as monomorphemic. Yet little reflection is needed to recognize that that must be too simple. First, if baca in that sentence were monomorphemic
there would be no reason not to consider it as a free variation of membaca. However, that would make buku itu the object, which is impossible in Indonesian (*OV), unless we want to phrase a meaningless ad hoc rule to salvage the free variation assumption. Then, also, though buku itu may occur to the right of baca (Besok akan saya baca buku itu), yet buku itu could not in that case be the object either, for it could not be replaced by -nya even though that would be possible with membaca: Saya akan membacanya is all right: *Besok akan saya baca-nya (see also note 5). Furthermore, if buku itu were the object (in either of the two examples just cited), there is no way for saya not to be the subject, as that functional interpretation would conflict with a number of characteristics of the constituent saya: it cannot be separated from the constituent baca by any other constituent (genuine subjects can be separated from their predicates), and it can be replaced by ku- (the subject saya cannot).

Therefore, baca in these examples is not an active. Could it be a "semilative" in the sense that we could call baca a "semitransitive" verb? By "semitransitivity" (as distinguished from "strong" transitivity, whose object may take the form of -nya) here is meant the relation of a verb to its complement in ways readily comparable to the relation between a strongly transitive verb and its object. Such a comparison makes sense for Indonesian, because this language has a few truly "semitransitive" verbs, i.e. makan, minum, minta and mohon. They are like memakan, meminum, meminta and memohon in that their complements must occur to the right of the verb. *The filling complement place is "objective", both for the forms with men- and for the forms without that prefix. On the other hand, only with the men-forms is the complement replaceable by -nya: Saya memakan-nya is well-formed, while *Saya makan-nya is not. Therefore, let us call the complement of makan, minum, etc. "semitransitive objects", those verbs themselves "semitransitive", and the role in predicate position "semilative". Then, it might be asked, why can we not deal with baca in the same manner? Then there would be some sense in which we would have to agree with Chung (1976a: 59) that men- is indeed "optional". The makan-minum list would be much longer than just four, and we would have a useful generalization. Other arguments would support this: while we have such forms as kemakan, kaumakan, we would have the same formations also in kubaca, kubaca, etc.

Nevertheless, the counterarguments are too strong. It is true that forms like kemakan, kaumakan, dimakan, etc. are grammatical and therefore look the same as kubaca, kubaca, dibaca, etc. But while they agree in the noninterposability of constituents between the pronominal agentive and the verb ([...] sudah saya makan and [...] sudah saya baca are all right), they do not equally admit of interposition (*Saya sering makan nasi. Saya tidak makan roti are grammatical, but *Saya sering baca buku and *Saya tidak baca buku are not). This is because baca is a genuine passive (of membaca), while monomorphic makan is not even a paradigmatic member, let alone the passive, of memakan. A sentence like Saya makan nasi is ambiguous: makan may be the passive of memakan, in which case it is a zero passive as much as baca in Besok akan saya baca buku itu; or it is the semitransitive verb makan; the former consists of - + -makan, the latter is monomorphic. No such ambiguity is found in any occurrence of baca, which is always polymorphic, and a passive. Similar arguments could be given for minum, mohon and minta, and these four verbs are therefore truly a class all their own. 12 It follows, among other things, that men- is never demonstrably optional. 13

When we now return to our passive baca, a new problem arises. If indeed passive, why polymorphic? Is it not enough, in view of the evidence above, to distinguish a form like baca from makan (and its three colleagues) and have done with it? Why must baca consist of - + -baca? My reason for postulating the presence of a zero prefix here is that there is an opposition between baca of all the examples above on the one hand and the basic form, or "root", -baca, which is both monomorphic and a bound form: a lexical item in its own right, "precatenatorial" (my term) in that it does not qualify for membership of any word class ("pre-") refers to the history of morphemic derivation). At the same time zero (O-) in baca (as distinct from -baca) contrasts with active men-, with ku- and kau- of the pronominal passive, and with di- of the canonical passive. I grant that neither argument is highly compelling on empirical grounds. The first argument is paradigm-external, the second paradigm-internal, but not all contrasts need to be marked by an affix (in this case O-). The real argument for O- in the noncanonic passive is one of theoretical coherence and descriptive consistency, especially as regards the first argument: the list of precatenatorial forms in Indonesian totals several hundreds, most of them of high text frequency, and -- a typological argument -- many thousands in each of a relatively great number of related languages in Indonesia; concerning the second, paradigm-internal argument, we may perhaps say that polymorphicity of the noncanonic passive gives a ready syntactic ground for the inseparability of such passives and their proposed polymorphically free pronominal agentives: e.g. saya in saya baca is bound to baca by reason of baca’s prefix, O-. It is now also clear why pronominal passives (with ku- and kau-) are distinct from zero passives: there is no need for O- where there is already the bound form ku- or kau-.

One prominent form of the zero passive is the imperative. In Pacelah (lah) buku ini, baca! is passive. The arguments are simple: first, -nya cannot replace buku in: *Bacanya(lah)! is ungrammatical; second, the agent may be expressed with oleh (not optional this time, if there is an agentive constituent): Pacelah oleh! The construction, though rather literary, has long-standing credentials; third, only imperatives of transitive men- verbs disperse with men-, and intransitive imperatives of men- verbs retain their canonical-Mendekat-lah, Memperbanyak di sini! The conclusion must be that buku ini in Bacalah buku ini! cannot be the object. The elimination forces us to conclude that it must be the subject; this is also confirmed by its role: objective, for objectives otherwise with passives are subject functions-wise. One salient feature with this kind of subject, however, is that it can occur only to the right of the verb, and never, like other subjects (including those of the other zero passives) to the left: *Buku ini Bacalah! is not wellformed (unless, of course, there is a pause after buku itu: Buku itu/bacalah!, but then we have two clauses, not one, and each with its own functional analysis; the pause itself would be an instrument of topicalization). There it is, it must be noted, also something countere intuitive about the designation of buku ini as the subject. Though intuition is notoriously of little value for the substantiation of theories (in contrast to intuition as an argument for the determination of grammaticality of utterances), yet in the present case some explanation reducible to intuition is possible. I shall return to that point at the end of this paper.

There now arises the question of the agentives with zero passives (for pronominal passives the result is already there for us to see: only ku- and kau-). The agentives, proposed all of them, except for peripheral oleh- in imperatives,
The eventive passive

There is a great deal more to ter- forms of verbs (there are also nonverbal ter- forms, which are of no importance to my topic here) than those that are here called "eventive". Forms like tertiar, terjadi, etc. are also "eventive" in some straightforward use of that term (saying that something "happens to" take place), but they are not passive, and I will not be concerned with them, as neither with those that are passive with (intransitive) men- forms of the same base, like tertancang/ menancap, terjulur/menjulur, which are not passive either. We are concerned, then, with forms like terkun- , tertutup, terganggu, etc. (some are related to men- forms slightly different: meninggalkan → tertinggal, melihatkan → terlibat).

Some ter- forms which are prima facie verbs! passives are in fact adjectival passives, i.e. it is perhaps more straightforward not to consider them as included in the paradigms of the verbs concerned, but rather to treat them as derivatives (see above, note 3). These occur for the most part with a negative modifier tak (not *tidak) to denote impossibility: tak terelakkan, tak tertahan, tak terungkapkan, and many more, with slight productivity (assuming the ter- form itself can be productively formed15). I shall not be concerned with those any further either.

As to paradigmatic passive ter- forms more properly so speaking, many verbs do not have them, and new formations may be felt to violate productivity rules. I have not found any clear pattern yet (though some hard work should uncover them soon enough), why, e.g., tertebati is doubtful, while tertolong is all right; or why terberkatlah! is fully acceptable, while *termulakanlah! is not. Terbaca is acceptable, but I suspect *terbacaakan is not. Rules would have to be elicited from indubitable material and from authentic pronouncements on acceptable productivity of new formations.

Finally, agentives with ter- forms are always postposed, always periphrastic, and not confined to third person.

Paradigmatic rules for passives conflated

The following conflated rule should take care of most of what has been said about the passive so far; a few details are added.

Optionality of the entire agentive constituent (in all cases) has been ignored, to avoid the unsightlyness of top-to-bottom parentheticals for it. Brackets, braces, parentheses, and underscores are used according to current conventions. Asterisks before parentheses rule out optionality; the symbol "--" stands for any appropriate constituent. "Free" means "morphemically free", and "full" honorific pronouns rule out the short alternatives. The "base" has no affixation (e.g. -baca, bound; or pahat, free), but it does not have to be monomorphic; for example, it may be reduplicated. "N' is "Noun" and "P' is "Phrase". I ignore the possibility of the base having the suffixes -i or -kan.

Some generalizations have had to be broken up, because of complications in conflating the rule, e.g. the optionality of oleh after di- passives. I am not sure whether the reduplicated forms of pronouns are exhaustively presented (cf. deprecative saya-saya).

Monomorphic passives

This class (one member paradigms all of them) has been very little researched so far. Berg 1937 has a number of interesting examples for Javanese, which language has more of them than Indonesian. Examples for Indonesian are lupa, tumpak, kena, sembuh, sembuh, tewas, kalah, masak, and perhaps a few dozen more. But their syntactic distribution is not the same everywhere. E.g. kena may have an agentive, without oleh, whereas tumbuh and lupa would need a periphrastic agentive. I have not found out whether there are any that could not have an agentive at all, and neither do I understand, at this stage, how much of interference there may be from a first language (for example, I have repeatedly heard, from Javanese native speakers, the phrase Saya periksa dokter, where the context is clearly that the speaker diperiksa dokter).

Also, a number of such words may be "passive" only on a "translationese" view. A wider framework for this question is whether a lexical item could be "two-faced" in a y o t hetero contrast than that of active vs passive, e.g. the Indonesian word sep1, which (as also in Javanese sep1, Krama sep1) corresponds both to 'empty' and 'lonely' (one is lonely, the implication would be, in an empty place). Here, too, there may be something of the "translationese" fallacy. My principal purpose in mentioning the monomorphic passives is that I feel they should be further investigated, and that, in any case, they are different from the base of a passive form as per the above conflated rule.

Why "passive"?

There is scarcely any imaginable view of what is here called "passive" that has not been represented in all the studies (much of it polemics) around the "vervoegde werkwoordsvormen". To take just a sample or two, Mees (1954: 315) maintains that there is no active-passive problem in Indonesian at all. Wils (1952, passim) feels that the so-called "passives", especially those with proposed agentives, are very concrete "locatives", or perhaps rather "ostensive", indications which are virtually equivalent to the denotative capacity of nouns, the agentive suffixes themselves being largely "possessive". Though Wils is highly "romantic" and "empathic" in the manner of van Ginneken's psychologism
in which he received his training as a linguist, and his presentation accordingly: persuasive rather than supported by hard evidence, his heuristic hunches must, in my opinion, be taken seriously. The interpretation of passives as a somehow "nominal" is already old (for di- passives the combination di-/nya has been used as an argument of this, and di- has also been equated, historically, with either the preposition di or the pronoun dia). Van der Tuuk (1971: 122) was very much in favor of the "nominal" theory, though he never said so in so many words (see also Teeuw 1971: XXXI).

Again, it has been claimed that Indonesian is not an "inflectional" language for verbs, but when these ideas are developed in discussions it invariably (in my experience) turns out that what is meant is that Indonesian verbs are not inflectional in the way Indo-European verbs are. That reminded, despite its obviousness to the point of triviality, may not have been so superfluous in earlier times when Latin and Greek were supposed to stand model for the description of any language whatever.

It is hard to imagine that anyone could have a comprehensive grasp of what the opposition active-passive entails language-universally. Gonda, in his detailed twosome of articles "Over Indonesische werkwoordvormen" (1949a and b) made a great many digressions on passives in languages other than those in Indonesia, many of them useful even if well-known: for example the Latin verbs deponentia, passive in morphemic form but active role-wise (as we might say now) are transitive; there are those that are active in form and passive role-wise; there is the well-known problem of the "middle" in Greek and other languages. Many languages have no (morphemic) passive at all; and so forth. Gonda's review of them is erudite, insightful, and makes the kind of one-man brain storming that may give one new ideas.

One would like to cut down on the number of problems by distinguishing those due to a variety of data from many languages from problems that are largely terminological. There is, from the terminological point of view, no reason not to employ the term "passive" for the forms so named in the present article. Once one does, of course, so call them, one may reject interpretations of them that are due only to the critic's understanding of the terms involved; for example "passive" need not be understood in its Indo-European sense. One also has to take the consequences of terms once one has (stipulatively) defined them; in other words, the stipulations must be clear. This writer, for example, is committed to the idea that the active-passive contrast in Indonesian is a paradigm-internally one. That in itself is merely stipulative. But one cannot, then -- on my understanding of what a paradigmatic process is --, also accept that, though men-forms are verbs, the passive forms thereof are nouns, for class membership distinction can never fit the same lexical identity (entailed in the notion of paradigm), or at least it cannot to me. But all these problems (which could easily be added to) are matters of internal consistency of the assumptions used, and, though in that case they are no longer merely terminological any more but rather conceptual-theoretical, they still do not necessarily directly concern the data in the sense that no other conceptual-theoretical framework could handle those data. Protestations like "There is no active-passive problem in Indonesian" are perhaps exclamations of theoretical impatience (or intolerance) rather than statements about linguistic data. (This is not to say, I should like to add, that I imagine that data are available as such without any approach that has theoretical implications classifying them.) I have no strong reasons for insisting that the forms called "passive" in the present paper are most aptly so called, but I have not run into a better approach that would preserve conceptually-theoretical consistency (especially concerning the relation between lexical identity and word class membership); however, I cannot imagine that there could not be a much more adequate approach than the one taken here.

By "passives", then, I mean passives morphemically, with syntactic consequences, such as that the object to an active becomes the subject to its passivized form. I would,
for example, call Latin *verba deponentia" "semiactives", for, though they are passives morphemically and are like actives in that they are transitive, yet they cannot be passivized as morphemically they are already passive, and Latin, as it happens, has no syntactic standby to do the passivization job, as one might perhaps argue is the case in certain ergative languages.

Morphemically, I think it can be argued that the forms called passive in the present paper may be considered as genuine passives, in the sense that there is confirmation from syntax (though I shall make a few reservations concerning this point in a moment). If, then, it is argued that, for example, zero passives are much less like passives when compared with the dl- forms, or that dl-/nya forms are "active" semantically, or (perhaps better) are the Indonesian equivalent to a praeens historicum in other languages, depicting "actuality" rather than "activity", then there is no contradiction between such an intuitive insight and the morphemic-syntactic evaluation on the other. The intuitions evaluations, even though only heuristic and rather vague, should perhaps be taken seriously in the case of those who have a good grammatical and stylistic command of the language under analysis, and they may open the way to a new insight not easily attainable along a chain of strict argumentation, while there may always be new possibilities of testing. Argumentation and theory will be the easier to check so long as they are "reconstructive" rather than "constructive".

A special problem for passives in Indonesian arises where syntax is also semantic: in the roles. The roles are not all that semantics is about (lexical semantics is excluded from role evaluation, as also the kind of semantics entailed in such problems as discourse structure and topicalization), but they appear to be of great importance in our morphosyntactic passives. A good example of this is that there is something counterintuitive about calling the "complement" of *baca*lah buku ini! in *Baca*lah buku ini!, i.e. buku ini, the "subject" of the sentence. Role-wise, of course, buku ini is "objective", which is much closer to an analysis of intuition. As it happens, the imperative differs from other zero passives in that its subject must be to the right of the verb, which is unusual for the subject position. If, then, our intuitive appraisal of *Baca*lah buku ini! in *Baca*lah buku ini! is closer to the objective role than to the functional subject (even though both qualifications apply equally to a theoretical point of view), and if the intuition is such that we feel that "transitivity" would somehow convey the relation from *baca*lah! to buku ini!, then we might phrase this by saying that we have in that sentence is not functional transitivity but role transitivity. This conception has interesting corollary for Indonesian syntax, and I want to go into just one of those now.

Perhaps the obligatory and highly consistent V0 order for Indonesian (which, strictly functionally, is perhaps better phrased as PO, Verb being a category and Predicate being a function) has a few interesting parallels for word order involving constituents whose role is objective (objective constituents). *Baca*lah buku ini! is one example. Another one is the functional "adjunct" filled with objective role content, in the case of predicates that already have an object (with a different role), as in the sentence *Ayah mencarkan saya perek-"jaan.* The object is *saya* (for *saya* would become the subject in the passivization *Saya dicarkan perek-jaan oleh ayah*), even though its role is not objective but benefactive, while the constituent filled by the objective role, *peker-"jaan,* is not an object but an adjunct (even though that adjunct is a nuclear rather than a nonnuclear constituent). (Grammarians who speak of "double object" here confuse function and role.)

Now, the point I wish to make here is that *peker-"jaan,* even though it is not the object, cannot be placed to the left of the verb, whereas all other adjuncts invariably can. Even in passivization this adjunct still has to take its place to the right of the verb: *Peker-"jaan saya ayah mencarkan saya,* *Peker-"jaan saya dicarkan ayah* are both ungrammatical. This feature of syntax I have never seen noted anywhere except in Chung 1976b (Chung calls the objective adjunct the "direct object", and the benefactive object the "indirect object", but in Chung's theory that is, this time, not a confusion of function and role, but rather due to the distinction between underlying and surface structure; nevertheless, the determination of deep structure in terms of functions rather than of roles is perhaps an "Indo-European" onesidedness, which non-Fillmore transformational grammarians still seem to think language-universal (66-67)). It is relevant to my topic here that even in the passive form there is no way for the objective adjunct to get to the left of the verb. This shows, among other things, that the PO order has its strict parallel in a PasOb order (Passive plus Objective), but only in imperatives for their objective coconstituents functionally not the subject. This is not much of a generalization yet, probably because we still know so little of the relations between the functional level and the role level in Indonesian syntax. (And, perhaps, in syntax more generally: the basic polemics between Fillmore's earlier case grammar and Chomsky's earlier standard theory is: transformational grammar may have proved insoluble precisely because of the insolubility, so far, of the problem how functions and roles compare language-universally.)

One should write a detailed study on the passive in Indonesian, preferably bringing in a great deal of data from many languages related to Indonesian. In the present paper I have outlined a few problems to which, among others, such a new study might have to address itself.
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FOOTNOTES

1. I have profited much from discussions, oral and by correspondence, with Dr Savitra Chung, Mr Hartmurti Krida- laksana, M.A., Mr A. Moeliono, M.A., Dr Muhadhir, Mr Bambang Kaswanti Purwo, M.A., Professor Samsuri, Dr W.A.L. Stokhof, Mr Sudaryanto, M.A., Dr I. Suharno, Dr Alan Stevens, and Dr Dale Walker. I owe first insights into the passive in Indonesian to many more, especially to Rev. J.D. van den Bergh, as specifically mentioned below. None of all these colleagues in responsible for the use I have made of their ideas. -- The present article is a revised version of one under the same title, which appeared in: Ignatius Suharno (ed.), *Irian: Bulletin of Irian Jaya Development*, vol. V, no. 3, October 1976, Institute for Anthropology, Cenderawasih University, Jayapura, by the gracious permission of the Editor.

2. See Haaksmab 1933. In that work is also to be found previous bibliography including all the items of an acrimonious dispute, involving Tendeloo and Honker, concerning "de ver-voegde werkwoordsvormen", beginning in the 1880-ies and closing in 1911. Haaksmab's book was extensively reviewed by Esser (1935). J. O Elsa has two articles "Our Indonesische werkwoordsvormen" (1946); 1949, 1950. Most of the above (plus some other discussions) has been reviewed by Wils (1952);
ways of obtaining informants' responses, untrammelled by theoretical considerations, are inadequate, but they were, in this case, the best I could think of. I have found one spontaneous contrastive exception in a carefully composed liturgical text, in a prayer for the deceased, especially for those unknown ones [...]: yang hanya dikenal oleh-Mu (where -Mu refers to God), Dr Alan M. Stevens (personal communication) tells me that in a year of daily reading of two newspapers and one magazine he came across only one example of nthird postposed agentive: Toldh pertempuran dimenangkan kita ('And yet we won the battle'). Typologically, it is interesting to find that Sundanese is an exception in allowing first and second person agentives with di-passes; these also occur in Jakarta Malay, but they are structurally exceptional and their text frequency is very low, according to data communicated to me by Muhadjir. Several North-Sumatran languages can have second person (but not first) agentives with (their equivalent of) di-passes.

Lawler (1977) has drawn attention to an "agreement" (which term he uses in a somewhat wider sense (221)) between a verbal prefix for passive in Acehnese and the postposed agentive. The point is evidently of importance, as Lawler himself points out, for relational grammar, seeing that there is in such a case verbal agreement with a "nonterm". I should like to point out that Acehnese is not so exceptional in this respect, for Indonesian (and vernaculars such as Javanese) can have only third person agentives with di-passes. Below I shall show that di-itself must be somehow considered to be third person "pronominal"; meaning, it should be emphasized, purely synchronically.

10. It is tempting to see in "proleptic" di- without a formative postposed agentive Javanese influence, as indeed Javanese has no equivalent to agentive -nya with di-passes (notwithstanding the fact that the language has postposed agentives that are morphemically free). In fact I hear most of such di-forms from Javanese speakers. However, a thorough investigation of older Malay would be needed to determine if proleptic di- is not older in Malay, quite apart from interference. Provisional ratings by Gonda (1949a; 1949b) show that agentiveless di-passes in older Malay are in the minority; however, what Gonda investigates here is an original situation as compared to the recent increase in impersonal passives, which are undoubtedly due to Indo-European influence. The question then is if there is a much larger difference between agentiveless passives and impersonal passives. To the extent that the difference might be comparatively small, we would have to expect the remarkable convergence, in Indonesian of modern times, of interference from Javanese and interference from languages such as Dutch or English.

I should like to distinguish quite a distinct type of agentiveless passives, i.e., what I call the "absolute" di-passes (which could never have an agentive added to it), i.e., in the di-forms which are imperatives semantically: jatah! 'turn it!'; dinaiikkan 'lift it!'. I have no data to account for this. Such di-imperatives are mostly used by Javanese speakers. However, without evidence to the contrary we might as well assume that such di-forms are elliptic, for super (an optative preverbal particle) + di-form, in which super is left out for the short.

11. Chung (1976a: 62) points out that with di-passes the subject does not need a determiner, but that "object preposing" (i.e., the subject of a noncanonical passive) will have a subject with a determiner. The examples given are somewhat hard to evaluate for determiners need, frequently, a context. But later it is pointed out (63ff.) that object preposing is not in fact a topicalization rule but a passivization rule.
However, that argument does not seem to hold water, for subjects of passives (except imperatives, see below) have no fixed position; they may occur to the left or to the right of the verb.  

12. The ambiguity of Saya makan nasi is anything but merely theoretical. Context will easily disambiguate it. For example the sentence Pagi hari saya makan nasi, sore hari saya makan roti, assuming it states the speaker’s habit, makes it hard to interpret makan as a passive, which is unusual for something so timeless as a habit. If the utterance were to be continued by saying that for example I prepare what they prefer I would have to add a clause like [%], tetapi kalau ada tamu saya mempersiapkan makanan menurut selera mereka, and the alternative [%] *saya persiapkan makanan [%], which is in itself morphemically and syntactically possible, would surely be ungrammatical, unless other reasons force neutralization of the contrast between makan-form and zero passive, as for example, if the continuation were to be [%], tetapi apa yang saya persiapkan untuk tamu selalu sesuai dengan [%], because in this case the fixed position of yang must make it the subject of the relative clause, and therefore, the verbal form a passive. Barring such cases of neutralization, when makan expresses a habit, that form cannot be interpreted as a zero passive. There is another test for this, e.g. the outlawish character of a sentence like *Pagi hari tidak saya makan nasi (instead of the normal Pagi hari saya tidak makan nasi), even though it would not be hard to find a (time-determined) example of [%] ti-
dak saya makan.  

13. Men- has many other complications. For example, the sentence Mereka sering tidak kirim surat is perfectly well-formed, while *Mereka sering tidak bantingan yang satu dengan yang lainnya is not. The first example is the exception. I am inclined to hypothesize that the exception is due to closeness of the group, perhaps even to the point of kirim surat being made into a compound. Saya mau tunggu jawab dulu is approved by many careful speakers of Indo-
nesia, who would reject *Kami akan selesai ugas itu besok immediately. Again, tunggu jawab is a closer group than sel-saikan tugas. The growing influence of vernaculars and dialects where preanalysis is far more optional is sociolinguistically a complication, but that influence has basically very little to do with close-group preanalysis-
lessness in standard Indonesian.  

14. The term "eventive" as used here should be sharply distinguished from van den Bergh’s use of that term as, explained above.  

15. Newformations in nominalized form, without the negative, are limited to professional circles of scholars, e.g. philosohers. I have myself been responsible for a few of them, and reception of scholars has been positive; examples: keterbacaan ‘readability’, ketepertaayaan ‘plausibility [of a theory e.g.], keteperrumunan ‘generalizability’ (itself from the neologism memperumum to ‘generalize’), to get away from the cacophonous menggeneralisasiikan which one may hear now and then), keterbacaan ‘divisibility [by x]’.  

16. I consider functions (subject, predicate, object, etc.) as empty places of constituency; only frames, so to speak, of constituents. These frames have to be "filled" (according to a conception freely borrowed from tagmemic theory) in two ways: according to form, and according to meaning. According to form functional positions are filled categorically. It is the semantic fillings of functional positions (such as active, passive, objective, benefactive, locative, and the like) which are here meant by "roles". The issue raised here is, of course, the role of role rather than the case for case.  

17. One may occasionally hear sentences like Ayah men-
carikan saya pekerjaan untuk saya, or Saya memukulkan pintu un-
tuk tamu. Such constructions are, in my own environment (Jakarta and Central Java), clearly due to interference from Javanese, which allows a similar word order with their -ake verbs, and I consider them ungrammatical for standard Indonesian. However, Dr Dale Walker (personal communi-
cation) considers them acceptable and in tune with princi-
pal typological features of Indonesian.  

There is another problem with my analysis of Ayah men-
carikan saya pekerjaan as containing a (benefactive) object saya, and an objective adjunct pekerjaan. This analysis pre-
supposes, theoretically, that the benefactive suffix (focus ex-
ing) -kan is derivational, not paradigmatic. But clearly if -kan is paradigmatic, then two passivizations are possible with the same verb, i.e. Pekerjaan dicari ayah untuk saya, and Saya dicarikan ayah pekerjaan similarly, we could have the passives Beras itu saya bell untuk ayah and Ayah saya bell berkas. The argument would then be that mencarikan and mencari are lexically identical, and similarly membela-
kan and membela (this would just be a more principled way of saying that -kan is paradigmatic, not derivational). In that case the theory which interprets the two complements in Ayah mencarikan saya pekerjaan and Saya membelikan ayah berkas, as two objects, or a "double object", would be correct. That analysis, also, would not confuse function and role. Therefore, it would, in such a discussion, be up to me to prove that mencarikan and mencari, as well as membela and membela, are not lexically identical. Such a proof, obviously, would have to be based on lexical semantics, and would therefore be hard to substantiate, unless one had a gram-
matical test. I think I have found one in what I have called the "law of government basis" (hukum dasar pengusahaan) in Verhaar forthcoming.  

Though I think I have thus vindicated -kan as derivational, not paradigmatic, on the basis of lexical identity supported by syntactic tests, there are still problems with -kan which seem to show that "paradigmatic interpretation" is not totally out (confirming also Dale Walker’s grammatical stand as cited above, in the present note). Consider the sentence Perusahaan ini membuatkan kami pakai serangam, Context variations (not really transforms, but that is now in vogue) may produce such sentences as […] pakai serangam yang baru saja dibuatkan oleh perusahaan ini […] which I consider to be grammatical; if we fill in a benefactive constituent kami here, we would get the ungrammatical […] *pakai serangam yang baru saja kami dibuatkan oleh […] What is ungrammatical here is the prepredicate position of yang, which, even though it would (on my theory) not be an object, while yet it would be objective role-wise, as has just been argued. Therefore, if kami as a formative is not possible, then its postulability as a zero constituent (‘n parallel dis-
tribution with kami) is equally out of the question. This would mean that dibuatkan cannot have any subject, whether forma-
tive (kami) or zero, which would have no parallel in any other utterance, so that a rule posting obligatory subjectlessness would be out as clearly ad hoc. Therefore, inescapably, in […] pakai serangam yang baru saja dibuatkan oleh […] yang must be the subject. If so, -kan in dibuatkan must be paradigmatic, not derivational. I do not know how to solve this problem, considering the validity, as I see it, of my "law of government basis". Unfortunately to explain that law here would lead me to far afield in the present article.
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PARTICIPANT RELATIONSHIPS IN NGA'dA DISCOURSE

Stephanus Djawani

I. Introduction

The focus of the present effort is to analyze the ways speakers of Nga'da establish interpersonal relationships in discourse. I am using the term discourse in its narrow sense, that is, speech or oral communication. The theoretical background of this study is, to some extent, based on works done by C. Geertz, David G. Hays, R. Brown and A. Gilman, and Charles Pyle.

Geertz, in his essay "Person, Time, and Conduct in Bali" (1973), maintains that people everywhere have developed symbolic structures in terms of which persons are perceived as representatives of certain distinct categories of individuals. In other words, every individual has his own place within the social system to which he belongs, and this practice is socially determined and maintained. This is true among the Nga'da people who, according to my observation, distinguish persons and map them within the social system with respect to age, caste, as well as social status. Hays (1973) asserts that language is a vehicle of socialization, of group solidarity, of tension release, of psychotherapy, and of love, which is in fact what conversation is all about. He further claims that a conversation is an interchange of remarks within a social setting that gives each participant a role as well as a status. Hays' ideas fit perfectly with the subject of the present study concerning a verbal interaction in Nga'da whose ultimate purpose is to mend a breach among family members and in which each participant plays some role and is given a status with which to analyze others involved in a family dispute. Brown and Gilman (1960) observe that, in a conversation, a speaker may express his transient moods and attitudes towards his audience by varying his pronoun style. The notion holds true in Nga'da as we will see in the discussion where, judging from the choice of pronouns, one could interpret and even predict the emotions and attitudes a speaker has towards his audience. One could judge whether the speaker considers his addressee as superior, inferior, equal, intimate, or as distant. Pyle, in his paper called "Pragmatics" (1975), regards metaphor as a deviant use of language since it is not meant to be taken literally. He also sees metaphor as a language device manipulated to gain respect, credibility, or advantage over other people.

As will be shown in the discussion, the conversation in Nga'da is strewn with metaphors which can be considered as "clichés" in the language since they have been used time and again. However, one must also consider that metaphors are an essential device in language whereby people express themselves. Despite their constant use, metaphors in Nga'da have a unique function of preserving knowledge as Nga'da remains an oral tradition even up to the present moment. Like other oral traditions, Nga'da relies heavily on simple, stereotypic, and formulaic expressions that can easily be memorized and hence handed down from generation to generation, and metaphors constitute one particular kind of them. Furthermore, as Charlotte Linde (to appear) puts it, an individual having a high social status tends to use more metaphors than those lower in status. This is also true in Nga'da.

I hope to show in this paper that in Nga'da, the interpersonal relationships of individuals involved in a conversation may be interpreted and explained in terms of the language they use, especially, in the manipulation of pronouns, honorifics, verbs that mean to speak, and metaphors. The attitudes of the participants to one another, as well as to the subject-matter of the verbal interaction, and their stances could be defined by observing the way they interact. While the conversation builds up, the interpersonal relationships between the speakers develop and are finally established based on their respective statuses.

The material used for this study is part of a thirty-minute recording of an actual conversation in Nga'da, tapc', in its natural setting. The main topic of the conversation is an attempt to solve a family dispute over an inheritance in the form of land. The term "family" is to be understood as "extended family" in that it is not applied exclusively to immediate-family ("nuclear family") members only. The family-talk which pretty much resembles an "arbitration" is initiated by the disputants in an attempt to solve a problem concerning shares of the inheritance before they go to court to get a written certificate of ownership; basts, they also want to decide about whether or not to sue a neighbor with whom tw. of the family members have a dispute over land boundaries.

It is a common practice among the Nga'da: people try to settle disputes over inheritance among family members before bringing the case to an official village court. Several cases resolved in a village court are reported by Arndt (1984)3. If the dispute can be solved in accordance with the customary laws within the family, or in a village court, the case is regarded settled and there is no need to go to a higher court. Then, government officials are asked to register and certify in writing ownership of land with its boundaries. However, if an agreement cannot be reached, the case may be brought to a higher court where it will be solved in accordance with both the customary laws of Nga'da and the constitutional laws of the country (Indonesia). Usually, in this type of family meeting advisors are invited to help solve the problem. The advisors are normally village elders who are knowledgeable about the customary laws. This kind of situation where the disputants gather and invite advisors as well as witnesses to dine with them before talking about a family problem is very common. This practice, in my opinion, reflects some kind of democracy in the villages which survives the changes of the social system of Nga'da. The most significant changes resulted from the introduction of the tradition of Kings in 1907 by the Dutch, and from the new constitution of Indonesia when it became independent in 1945. Such a meeting is usually held in the evening and while people talk, palm-wine is served.

The participants of the conversation can be classified into three groups, namely,

A. Advisors
These people are the village elders or current government officials who are knowledgeable about the customary laws concerning inheritance as well as the government regulations concerning land-ownership and taxes.5

1. JD, the current village chief.
2. PM, the former village chief.
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3. HN, the former chief of the district.  
   [When the conversation took place HN was a member of 
   the People's Council of the regency of Nga'da.]  
4. WS, acting as a counselor of N.  WS is probably an in- 
   law of N by marriage.

B. Witnesses
These are people who are knowledgeable about the kinship 
relationship of the disputants as well as the inheritance. 
Older people are considered the best witnesses since they 
have possibly had direct experiences about a certain village 
affair and they are the preservers of knowledge about the 
people and the village.

5. UV, an old lady who knows about the "family-tree" or 
kinship relationship of the disputants, the shares of the 
inheritance, and the land boundaries. UV is a 
distant relative of the disputants by marriage.

6. GI, a distant relative of the disputants who is also know-
ledgeable about the shares of the inheritance as 
well as the land boundaries.

C. Disputants
These are members of an "extended" family who have two 
problems to be resolved, that is, N's claim for his share of 
the family land, and whether or not a family as they agree to 
sue V concerning land boundaries.

7. G, the oldest in the family who is in charge of the inher-
tance, in this particular case, land.

8. B, a younger brother of G.

9. N, a cousin of G and B who feels unfairly treated by G. 
   He is now claiming his share of the family land.

10. T and Na (husband and wife), cousins to G and B as well 
as to N. T and Na have a dispute over land bounda-
ries with V who is probably a neighbor. V is not in-
vited to the meeting as he is not a member of the 'ex-
tended' family.

There are other people present at the meeting but they 
are hard to identify. Most likely they are all members of 
the "extended" family of the disputants. Some comment a-
bout the importance of witnesses is, I think, necessary at 
this point. Witnesses are a very important factor in Nga'da 
customary laws and culture since there are no written re-
cords about land-ownership or "family-trees", that is, kin-
ship relationships. Moreover, there is no written code of 
the customary laws.

The family meeting described here is not a village court 
but rather an 'arbitration' because it is the disputants them-
sew themselves who take the initiatives and not the vil-
lage chief and elders; however, the presence of the village chief, advisors, 
and witnesses makes the meeting a little bit formal and yet 
retains the informal atmosphere of a family meeting.

II. Relationships established

In an attempt to define the relationships of the participants 
of this conversation, I begin with an assumption that language 
can be used to negotiate relationships as it is a common prac-
tice that people who engage in a verbal interaction put them-
sew themselves in their appropriate places in relation to one another. 
To put it in another way, where am "I" or where do "I" fit in 
the "social map" of a particular interaction. As I mentioned 
earlier in the introduction, the status of a speaker is social-
ly determined by age, caste, and social standing and within 
these categories a speaker must, according to Nga'da tradi-
tion, put himself with respect to his interlocutor. However, 
negotiation of relationships is still possible in that one may, 
despite the difference in age, caste, etc., view his interloc-
utor or addressee as superior, inferior, equal, intimate, or 
distant, although a choice in matters like these is normally 
available only for those having a high social status.

In Nga'da, and I suspect in other sub-cultures of Indone-
sia as well, the defining and establishing of relationships be-
fore people talk "business", as opposed to "small-talk", is 
an important introductory part of a conversation. Very of-
ten the introduction is lengthy and unclear, and, to foreigners 
particularly, it can be very confusing as the talk usually goes 
round and round before hitting the heart of the problem or the 
intention of the speaker. Sometimes the introduction is even 
left unsaid and the addressee, to his bewilderment, has to in-
ferr or guess as to what the speaker is trying to say. This 
can only be understood if one considers the introductory part 
as a way a speaker of Nga'da attempts to "define" his relation-
ship with another individual. The content of this part of 
the conversation may not be important; what is important is 
the acknowledgement of a good relationship. If the relation-
ship is good, then, the speaker will make it clear as to the 
purpose of the conversation or the intention of a particular 
encounter. It is also worth mentioning that in a small com-
unity like Nga'da the relationship is always perceived as 
long-term since mobility is low and everybody knows every-
body else in a village.

Below is the discussion of the conversation. For prac-
tical purposes, the data, gloss, and free translation are given 
in three lines: line 1 is the Nga'da utterance, line 2 is the 
gloss or the grammatical category it a gloss cannot be given, 
and line 3 is a free translation of the whole utterance. I must 
also add that due to the limitation on the length of this paper, 
I am not including the complete text of the conversation; in-
stead, I quote sample sentences which I think best illustrate 
the core of the conversation. While to give a "real" feeling a-
bout the conversation I am including the phonemic transcription 
of the first three minutes of the interaction in the appendix.

(1) JD :  
Na?u Pegho no?e Langa Pegho na  
Nd?u Pegho and with Langa Pegho  
re o mogo ?  
IRREALIS together TAG  
'Na?u Pegho and Langa Pegho [both personal 
names, male or female] are from the same 
family, right?'

(2) G :  
e?e ngata ka?e ne?e  
yes they- respect  older-sibling and/with 
azi.  
younger-sibling  
'Yes, they were sisters.' [They are both dead 
now.]

(3) JD :  
miu vi na?u ngia sei di ?  
you-pl IRREALIS keep face/plac whotthis  
'Whose place do you keep? (Who begot you?)'

As expected by the Nga'da people, the village chief, due 
to his social status, is given the privilege to open the discur-
son. He starts with a statement (1), which is in point of fact 
meant to be a question directed to the disputants. Notice 
that the tag-question is rhetorical since JD knows what 
he states is the case. G's answer in (2) acknowledges the fact
that Na'yu Pegho and Langa Pegho were sisters, and in (3) JD pursues the question further asking G and supposedly all of the disputants as to where their places are with respect to the two ancestors. JD's utterances are to be viewed as an invitation to the disputants to state their relationships to Na'yu Pegho and Langa Pegho and consequently to one another. This is the time for the disputants to acknowledge or re-establish their relationships to one another as members of an "extended" family. Notice also that JD, the village chief, does not proceed directly to the problem concerning inheritance or deal with N's claim for a piece of land but rather he works from what is basic in this culture, that is, the relationship of the people involved. JD seems to act in line with the general notion that when the relationship is good, half of the problem is already solved. G's answer in (2) clarifies the state of affairs. Although the lengthy description of their kinship relationships is not presented here, it is in fact the case that G and B are descendants of Na'yu Pegho, while N is a descendant of Langa Pegho who was Na'yu Pegho's younger sister. The land that G and B now occupy and claim to be their own is part of the inheritance bequeathed by Pegho who was the two ancestors' father.

The attitudes of the two speakers quoted above are obvious from their utterances. In (1) JD is being impersonal, like reading a line from the village record. He is detaching himself from the disputing parties and as an outsider he just opens the discussion, he himself uninvolved. He does not even use any honorifics when referring to Na'yu Pegho and Langa Pegho. Normally, one would in Nga'da use the expression bau nusi 'ancestor(s)' as an honorific, or the title mate 'the deceased' to show deference to dead people. The word bau literally means 'grand-parent(s)', while nusi means 'great-grand-parent(s)' or refers to the generations preceding great-grand-parent(s). In (3) JD addresses the disputants with the pronoun miu 'you [plural]' without being specific. (3) is an instance of a rhetorical question where three things are asked in just one utterance, that is, what is the kinship connection between them and Na'yu Pegho and Langa Pegho, how are the disputants related to each other, and through what line of descent do they claim their shares of the inheritance. G's attitude to his ancestors is different and he refers to them using the pronoun ngata 'he/she' or 'they' in a manner which is distant and respectful. G might have chosen the pronoun emu 'they' but he did not since they were his ancestors who deserve respect.

As the disputants describe the kinship relationship, the land they inherited, as well as the land boundaries, the advisors just sit back and watch. But when N tries to present his view and the others interrupt him, HN steps forward saying...
owned the land and what are the boundaries, as well as who inherited or inherits which piece of land. HN’s deference to the old lady is manifest even in the very idea of asking her views since nobody else has done so. Moreover, HN refers to her by using the honorific uge which literally means ‘mother’ but here used as an honorific or endearment term. The word uge can also be considered as “reciprocal” terminology, as Geertz (1973) puts it, since it can be used to refer to one’s daughter for example. Notice also that HN refers to UV using the pronoun mju ‘you [plural]’ and not kau ‘you [singular]’ as when he addresses G in (5). The plural pronoun is here used to mark respect; HN is addressing UV not as an individual but as representing a generation older than his own, the ascending generation, that is, of his own parents.

The old lady responds, saying

(8) UV : 'dano mu tana ja?o mma.
also ATT-PART ask I father
You ask me too, sir/son.'

(9) UV : ja?o Na?u, me Tena
I Na?u intimate title for men Tena
bola 'bagho la?g ro?i ?
really REALIS NEG go clean garden before
for planting
'I said, Na?u [personal name, male or female] why doesn't Tena [personal name, male] go to clean the garden to prepare it for planting?'

This utterance is an understatement since eventually, it is HN who, with his knowledge and experience about the customary laws as well as his knowledge about the current government regulations, helps solve the problem. Due to his status, HN is a perfect mediator since he is detached enough in the sense that he is not emotionally involved in the problem and is free enough to offer an impartial judgement. (12) is another example where no honorific is used and like the situation in (9), the reader might guess as to what kind of relationship HN has with respect to PM. Actually, HN and PM are second cousins and they are of about the same age and intimate with one another as well. If the situation were otherwise, HN would have to address PM with an honorific. Notice also that HN uses the pronoun kita [we [Inclusive]] to refer to himself and PM but in this case excluding all the other participants. Another clue about the relationship of HN and PM is the use of the verb maj which literally means ‘to say’ or ‘to mean’ but in this context it may very well mean ‘to reprimand’ since PM volunteered to invite HN to attend the meeting with the people who are not their relatives. Besides, PM knows full well that HN does not have enough information about the case especially, the “family-tree” of the disputants.

Nevertheless, HN is willing to help solve the problem and he even identifies himself with them and acts on their behalf in appealing to the village chief to consider their problem more wisely, when JD, the village chief, threatens to confiscate the land under dispute and make it a site for the village greens. Consider the following
Even though HN is higher in status, in age, and in rank in the
government hierarchy than JD, he addresses JD with an
honorable, which is the full title of a village chief. This is also
an example of giving respect to the village chief since earlier
one of the speakers, G, referred to him only by his name.
To express his respect HN also uses the verb mazi 'to speak'
or 'to discuss' and not verb maji like in (12). So far we have
seen instances of the development of HN's relationship with
the disputants as manifest in his utterances, that is, in (4)
he addresses them with the pronoun miu 'you [plural]', in
(6) with kita 'we [inclusive]', and now in (14) he refers to
them as doa ja?o 'my cousins'. Putting himself as one of
the disputants, HN not only lowering the tension among
the people, but also strengthens the appeal to the village chief in
order that their land not be confiscated. In return, the dispu-
tants respect him more and towards the end of the meeting
G even offers HN a piece of land as a token of gratitude.
Now, having considered the parties to the dispute as
'cousins', HN is given the privilege to act more directly to-
wards finding a solution to the problem. Notice how HN
speaks directly to G in (15), (16), (17), (18), (19), (20) and (21).

(15) HN : bari mo edition, dia ja?o e tuku
NEG fine like this, I make longer
GO mazi GO azi ja?o
NON-HUM speak POSS younger, 'ib I
buiku.
Bulu
'Well, fine, and now I want to add to what my
younger brother Bulu [personal name, male]
was saying.'

(16) HN : dia na ja?o ngede.
this POINTER I beg/ask for
'I hereby beg you.'

(17) HN : kau Ga?e, wuy ngara
you-sg Ga?e you-sg COMP/more
ka?e.
older-sibling
'Ga?e, you are the oldest.' ('You are older
than anybody else.')

(18) HN : kau da ngara ka?e, kau
you-sg REAL COMP older-sib you-sg
bo'da ngara pada.
must EMPHASIZER arrange
'You are older and thus responsible for ar-
ranging things in the house.'

As HN's involvement in the dispute becomes more intense,
he feels appropriate to act on N's behalf in getting his share
of the family land. HN literally begs for G's considerate
judgement concerning N's claim as N needs a piece of land
to work on. Notice that in (15) HN puts himself one more
step closer to the disputants by putting B's remark in his dis-
course, that is, continuing what B was saying; and in ad-
dition, HN regards B as azi ja?o 'my younger brother'. HN also
gives due respect to what B was saying by referring to his re-
mark as mazi, that is, as 'discussion' or 'wise words'. B
was in fact suggesting to his elder brother G to give a piece
of land to N and thereby restore family unity. HN's remarks
in (17) and (18) are interesting since here he switches his
position to that of an elder brother of G and B and which,
subsequently, gives him the right of an elder brother to speak
strongly and even reprimand whenever necessary. HN is re-
mind G of his position as an elder brother who must think
and act wisely towards the other members of the family and
also of his responsibility for arranging things in the house,
seeing to it that every member is well-of by giving them land
to work on. HN addresses G only as kau 'you[singular]' with-
out an honorific, which is acceptable only after asserting him-
self as an elder brother. In fact, HN could, if he wanted to,
use his high social status to impose his views on G and B but
he did not want to since it would only cause G and B to resent
him. Notice also that even though HN is being harsh with G
and then comes to the climax in (21) where he literally and
directly orders G to divide the land, he still gives due respect
to G by acknowledging G's rights and responsibility as the el-
dest in the house; and thereby HN maintains his good relation-
ship with G. In (19), (20), and (21) HN switches to his status as
a government official; he is now telling them about the new
regulations concerning clan-lands and land-ownership. HN
uses the verb punu which literally means 'to tell' and which
carries with it the force of an order implying that they had
better pay due attention to him now since it is the govern-
ment plan to take away all untilled lands and give them to those
who do not own land. Furthermore, if G wants to keep all of
the family lands then he is the only one responsible for paying tax-
es, while if the lands are divided among the family members
then each of them will share that responsibility and not just G
alone. HN is well-informed about these regulations since he
was chosen to represent the regency of Nga'da in conference
on customary laws concerning clan-lands at the capital of the
province. It is understandable that HN has to switch to his pos-
tion as a government official in order to make his point
more clear and strong, at the same time gaining credibility or what
he is saying. These remarks eventually lead to the solution
of the problem about N's claim for a piece of land. As I pointed out before, HN is the best mediator since he is detached enough and yet due to his high status he may put himself as belonging to the in-group and suggest a solution that is acceptable to all. At his point in the conversation G agrees to give a piece of land to N and eventually the family breach is mended. They then go on to discuss whether or not to sue V concerning a dispute over land boundaries with T and Na.

It is worth nothing that in the course of the conversation, JD, the village chief, repeatedly quotes HN, putting him in his discourse. This seems to be an effective strategy of gaining credibility. Here are some examples:

(29) JD: 'baka ige, ree go ngata kaka
Necation deny POSS he-resp older-sibling hengki.
(borrowed from Indonesian kakak)
HN
'Well, nobody is to deny what [honorable] HN is saying.' (Hengki is a nick-name, male)

(23) JD: jiko toko vali sazu go
I make long more/again talk POSS kaka beyczki.
older-sib HN
'I want to add to what [honorable] HN is saying.'

(24) JD: remo go ngata ka e ja o
fit POSS he-resp older-sib I da 'danga sazu.
REALIS used to talk
'It fits precisely with what my elder brother [meaning HN] used to say.'

(25) JD: kambi kamo papai mazi kami
we-excl also RECIPROCAL speak we-excl ka e azi tau tu.
older-sib younger-sib make three
'The three of us, I, you and HN have also discussed the matter together as brothers.'

In (22) and (23) JD refers to HN as kaka which is a borrowing from Indonesian ka-ak meaning 'older sibling'. The word can be used as an honorific or an endearment term. In (23) and (24) JD refers to HN's remarks as sazu 'talk' or 'wise words', and to HN as ngata 'he/she' or 'they', in a respectful manner. JD could, if he wanted to, refer to HN as gazi he/she but he chooses the pronoun ngata to put HN in his respectful status. The relationship that JD has with PM, the former village chief, and HN is manifest in (25) where he quotes that the three of them 'discussed things together as brothers' that is, papa mazi. The expression papa mazi implies that the participants are on an equal basis in which every one is given the opportunity to give his views. The words ka e and azi, like uge and mma, can be used as honorifics.

To sum up we can say that the participants of the conversation succeed in establishing, re-establishing, and maintaining good relationships among themselves and that every one of them is given the respect he deserves in the various positions each of them holds, and this not only minimizes the difference in social statuses, but also eases the way towards a solution of the dispute. This is an example of how language is used for tension release and for maintaining group solidarity as Hays (1973) puts it. At the end of the conversation G even pretends that the conversation is only a play when he says

(26) G: 'bila kita ka e azi go yooc,
like we-incl older-sib younger-sib one clan kita da papa mazi dega.
we-incl REALIS RECIPROCAL speak play
'Just like we all older and younger siblings of one clan speak to one another as when we are at play.'

Here G wants to make sure that all misunderstandings and bad feelings are eliminated because they are in fact members of one clan, and united, they will go to court to sue concerning garden boundaries.

Finally, I want to add that the subjective points of view in defining relationships are manifest in the utterances of every participant throughout the conversation. To quote Benveniste (1971), "Language is possible only because each speaker sets himself up as a subject by referring to himself as 'I' in his discourse." In other words, it is 'I' that defines myself as 'an ego' in relation to others and defines other people in relation to 'I'. While on the other hand, it is the society that defines my place in the 'social map' as an individual according to age, caste, or social standing as the case stands in Nga'da culture. When people talk about 'individuality' it seems to me, that in a culture like Nga'da where individuals are rigidly defined according to their respective statuses, the sense of 'being individual' is most obvious.

The following is an attempt to display the core of the conversation in diagrams. Diagram 1 is a paradigm of personal pronouns, diagram 2 maps kinship terms used as honorifics or terms of address, paradigm 3 gives titles used as honorifics or terms of address, diagram 4 is a paradigm of verbs that mean 'to speak', and diagram 5 represents the interpersonal relationships of the participants.

Diagram 1: Personal Pronouns in Nga'da

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLOSE</td>
<td>DISTANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST PERSON</th>
<th>jac</th>
<th>[kami [exclusive] gami [exclusive] kiti [inclusive]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SECOND PERSON</td>
<td>kau</td>
<td>miu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THIRD PERSON</td>
<td>gazi</td>
<td>emu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nata</td>
<td>[emu xoga [respectful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>re-spectful</td>
<td>emu soga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rivu (unknown 'people')</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. There is only one set of pronouns in Nga'da.
2. To mark possession the POSSESSIVE PARTICLE go is stacked preceding the pronoun.
3. The term exclusive is used to mean excluding the addressee, and inclusive means including the addressee.
4. The word xoga or its variant soga literally means 'young man'.
Diagram 2: Kinship Terms

Can be used as pronouns or honorifics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bbu</td>
<td>'grand-parent(s)' also used reciprocally by grand-parent(s) and grandchildren, father and son, or mother and daughter to show respect or affection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mma</td>
<td>'father'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ine</td>
<td>'mother'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uge</td>
<td>'cousin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka'ẽ</td>
<td>'older sibling' (kakak is borrowed from Indonesian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaka</td>
<td>'younger sibling'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aizi</td>
<td>'clan members' (voe 'clan')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doa</td>
<td>'cousin'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cannot be used as pronouns but only as honorifics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bburnsi</td>
<td>'ancestor(s)'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ine voeta</td>
<td>'aunt' (father's sister(s)) (voetā 'sister')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana sa'bo</td>
<td>'members of an &quot;extended&quot; family' (ana 'child' sa'bo 'traditional house')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ana voe</td>
<td>'clan members' (voe 'clan')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 3: Titles

Used independently without personal name(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bapada</td>
<td>'village chief' (borrowed from Indonesian; bapa 'father', desa 'village')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapa</td>
<td>'chief' (borrowed from Indonesian kepala 'head')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapala mere</td>
<td>'village chief' (mere/meze 'big')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapala camat</td>
<td>'district chief' (camat 'district' is a borrowing from Indonesian)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Always used with personal name(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>'intimate title for men'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne</td>
<td>'intimate title for women'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meo</td>
<td>'intimate title for unfamiliar person(s)' (also used as a playful term of address to a familiar person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghili</td>
<td>'friend' (may be used with or without personal name(s))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 4: The Verbs for 'to speak'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mazi</td>
<td>to speak, to discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naji</td>
<td>to say, to reprimand, or to mean [in general]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>punu</td>
<td>to tell, to relate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suzu</td>
<td>to talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram 5: The Interpersonal Relationships of the Participants

Notes:
1. Below and to the left of the arrow are the verbs for 'to speak'.
2. Over and to the right of the arrow are the pronouns, honorifics, title, or just name initials.
3. The nearer an item is to the originator (from which the arrow departs) the closer and more intimate the relationship.
4. $\emptyset$ means no verb is present (where 'to speak' is understood).
5. The number next to the initials corresponds to the number given to each participant of the conversation by the end of section I (Introduction) of this paper.
6. V is not invited to the meeting but constantly mentioned in the conversation.
7. ngede means 'ask for' and tana means 'to ask' (like a question).
The uses of metaphors, metonymy, and words with uncommon meanings

As I mentioned in the introduction, metaphors are important in Nga'da culture since they can be used as a device to gain respect, credibility, and advantage over other people, likewise are the uses of metonymy and words with uncommon meanings. Moreover, metaphors and metonyms in Nga'da normally constitute the so-called "words of wisdom". They are stereotypic as well as formulaic and are handed down from generation to generation as a form of knowledge and are taught to children as a mnemonic device to aid memory. In this section I will quote some examples as used by several participants of the conversation and I hope to show that the person who has the highest status in this social interaction actually uses more metaphors, and metonyms in his discourse than the rest of the participants.

(27) UV : *napa dia ga' e milo vi* *pasa turi ja:'o*... *till this Ga' e Milo IRR marry write I* 'Starting from the time that ga' e Milo [personal name, male] married me ...'

To gain credibility for what she was saying concerning her knowledge about the "family-tree" of the disputants, the inheritance, and the land boundaries, UV presents her personal history and refers to her marriage to Ga' e Milo who was a distant relative of G, B, N, and T & Na. She explains that her marriage is a *pasa turi*, meaning her husband paid the dowry and took her into his family; consequently, she has some claim to the inheritance in the name of her late husband. UV was an outsider before the marriage but now she is a member of the "extended" family, and it follows that in this type of family meeting she has the right to speak and act as a witness to help solve the family problem. Some comment on marriage in Nga'da is necessary here. In Nga'da, if a man marries a woman and is not able to pay the dowry set by the bride's family, the marriage is called *di'in sa?o (di?i 'to stay', sa?o 'traditional house') which means the man has to go and live with his wife's "extended" family. In the case of a *di'in sa?o, a man does not have the rights of being the "head" of the family; instead, the woman (if she is "strong" enough) will be the "head" of the family, while the usual case is that the woman's brother(s) will act as head(s) of the family. If a marriage is a *pasa turi*, the man will bring his wife to live with his own ("extended") family and he is the head of the new ("nuclear") family. Certain complications may arise if the caste system is taken into account but I avoid discussing it in this paper. For the reader's information, I will just mention the castes, as existing in the past, since at the present moment the system is almost completely extinct. The three castes in Nga'da are: ga' e meze (ga' e 'respected', 'god'; meze 'great') which is the highest caste, ga' e kisa (kisa 'middle') is the middle caste, and azi ana (azi 'younger sibling', ana 'child') is the lower caste. For more information on castes, see Arndt (1954) Chapter II, pp. 321 - 343; and Chapter I, pp. 17-72. II

(28) WS : *da mogo naji go jara* REALIS willing to stay say NON-HUM horse *da soga kuru kona ghe.* REALIS graze grass/pasture that INTEN 'Like a horse that is willing to stay at the place where it grazes.'

WS is speaking on behalf of N who is claiming his share of the family land. WS is here comparing N to a horse that will never leave the pasture where it grazes if grass is plentiful. WS is trying to convince G and B that N will be willing to stay with or near the "extended" family and can be counted upon only if he is given a piece of land to work on, otherwise N will go away and will not feel tied to the family. It is clear that WS wants to strengthen his statement by using this metaphor.

(29) G : *dia kita le papa mazi* this we-incl ADV-MANN RECIP speak *mema kita dia moti nga kita* true we-incl this at/together face we-incl *ka' e azi sa voe.* elder-sibling younger-sib one clan/herd 'Now we had better speak truthfully as we are gathered here face-to-face as older and younger siblings of one clan.'

The utterance is an appeal by G that everybody speak truthfully and that all should act as witnesses in the future to what is agreed on in this meeting. The expression ka' e azi can be rendered as "love one another", sa voe means 'one clan' or 'one herd'; like a herd of cattle the family should stick together.

(30) GI : *dia nale 'domi ngaku da mai* this Nale only INTENS REALIS come *go kuru da ngaku unol* NON-HUM grass REALIS green attracted *vae da limo* ... water REALIS ample and forming a pool *'Nale [personal name, male or female] here only comes because the grass is green and the water is abundant ...'GI is being sarcastic to N and compares him to a horse that comes only because grass and water are abundant. It is to be noted that N married a girl from a rema village and used to live there for a while, but now he comes back since the conditions are much better at home.

At some point in the course of the conversation HN states that he does not want to be a witness to a family fight, to which B replies

(31) B : *vaki gami dia ka' e ne' e body/TOPIc we-excl this older-sib with/and azi* younger-sib *'As for us, we are older and younger siblings.'*

B makes it clear that this is a family meeting and nobody wants to have a fight. B's attitude towards the others is implied in the use of the word vaki which literally means 'body'; it reflects the idea that every one of them is a member of the same family and a descendant of the same 'blood'.

(32) JD : *kita bo'da pu nu pa' u bhu* we-incl must tell from grand-parent(s) *kita na'a dia na ...* we-incl keep this POINTER 'We must state and explain that our grandparent(s) or great-grandparent(s) bec'ot this person and left the property to such-and-such a person ...'
JD wants the disputants to be clear about their positions in the kinship relationship. It is worth noting that the word na’2a ‘to keep’ is here used with an uncommon meaning, that is, ‘to begot’. In everyday conversation, the word na’2a is normally used to mean ‘to keep’ or ‘to store’. In this type of family meeting the word pumu also has a special meaning, that is, ‘to invoke’, whereby one invokes the ancestor(s) to be witnesses and this is the reason why everybody should speak only the truth.

(33) JD : kita tau moli gha, we-incl do/make finished PERF-ASPECT gazi ko’o mu le seghe he/she still INTEN ADV-MANNER put/bend buri tato meda, buttock and then/CONJUNCTION sit in relaxation ‘We have already dug the garden, then he just claims it and sits and relaxes without doing anything.’

JD is talking about V, who starts the dispute over garden boundaries with T and Na. JD uses a sarcastic expression to refer to V’s dishonesty, that is, V waits until others have dug the garden and prepared it for planting before claiming that the garden is his and so saves himself the hard labor. seghe buri is an expression used ordinarily to refer to a lazy person who just sits and never works.

In (34) JD is quoting HN putting him in his discourse. This is a strategy to make one’s statement more credible.

(34) JD : ka’2e ja’o nai ne’2e ugi tangu older-sib I say with range/line neck ngata ‘baghi ngir, he/she-resp each place/face ‘My elder brother [meaning HN] says everybody has his own range of the neck.’

This utterance is to be taken as meaning ‘everybody has his own strength and should: be responsible for himself’. JD makes this remark in relation to HN’s suggestion to divide the family land in order that every one of the family is responsible to pay taxes on his share.

(35) JD : ngalu kau ga’2e, ne’2e ngalu kau ga’2e, share you-sg Ga’2e with share you-sg Ga’2e ‘You, Ga’2e, have your place in the family along with your share of the inheritance.’

ngalu literally means ‘share’ but in Nga’da tradition one’s share is defined by his place within the ‘family-tree’; so the word can be rendered as ‘a node’ in the ‘family-tree’. In everyday conversation, the word ngalu is used to mean ‘first’ like in ana ngalu ‘the eldest child’, or to refer to person(s) who are giving a feast as in mori ngalu (morir’owner’). JD’s remark also implies that nobody is to meddle with someone else’s share, in this particular case N’s share of the family land, because that might bring about disputes.

(36) JD : naps mali rivo da miri, kita till when/If people REALIS push we-incl ghagha utu bhou, then gather pile ‘Only when an outsider [meaning V] tries to push us, then we will stand together.’

This remark is made in relation to the question as to either divide the land among family members, or keep it under one name. JD is suggesting that it would be wise to divide the land and to consider it as one family land only when one of the family members has a dispute with another person who does not belong to the family. In the case of going to sue V, they all should go and bear witness that the land is their family land and not just ‘Tand Na’s problem. The word miri literally means ‘to shove with one’s shoulder’ and is used here to mean ‘try to take away somebody else’s property’. While utu ‘bou is an expression meaning ‘to stand together and help one another’.

(37) JD : miu vi longi badi ne’e pamareta, you-pl IRR lubricate gun with government miu da me’bop, you-pl RÉAL crumble ‘If you want to wage war against the government [meaning ‘the government regulations’], you will be crushed.’ (The word pamareta is borrowed from Indonesian pemerintah ‘ruler’ or ‘government’.)

Here JD is reminding the disputants that it is of no use fighting government regulations concerning taxes and land ownership as HN has clearly explained that the government will take away untitled lands and give them to those who need land but do not own any. langi badi ‘lubricate gun’ is a metonym referring to a preparation for a war or actually waging war. me’bop ‘to break into small pieces’ is a metaphor derived from the decay or disintegration of wood, bamboo, or stone.

(38) HN : ja’o naii mali da vi utu ulu I say li RELATER IRR gather head kons, ja’o ngeee, that I can ‘I said, if it was just to have a meeting, I could come.‘

HN is here explaining about accepting the invitation to attend the family meeting. The expression utu ulu ‘gather head(s)’ is to be interpreted as ‘to meet and exchange ideas’. The metaphor is derived from piling corn in groups of forty as ulu also means ‘a group of forty’ normally used when counting corn on the cobs or coconuts.

(39) HN : me’2a mma kita ngata kaa UNSPEC-NUM father we-incl they-resp eat da le papa rebu, im REALIS ADV-MANN RECIP snatch/rob drink papa reei, RECIPROCAL leave food or drink ‘Our fathers used to eat together from one plate and drink from the same cup, one leaving some amount for the other.’

HN is reminding the disputants of their ancestors who lived in peace and helped one another. The ancestors were never selfish as they shared food and drink. The expressions kaa do le papa rebu and imu papa reei figuratively mean ‘love one another as brothers and sisters’. HN is, in fact, asking G to give N a piece of land since he (G) already has enough.

(40) HN : voki kau ga’2e, kau da body/TOPIC you-sg Ga’2e you-sg REALIS
HN repeatedly stresses the idea of family unity because of its importance and usefulness in resolving family disputes. *To'o la'a* literally means "to get up and go!" but, with respect to the case at hand, the expression means "to make ready for litigation against V". _mogo so ate_ "having one liver" is to be rendered as "being in agreement with one another".

(44) HN: kita la gago one sa'o; we-incorporate drive into a flock inside traditional ngita ma'e nuu, pausu ma'e house face don't smoke/frown: check don't sprawl dorep 'We have to stick together like a herd of cattle and we must not frown upon or look down upon one another in our family.'

The notion of family unity is here restated by HN implying that outsiders may read what is in their hearts. The expression in their faces will tell the public that there is a resentment against another in their family. Ultimately, HN wants the disputants to settle their dispute once and for all and that they love one another as brothers and sisters. *Kago* literally means 'to drive a flock of sheep together', that is, not letting even one go astray. This is apparently an appeal to welcome N back into the family.

To sum up we can say that it is obvious that metaphors, metonymies, as well as words with uncommon meanings can be used as a device to gain credibility, respect, and advantage. In this particular study the advantage is the mending of the breach among members of an "extended" family. To support my claim that a person having a high social status tends to use more metaphors I did some counting and the result shows that HN uses the most metaphors and is second only by JD, the village chief. Interestingly enough, HN and JD have naturally become the center of attention to whom the disputants look for advice and help in resolving the family dispute.

IV. Conclusion

This short study concerning the interpersonal relationships in Nga'dais not exhaustive, and the present paper serves as a partial contribution to the study of pragmatics as a means of investigating human interaction. I should acknowledge that my subjective point of view may have crept into the analysis since I personally know most of the persons involved in the conversation. However, as Pike puts it, "The observer adds part of himself to the data that he looks at or listens to".

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, June 22, 1978

NOTES

* I must acknowledge the help of Alton L. Becker (University of Michigan), J.W.M. Verhaar (University of Indonesia), Anton M. Moeliono (University of Indonesia), and several other scholars who read the draft of this paper and gave useful comments and suggestions. My thanks also to my father, H. Nainawa, who taped the conversation and sent the recording to Ann Arbor.
1. Nga'da is a language spoken in the West-Central part of the island of Flores, Indonesia by an ethnic group also called Nga’da. For the reader’s information, the following are the phonemes of Nga’da and the orthography as used in the present paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Vowels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m n ŋ b d g</td>
<td>i ə u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p t k v z ž</td>
<td>e ø o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f s x j r l</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For practical purposes the phonemes are orthographically represented as

| m n ng b d g | i ə u |
| p t k v ž | e ø o |
| f s x l | a |

For further information about the phonology of Nga’da, see Djawanai (1977).

2. I am indebted to A. L. Becker for drawing my attention to C. Linde's idea.

3. See Arndt (1954) Chapter V, Section II, pp. 501 - 543 (Stafrecht)


5. Indonesia operates under the constitutional laws of the country, and the customary laws. The customary laws are unmodified and based on tradition, and vary from area to area. For further information see Arndt (1954) Chapter V, pp. 471 - 543 (Rechtswesen).

6. The hierarchy in the government of The Republic of Indonesia is:

1. The central government (Pemerintah Pusat)
2. The provinces (Propinsi); a province comprises several regencies.
3. The regencies (Kabupaten); a regency comprises several districts.
4. The districts (Kecamatan); a district comprises several villages.
5. The villages (Desa or Kampung). The hierarchy starting from the districts down may vary from area to area (rural or urban).
6. The most common property bequeathed is land but very often cattle and gold are inherited.
7. The Nga’da villages are relatively small. The largest town, Bajawa, has a population of about 1000 people.
8. The Explanation on abbreviations used for the glosses of Nga’da words:
ADV-MANN(ER) - adverb of manner
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APPENDIX

The dialogue in Nga’da (the first three minutes of the conversation)

Unidentified Speaker

1. 'ini kita mau tanya...

   dis we-incl want ask
   (The words are all borrowed from Indo-
   nesian)
   'Now let's ask ...

JD

2. na?u pegho ne'e na ..., ma'u pegho ne'e
   Na?u Pegho and Na... Na'U Pegho and
   langa pegho na vi ... mogo; ?to?
   Langa Pegho POIN IRR together TAG
   'Na'U Pegho and Langa Pegho are related,
   right?'

G

3. e'e ngata ka'e ne'e asi.
   yes they-resp older-sib and younger-sib
   'Yes, they were siblings (sisters).'

N

4. ka'e ne'e asi.
   older-sib and younger-sib

Unident. S.

5. ka'e asi.

JD

5. ka'e ne'e asi ?artinya kona
   older-sib and younger-sib meaning that
   vi ngis mogo so ngalu na.
   IRR place together one share POINTER
   (artinya is borrowed from Indonesian)
   'They were siblings mean they shared the
   inheritance.'

G

7. e'e
   yes

Unident. S.

8. m'm
   yes

JD

9. miu vi na?u ngis
   you-pl IRR keep/beget/bequeath place
   sei di ?
   who this
   'Who bequeath you then?'

G

10. oje na?u
    Oje Na?u

JD

11. miu vi da; dau na, vi na'a
    you-pl IRR nowa' days POIN IRR keep/beget/
    sei?
    bequeath who
    'But who bequeath you' ('Whose place do you
    keep?', or 'Who bequeathed the property
    to you?')

B

12. na?a gami di.
    keep we-excl this
    'They bequeathed us here.'

G

13. e'e moli ... ha pi vo ... na'u pegho ne'e
    yes finished NEG IRR Na'U Pegho and
    langa pegho vanga na'a oje na'.
    Langa Pegho IRR/would keep Oje Na'U
    'Yes, well... Na'U Pegho and Langa Pegho
    bequeath Oje Na'.

Oje na?u vanga na'a gami di
Oje na?U IRR/will keep/beget we-excl this
POIN
'Oje Na'U then bequeathed us here.'

JD

15. miu na utu da denge miu ..., you-pl POIN gather REAL listen you-pl
   miu kona vaki gu'e na
   that/there body/TOPIC Ca'e POIN
   so'o ?
   TAG
   'You are here gathered to listen to G,
   right?'

16. ne'e sei sei so'o ?
    and who who TAG
    'Or who else?'


da". Paper read at the Symposium on Clan-Lands and Landreform in Nusa Tenggara Timur, at Kupang. (Unpublished ms.)


'We must relate the kinship relationship starting from our fore-fathers; such-and-such a person begot this person and left his property to such-and-such a person, and so forth.'

'And then to the East ...'

N

G

Kasa lau
side East

Kasa lau, moli kona eta mai vavo,
finished that up come over
konna go ja ... go go sina meo
that-POIN POSS POSS
'dano; sina meo 'diamo'.
also
'To the East and then above is also Sina Meo 'Diamo's garden.'

B

Zeta vavo go e ... go sile nga da.
up over POSS Sile Nga'da
'Above it is Sile Nga'da's garden.'

31. Zeta ulu go sile nga da.
up head

Interrupt. (not clear)

G

Sile nga da vonga na ?a uge vua
IRR-will keep mother Vua
diana
this-POIN
'Sile Nga'da then begot mother [honorific] Vua here.'

N

Interrupt's (not clear)

PM

Dere ghe ?e; ma ?e kosa!
wait please don't add
'Wait until he finishes what he's saying, and please don't interrupt!'

HN

34. Moli, molo gha ... fine fine PERF-ASP
'That's fine ...'

G

Sile nga da vonga na ?a uge vua
Sile Nga'da IRR-will keep mother Vua
diana,
this-POIN

HN

36. Molo gha, miu : miu mazi.
fine PERF-ASP you-pl ATT speak
'That's fine, you all may speak.'

Unident. S

'ha?l ... papa rebu 'ha?l
NEG RECIP snatch/take/rob NEG
apa aps. what
'It's fine to interrupt, and fight for turns at talking.'

N

38. Yold fale zale ...
TOPIC side South
'As to the South of ...'

B

Kona lange ne 'e vuda kona
that/there adjacent with Vuda that/there
lau mai notu alo na ...
East come along dituu POIN
'There is the boundary next to Vuda's
garden right along the ditch there.'

JD 40. konan niu modu papa relu that-POIN you-pl NEG RECIP take go ngora domi tange go NON-HUM garden onlyfight NON-HUM tangle.
boundary
'Now it looks like you are not fighting for possession of a certain garden but you are disputing about boundaries.'

Unident. S. 41. dia papa tange go lange this/here RECIP fight NON-HUM boundary 'We have a dispute over land boundaries.'

JD 42. yang paleng ponting RELAT most/SUPERLATIVE important
niu 'bee ne’e orang-orang yang you-pl summon with people RELAT
kulup konal ... pnu’u vunga da tau enough know from first REAL do ghe’e, ?io ka’e ? please TAG older-sib
'The most important thing for you to do is summon all those who know enough about who first tilled the land, right [honorific-id]' (The words yang, paleng, ponting, orang, kulup, konal, are borrowed from Indonesian)

HN 43. e’e yes

JD 44. pu’u vunga da tau vi lange ne’e from 6:st REAL do IRR adjacent with sej ne’e go sej, who with POSS who 'When you first dug the garden who worked near you.'

45. vi zeal na’g ... lange ne’e sej da at West keep boundary with who REAL tau gha na? do PERF-ASP POIN 'Who worked in the garden to the West of yours?'

46. emu me vuda ro’baze’e vangizua they int–title Vuda tomorrow the day-after–
mu malu naji y’ da ter-tomorrow ATT if say IRR REAL tau na, lange ne’e sej ne’e sej? do POIN boundary with who 'In the future Vuda (and his party) should also name their witnesses if they claim the garden.'

HN 47. moe dinan ga’e, ju’o mazi ne’e like this-POIN Ga’e I speak with kau.
you-sg
'Now this is the way Ga’e, I'm speaking with you.'

HN 48. 'bee masa masa ne’e o ... summon all with 'Please summon all of . . .' 

JD 49. ne’e behi, with witness

HN 50. ne’e behi kita na, with witness we-incl POIN 'Our witnesses.'

51. pu’u tave kona da tau, pu’u xiva from time that REAL do from year konan lami tau un ... uma that-POINTER we-excl do POIN garden dinan.
this-POIN
'At that time, in that year, we worked on this garden.'

52. dia lange ‘ ne’e konan; kona tau this adjacent with that-POIN that do ne’e konana, with that-POIN 'Our garden here is adjacent to that one, and that person worked together with such-and-such a person.'

53. zeta ulu ra’e sej zili vona ne’e sej; up head with who down bottom zale ‘have ne’e sej ulu mana ne’e sej? c’uth slope to head North 'who worked or owned the garden above, at the bottom, to the South slope, and to the North of you?'

54. supaya ro’baze’e vangizua so that tomorrow the day-after–tomorrow na, kona vi tau go e beli POIN that IRR do NON-HUM witness kita na, we-incl POIN: 'So that in the future they could act as our witnesses.' (supaya is borrowed from Indonesian)

Notes: 1. Lines connecting two or more speakers mark that the speakers talk simultaneously.
2. I mark the Indonesian words used here as borrowings but most likely the speakers just switch from Nga’d to Indonesian and back.