

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:

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>meN</u> + verb | AF |
| $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} + \emptyset \\ + \underline{i} \\ + \underline{kan} \end{array} \right.$ | GF |
| | RF |
| | IF |

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 facets of the happening. Typically, Indoeuropean 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 'deeper' level. Additionally, the focus process itself involves neither topicalization¹ 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-(t)ulis-∅ surat kepada Muti.
 AF Heru AF write GF letter to Muti
 'Heru wrote a letter to Muti.'
- (2) Heru men-(t)ulis-i buku Muti.
 AF Heru AF write RF book Muti
 'Heru scribbled in Muti's book.'
- (3) Heru men-(t)ulis-kan surat untuk Muti.
 AF Heru AF write IF letter for Muti
 'Heru 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 (Heru) 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 may 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 -∅ (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 senses directly analogous to Indoeuropean 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.
 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.² In transformational terms, that is, the question asked here is whether sentences such as (7) are derived from type (8) or type (9)

below.

(8) Arman mem-(p)anggil-Ø anjing itu.
AF Arman AF call GF dog that
'Arman called the dog.'

(9) Anjing itu di-panggil-Ø (oleh) Arman.
GF dog that -AF call GF by Arman
'The dog was called by Arman.'

This question may be resolved through an examination of the verbal prefix di- and additional transitive sentences in which the verb is not marked by the +AF prefix, meN-.

2.1. It has long been noted that the Indonesian languages typically have both full and short forms for the pronouns (e.g. Brandstetler 1916). The full forms are in most cases used independently, while the short forms are often bound as either prefixes or suffixes to the verb. Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) itself, however, is conspicuous for there no longer being a productive short, prefixed form of the third person singular (3sg) dia. Based on the internal evidence that the di- prefix is restricted overwhelmingly to use in sentences couched in third person, and on the comparative evidence that in many Indonesian languages, such as the Lampung dialect (Haaksma 1933) and many Sulawesi languages (John Wolff, personal communication) a short form of the 3sg pronoun still exists as a verbal prefix, it has been at least the implicit assumption of several scholars that the di- prefix in Bahasa Indonesia has developed from the full form dia although the connection is no longer recognized by native speakers.³ If this is correct, an interesting pattern develops when a comparison is made between -AF sentences such as (4), (5), and (6), and those of the type shown below.

(10) Tali ku- potong-Ø dengan pisau.
rope 1sg cut GF with knife
'The rope was cut by me with a knife.' or
'I cut the rope with a knife.'

(11) Ku- lihat-Ø Anjing Hitam ber- lari ke-
1sg see GF dog black stat. run prep.
luar, di- kejar -Ø oleh Kapten Flint.
out 3sg chase GF by captain Flint
'I saw Black Dog running out, chased by Captain Flint.' or
'Black Dog was seen by me running out, chased by Captain Flint.'

(12) Akan kau kejut -kan dia.
will 2sg startle IF 3sg
'You will startle him.' or
'He will be startled by you.'

It will be noticed that sentence (10) above bears a striking resemblance to (9) in that the 'object' has again been preposed, and a pronoun is serving as the verbal prefix. In (9) it is the 3sg dia, and in (10) it is the first person pronoun aku. Since it has been shown that (9), in which the 'dog' is the 'called', is the Goal Focus equivalent of AF (8), in which 'Arman' is the 'caller', it is suggested that (10) is also non-Actor Focus, differing from (13) in person only.

(13) Tali di- potong-Ø dengan pisau.
rope 3sg cut GF with knife
'The rope was cut with a knife.'

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-Ø 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 kejut -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 prefixed 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- prefix is no longer recognized as a short form of the 3sg dia by native speakers, which led to the erroneous 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 pronoun in sentence (9), or an independent form, as in (8). 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-Ø
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 analysed 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 unprefix verb in a sentence in which the actor is not focal. The "error" in this construction may really be the intercession of a modifier or auxiliary between a bound actor and its verb.

*(19) Aku akan pukul-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 kupukul 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 unprefix 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 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. Claudie 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 cliticized 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).

REFERENCES

- Becker, Alton and Umar Wirasno
1977 On the nature of syntactic change in Dahasa Indonesia. In Proceedings of the Second Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages. Ann Arbor.
- Brandstetter, Renward
1916 An introduction to Indonesian linguistics. Royal Asiatic Society, London.
- Ferrell, Raleigh
1974 Construction markers and subgrouping of Formosan languages. Paper delivered at the First International Conference on Comparative Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Givón, Talmy
1976 Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In Symposium on Subject and Topic (Charles Li, ed.). Academic Press Inc., New York.
- Haaksmā, Remy
1933 Inleiding tot de studie der vervoegde vormen in de Indonesische talen. Boekhandel en drukkerij voorheen E.J. Brill, Leiden.

Naylor, Paz Buenaventura
1975 Topic, focus, and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal
clause. In Oceanic Linguistic XIV 1:12-79.

Schwartz, A.
1976 On the universality of subject. In Symposium on
Subject and Topic (Charles Li, ed.). Academic
Press Inc., New York.

Tchekkhoff, Claudie
1977 The economy of voicelessness: an example in

Indonesian. In Proceedings of the Second Eastern
Conference on Austronesian Languages. Ann
Arbor.

Thomas, Michael
1977 Verbal affixes and focus in Bahasa Indonesia.
In Proceedings of the Second Eastern Conference
on Austronesian Languages. Ann Arbor

* * *