

TOWARDS A DEFINITION OF "NOUNINESS" IN INDONESIAN

JEFF DREYFUSS

Abstract

There are a number of affixes in Indonesian which are all said to be "nominalizing" affixes (Mees 1951, pp. 46; Ramlan 1967, pp. 55; Alisjahbana 1970, pp. 24, 48, 49, 51). They are the following: (a) *-an*; (b) *pe-+---+an*; (c) *peN-+---+an*; (d) *per-+---+an*; (e) *peN-*; (f) *ke-*; (g) *ke-+---+an*; (h) *se-¹*; (i) *-nya*; (j) *pe-*.

In order to evaluate the claim that forms (a) through (j) are "nominal" forms we must first define what a "nominal" is for Indonesian. Thus, this paper first of all tries to come up with a working definition for "nominal" in Indonesian, and then, on the basis of this working definition, we test the claim that forms (a) through (j) are "nominal" forms as opposed to other grammatical forms in Indonesian such as *meN-*, *ber-* and zero affixal forms which function typically as "adjectives" and "adverbs".² We find that our "noun-defining test" are, themselves, "squishy";³ that is, some of the tests are "stronger" than others in that they seem to pick out only the "nouniest" entities and reject entities which are less "nouny". Thus, on the basis of our "noun-defining tests" we propose a category "noun" for Indonesian which is "squishy"; some classes of entities (i.e. forms (a) through (j)) are "nounier" than are others (i.e. *meN-*, *ber-*) which are "nounier" than are zero affixal forms which are functionally "adjectives" and "adverbs". Thus the main point of this paper is that we may define the category "noun" for Indonesian in terms of "degrees of categorial classification" (i.e. a "squish"); secondarily, we find that the category defining tests are themselves "squishy"; some are "stronger" than others (i.e. more constrained).*

This paper uses the methodology of Keenan (1976)⁴ and Ross (1973)⁵, who both argue that it may be more profitable to talk about *degrees*

of categorial classification than to talk about categories as black or white phenomena. Keenan (1976) talks about degrees of "subjecthood" and Ross (1973) about degrees of "nouniness".

Ross (1973) argues that tests for "NP's" may themselves be ranked as to how selective they are in picking out "NP's". Ross uses one example, *Harpo*, (p. 96) as an example of an "NP" which is more "nounphrasy" than is, for example *tabs* (as in *Tabs were kept on him by the FBI* (p. 96)). Ross argues that certain "NP" defining tests will pick out *Harpo* but fail with *tabs* and thus *Harpo* is more "nounphrasy" than is *tabs* with respect to Ross's tests.

Using the methodology evolved by Ross (1973), and Keenan (1976) we will attempt to constrain the notion "NP" for Indonesian; our aim being to discover whether a given entity is "more or less nounphrasy" than another entity.

The following tests will be defined as "NP tests" for Indonesian. We first list these tests and then discuss each test on its own:

1. "NP's" may not be negated by the negative *tidak*.
2. Only "NP's" may function as the antecedent of a relative clause.
3. Only "NP's" may be preceded by "numeral + noun classifier" sequences.
4. Only "NP's" may be pronominalized.
5. Only "NP's" may function as grammatical direct and indirect objects.
6. Only "NP's" may follow *-i* suffixed verbs (in fully elaborated "active" clauses with no contextual deletions).
7. Only "NP's" may function as the object of a preposition.⁶
8. Only "NP's" may be followed by *itu*.⁷
9. Only "NP's" may be preceded by the "agent marker" *oleh* 'by'.
10. Only "NP's" may be "quantified" (i.e. one time, three times, several times, etc.).

The above list is not intended to be ex-

haustive, nor are all the above "NP" tests mutually exclusive.⁸ For example, an "NP" which follows an *-i* suffixed verb (test 6) will automatically function as the direct object of that verb, and thus pass test 5 as well.

Thus these tests are not entirely independent of one another and are hence not all of equal weight. Further work will have to be done in finding tests which are perhaps more independent of one another. The above list is only a first attempt. Now on to our tests.

1. "NP's" may not be negated by the negative *tidak* 'not'

In Indonesian there are several negatives among which are *belum* 'not yet', *jarang* 'rarely', *jangan* 'don't', *entah* 'don't know', *bukan* 'not', and *tidak* 'not'. It is often said that the main difference between *bukan* and *tidak* is that *tidak* is used to negate "predicates" and *bukan* to negate "nominals".⁹ In fact, this is too simple a generalization. *Bukan* may come before entities (i.e. negate them) which are intuitively "predicates" (or at least not clearly "nominals") as in the following examples:

- (1) *Bukan me-lompat tetapi ia duduk saja*
neg. jump but he sit only
'He didn't jump but only sat'
- (2) *Bukan merah tetapi biru*
neg. red but blue
'It wasn't red but blue'

The generalization that *bukan* is used to negate "nominals" and *tidak* "predicates" comes from contrasts like the following:

- (3) *Dia* { *bukan* } *Presiden*
 { **tidak* }
 { he } neg. President
 { she }
'He isn't the president'
- (4) *Ini* { *bukan* } *ular*
 { **tidak* }
 this neg. snake
'This is not a snake'

Although it does seem to be true that *bukan* 'only' may negate "nominals" (i.e. *snake*, *Pres-*

ident etc.), it does not seem to be the case that a word following *bukan* must be a "nominal" as (1) and (2) attest to. Thus we cannot use *bukan* as a test for locating "nominals". What about *tidak*?

The negative *tidak* apparently, may negate a whole range of entities but it cannot be used to negate entities which are "nominal".¹⁰ Note in the following example that nouns are not candidates for "tidak negation":

- (5)

Ini tidak this neg.	ada
	exist
	merah
	red
	berlari
	to run
	meng-gambar
	to draw
	duduk
	to sit
*Harpo	
Harpo	
*gedung	
building	

'This is not "X"'

Thus, we have a test for "NP's" which may be negatively stated (i.e. in terms of a negative constraint), and it is: "NP's" may not be negated by *tidak*. Using the "tidak test" let us see if forms (a) through (j) pass or fail this test. Note in the following example that only *bukan* and not *tidak* may precede forms (a) through (j):

- (6)

Ini { <i>bukan</i> } This neg. { <i>*tidak</i> }	(a) <i>tembak-an</i>
	shots
	(b) <i>pe-layar-an</i>
	sailing
	(c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i>
	killing
	(d) <i>per-buat-an</i>
	act
	(e) <i>pem-besar</i>
	boss
	(f) <i>ke-kasih</i>
	beloved
(g) <i>ke-percaya-an</i>	
belief	
(h) <i>se-suatu</i>	
something	
(i) <i>sakitnya</i>	
sickness	
(j) <i>pe-layar</i>	
sailor	

2. Only "NP's" may serve as the antecedent of a relative clause

Relative clauses in Indonesian normally have the order *antecedent - relative pronoun - relative clause*. Note in the following example that (a) through (j) pattern with (intuitively) "nounier" of "NP's" in that all may function as the "antecedent" of a relative clause:

(7)	antecedent	relative pronoun
	<i>Harpo</i> Harpo <i>gedung</i> building <i>Philadelphia</i> Philadelphia	
<i>Ia memikirkan</i> he thought about	(a) <i>tembak-an</i> shots (b) <i>pe-lari-an</i> chase (c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i> killing (d) <i>per-janji-an</i> promise (e) <i>pem-besar</i> boss (f) <i>ke-tua</i> boss (g) <i>ke-ingin-an</i> wish (h) <i>se-suatu</i> something (i) <i>sakit-nya</i> sickness (j) <i>pe-layar</i> sailor	<i>yang</i> that

relative clause

dulu dilupakannya

before he had forgotten about

'He thought about "x" that before he had forgotten about'

Note in the following example that *meN-* and *ber-* prefixed entities may also serve as the "antecedent" for a relative clause while entities which seem to function as "adjectives" (*merah* 'red', *cantik* 'beautiful') and "adverbs" (*cepat* 'fast', *lambat* 'late') may not:

(8)

Antecedent	relative pronoun	relative clause
<i>meng-gambar</i> to draw <i>me-nulis</i> to write <i>me-lompat</i> to jump <i>ber-lari</i> to run <i>ber-diri</i> to stand <i>*merah</i> red <i>*cantik</i> beautiful <i>*cepat</i> fast <i>*lambat</i> late	<i>yang</i> that	<i>disukainya</i> was liked (by) him

Thus it seems that NP test number 2 (i.e. antecedent of relative clause test) admits *meN-* and *ber-* forms but excludes what we will pre-theoretically call "adjectival" and "adverbial" forms (i.e. *merah* 'red', *cepat* 'fast', etc.). On the basis of test number 2 we may say that *meN-* and *ber-* forms are "nounier" than are entities like *merah* 'red' and *cepat* 'fast'.

The former may serve as the antecedent of a relative clause while the latter may not. However, we note that on the basis of this test alone, we have no reason to say that entities like *Harpo* and *Philadelphia* are any "nounier" than are entities like *meng-gambar* 'to draw' and *ber-lari* 'to run'. They all pass the "antecedent of relative clause test" with flying colors.

3. Only "NP's" may be preceded by numeral + "NP" classifier sequence (i.e. *one stick rice*, *two tail pig*, etc.)

Indonesian, as well as many other South-east Asian languages (see Adams and Conklin 1974, Becker 1976) have what are called "noun classifiers". "Noun classifiers" are words which precede nouns and give information as to the class of object of which the noun is a member. "Noun classifiers" themselves are normally preceded by some "number", thus we normally find the sequence "number+noun classifier" preceding some noun (i.e. *three tail pig*, *seven fruit mangos*). In English there are traces of

such "noun classifiers" as in *three head of cattle* or a *flock of geese*, etc. Although the system of using "noun classifiers" was somewhat more elaborated in the past in Malay (Indonesian), there is evidence that one classifier: *buah* 'fruit', or round or large object, is coming to displace many of the other classifiers formerly employed. Consider the following examples:

- (9)
- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <p><i>seorang</i>
a person</p> | } | <p>?<i>Harpo</i>
<i>Harpo</i>
<i>pegawai</i>
employee
<i>orang</i>
person</p> |
|------------------------------------|---|---|

- (10)
- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <p><i>gedung</i>
building</p> | } | <p>(a) <i>tembak-an</i>
shot</p> <p>(b) <i>pe-lari-an</i>
chase</p> <p>(c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i>
killing</p> <p>(d) <i>per-temu-an</i>
meeting</p> <p>(e) <i>pem-balap</i>
racer (as in a type of vehicle)¹¹</p> <p>(f) <i>ke-hendak</i>
wish</p> <p>(g) <i>ke-mati-an</i>
death</p> <p>(h) *<i>se-suatu</i>
something</p> <p>(i) ?<i>sakit-nya</i>¹²
sickness</p> <p>(j) <i>pe-licin</i>
instrument for smoothing something</p> <p>*<i>meng-gambar</i>
to draw</p> <p>*<i>me-nulis</i>
to write</p> <p>*<i>ber-lari</i>
to run</p> <p>*<i>ber-diri</i>
to stand</p> <p>*<i>merah</i>
red</p> <p>*<i>cantik</i>
beautiful</p> <p>*<i>cepat</i>
fast</p> <p>*<i>lambat</i>
slow, late</p> |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
- sebuah*
a

In (9) note that *Harpo* is strange when classified. One of my informants, Pak Syukur,

feels that "proper nouns" are not normally classified because their referents are "already specific" (i.e. can be pointed to). Thus, it seems that entities which are *already* referentially specific are not good candidates for "noun classifiers". This is a possible explanation for the form *se-suatu* 'something', being unacceptable when preceded by a noun classifier in 'X'. It, like *Harpo*, is already referentially specific.¹³ The form *sakit-nya* 'sickness' gets mixed reviews. Out of seven people I asked, three thought it could be classified, and the others thought not. I intend the '?' to mark the variation among my informants regarding the acceptability of the form when classified.

We note that *meN-* and *ber-* forms are thrown out by this test as are "adjectival" and "adverbial" functioning entities. Thus, while *meN-* and *ber-* forms pass test number 2 (i.e. antecedent of relative clause test) they fail test number 3, thus making test number 3 a "stronger test" for "nouniness" than test number 2, i.e. more constrained. In fact, test number 3 is "too strong" in some ways. It throws out entities (proper nouns) which we would all agree are nouns (if anything is) if they happen to be already "referentially specific".

4. Only "NP's" may be pronominalized

In Indonesian the form *-nya* may function as an anaphoric third person pronoun. Note in the following example that *-nya* in the second sentence refers back to entities enclosed by slash marks in the first sentence:

((11), see next page)

Note that once again we cannot distinguish between the "nouniness" of forms (a) through (j) plus "proper nouns" from *meN-* and *ber-* forms. They may all be "pronominalized". However, just as with our "antecedent of relative clause test", it is also the case here that *meN-* and *ber-* forms are "nounier" than are "adjectival" (e.g. *merah* 'red') and "adverbial" forms (e.g. *cepat* 'fast') in that *meN-* and *ber-* forms pass this test while the latter categories do not.

(11)	<p><i>Harpo</i> Harpo</p> <p><i>gedung</i> building</p> <p><i>Philadelphia</i> Philadelphia</p> <p>(a) <i>tembak-an</i> shot</p> <p>(b) <i>pe-lari-an</i> chase</p> <p>(c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i> killing</p> <p>(d) <i>per-temu-an</i> meeting</p> <p>(e) <i>pem-balap</i> racing vehicle</p> <p>(f) <i>ke-tua</i> boss</p> <p>(g) <i>ke-mati-an</i> death</p> <p>(h) <i>se-suatu</i> something</p> <p>(i) <i>sakit-nya</i> sickness</p> <p>(j) <i>pè-licin</i> instrument for smoothing something</p> <p><i>meng-gambar</i> to draw</p> <p><i>me-lompat</i> to jump</p> <p><i>ber-lari</i> to run</p> <p><i>ber-mimpi</i> to dream</p> <p>*<i>merah</i> red</p> <p>*<i>cantik</i> beautiful</p> <p>*<i>cepat</i> fast</p> <p>*<i>lambat</i> slow, late</p>
------	---

{
Dia } mengingat
{
She } remembers
{
He }

(12a)	<p><i>Harpo</i> Harpo</p> <p><i>gedung</i> building</p> <p><i>Philadelphia</i> Philadelphia</p> <p>(a) <i>tembak-an</i> shot</p> <p>(b) <i>pe-lari-an</i> chase</p> <p>(c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i> killing</p> <p>(d) <i>per-temu-an</i> meeting</p> <p>(e) <i>pem-balap</i> kind of racing vehicle</p> <p>(f) <i>ke-kasih</i> beloved</p> <p>(g) <i>ke-percaya-an</i> belief</p> <p>(h) <i>sakit-nya</i> sickness</p> <p>(i) <i>se-suatu</i> something</p> <p>(j) <i>pe-licin</i> instrument for smoothing</p> <p><i>me-lompat</i> to jump</p> <p><i>me-nyanyi</i> to sing</p> <p><i>ber-mimpi</i> to dream</p> <p><i>ber-tapa</i> to meditate</p> <p>*<i>hitam</i> black</p> <p>*<i>jelek</i> ugly</p> <p>*<i>pelahan</i> slow</p> <p>*<i>cepat</i> fast</p>
-------	--

{
Dia } menyukai
{
he } likes
{
she }

Kapan saja dia me-mikir-kan -nya, ia menangis
whenever { he } thinks (about) { it } { he } cries
 { she } { her } { she }

5. Only "NP's" may be direct (and indirect) objects¹⁴

One test of whether or not an entity is functioning as the "direct object" of a clause is if it can be "promoted"¹⁵ to "subject" of the clause (i.e. undergo "passive"). In the following example sentences the "a" sentences are "active" and the "b" sentences "passive":

(12b)	<p><i>Harpo</i> Harpo</p> <p><i>Gedung</i> Building</p> <p><i>Philadelphia</i> Philadelphia</p>	<p><i>yang disukainya</i> { what } is liked (by) { him }</p> <p>{ who } { her }</p>
-------	---	--

etc. (as per the bracketed list in (12a))

By the "direct object test" *meN-* and *ber-* forms pattern with forms "(a) through (j)+proper nouns". They may all function as the "grammatical direct object" of a clause. Note that the entities which function as "adjectives" and "adverbs" cannot function as the "grammatical

direct object" of the clause. Thus, once again we may say that *meN-* and *ber-* forms are "nounier" than are entities like *hitam* 'black' and *cepat* 'fast', with respect to this test.

6. Only "NP's" may follow *-i* suffixed verbs (this test assumes a fully elaborated "active" clause with no cotextual deletions)

The examples in (12a) serve to illustrate this test. The same generalizations we drew from (12a) are applicable here.

7. Only "NP's" may serve as an "object of a preposition"¹⁶

Note in the following example sentence that *meN-* and *ber-* forms once again pattern with "(a) through (j)+proper nouns" in terms of their ability to serve as the "object of a preposition":

(13)

<p><i>Dia</i> { She He</p>	<p><i>mendapat</i> found</p>	<p><i>untung</i> profit</p>	<p><i>dari</i> from</p>	<p>{ <i>Harpo</i> <i>Harpo</i> <i>gedung</i> building <i>Philadelphia</i> <i>Philadelphia</i> etc. (as per the bracketed list in (12a))</p>
--	----------------------------------	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

Note that once again "adjectival" and "adverbial" forms fail this test while *meN-* and *ber-* forms pass.

8. Only "NP's" may be followed by *itu* 'the', 'that'¹⁷

Example (13) serves to illustrate this test. Once again *meN-* and *ber-* forms are just as "nounphrasy" as are forms "(a) through (j)+proper nouns" with respect to this test. Entities which function as "adjectives" and "adverbs" once again fail this test.

9. Only "NP's" may be preceded by *oleh* 'by' (i.e. agent marker)

Oleh is an "agent marker" most often translated as *by*. Most commonly it occurs in so-called "passive constructions" marking the

"agent" of the clause. Note in the following example that only the "nouniest" of "nouns" (i.e. forms "(a) through (j)+proper nouns") pass this test:

(14)

<p><i>Si Anu</i> Mr whoever was scared</p>	<p><i>ditakut-takuti</i> by</p>	<p>{ <i>Harpo</i> <i>Harpo</i> <i>gedung</i> building <i>Philadelphia</i> <i>Philadelphia</i> <i>Gary Indiana</i> <i>Gary Indiana</i> (a) <i>teriak-an</i> shouts (b) <i>pe-layar-an</i> sailing (c) <i>pem-bunuh-an</i> killing (d) <i>per-janji-an</i> agreement (e) <i>pem-besar</i> the boss (f) <i>ke-hendak</i> wish (g) <i>ke-percaya-an</i> belief (h) <i>sakit-nya</i> sickness (i) <i>se-suatu</i> something (j) <i>pe-licin</i> instrument for smoothing something *<i>meng-gambar</i> to draw *<i>me-nulis</i> to write *<i>ber-janji</i> to promise *<i>ber-diri</i> to stand *<i>cepat</i> fast *<i>malas</i> lazy</p>	<p>itu that</p>
--	-------------------------------------	---	---------------------

10. Only "NP's" may be "quantified"

As with the "*oleh* test" this final test is "choosy". Only the "nouniest" "NP's" pass this test (i.e. forms "(a) through (j)+proper nouns"). *MeN-* and *ber-* forms fail to qualify as "NP's" along with "adverbial" and "adjectival" functioning entities:

(15)

Harpo
Harpo
gedung
building
Rukun Tetangga
person who is head
of a neighborhood

(a) *teriak-an*
shouts

(b) *pe-lari-an*
running

(c) *pem-bunuh-an*
killing

(d) *per-temu-an*
meeting

(e) *pen-dorong*
pusher

(f) *ke-tua*
boss

(g) *ke-mati-an*
death

(h) *?se-suatu*
something

(i) **sakit-nya*¹⁸
sickness

(j) *pe-layar*
sailor

**meng-gambar*
to draw

**me-nari*
to dance

**ber-tapa*
to meditate

**ber-nafas*
to breathe

**malas*
lazy

**lumayan*
so-so

Di kota Malang ada
at city Malang exist

{ beberapa
several
tiga
three
banyak
many }

Why the form *sakit-nya* 'sickness' should fail this test is a mystery to me.

Generalizations

So far we have found no principled way of distinguishing the syntactic behavior of so-called "proper nouns" (e.g. *Harpo*, *Philadelphia*, etc.) from stems affixed with (a) through (j). They pattern together with respect to our test 1 through 10.

From the results of our tests we may distinguish "three" levels of "nouniness".

- 1) *very nouny* (pass the "strong" test for "NP's")= "proper nouns+(a) through (j)" only.

- 2) *somewhat nouny* (pass the "weak" test for "NP's")= "proper nouns+(a) through (j), + *meN-* and *ber-* forms
- 3) *not at all nouny* (fail all our tests for "NP's")= includes entities functioning as "adjectives" and "adverbs"

Our "strong" test for "NP's" (i.e. the most constrained tests) pick out only the "nounier 'NP's'". These "strong" tests are as follows:

test number 1 "NP's" may not be negated by *tidak*

test number 3 Only "NP's" may be preceded by "numeral+noun classifiers"¹⁹

test number 9 Only "NP's" may be preceded by the "agent marker" *oleh* 'by'

test number 10 Only "NP's" may be "quantified"

Our "weak" test for "NP's" (i.e. the least constrained tests) are those tests which are not so choosy. They are:

test number 2 Only "NP's" may function as the "antecedent" of a relative clause

test number 4 Only "NP's" may be pronominalized

test number 5 Only "NP's" may serve as the grammatical direct (or indirect) object of a clause (i.e. may be "passivized")

test number 6 Only "NP's" may follow an *-i* suffixed verb

test number 7 Only "NP's" may function as an "object of a preposition"

test number 8 Only "NP's" may be followed by the "definitizer" *itu*

On the basis of our "strong" tests we may say that "(a) through (j)+proper nouns" are "nounier" than are *meN-* and *ber-* forms.

On the basis of our "weak" tests we may say that *meN-* and *ber-* are "nounier" than are entities like *cepat* 'fast', *malas* 'lazy', *merah* 'red', etc.

Summary

It is a common generalization that *meN-* and *ber-*

forms are "verbal formatives"; (see for example Slametmuljana 1957, p. 87). However, on the basis of our "weak" tests for "NP's" we see that *meN-* and *ber-* forms may function in the clause as "NP's". That *meN-* and *ber-* forms are less "nouny" than are "(a) through (j)+proper nouns" is argued on the basis of our "strong" tests for "NP's". Indonesian is not unique in having forms (i.e. *meN-* and *ber-*) which seem to overlap the categories "nominal" and "verbal". In English there is the category "gerund" which is typically defined as "a verbal *-ing*" form which functions in the syntax of the clause as an "NP". *MeN-* and *ber-* forms seem to serve this overlapping function (i.e. gerundive function) in Indonesian syntax as by our "weak" tests for "NP's" they may function as "NP's". It appears, however, that entities like *cepat* 'fast', *malas* 'lazy', etc. are in no way "NP's", at least insofar as our tests pick out "NP's".

Using Ross' terminology (1973, p.96) we may call "(a) through (j)+proper nouns" "nounier" than *meN-* and *ber-*, and *meN-* and *ber-* forms "nounier" than entities like *cepat* and *malas* etc. What we have in fact is a continuum of "nouniness", and thus, we define a "nominal" for Indonesian as "more or less" a nominal rather than "is or isn't". This seem a more useful way of handling the concept "nominal" for Indonesian than does a definition which cues on "formal" (i.e. morphological) characteristics only.

University of Michigan

NOTES

* I owe many people my thanks in the writing of this paper. Among them are the following: Dr Subandi, Dra Oka, Professor Samsuri, Drs Syukur (all here at IKIP Malang), Dr Verhaar (University of Indonesia) and many others, both students and friends. All errors are of course mine alone.

1. The grammars listed above do not list *se-* as a "nominalizing" prefix. I include it here as there is at least one example, *se-suatu* 'something', which seems to function in the

clause as an "NP" while the stem *suatu* 'some' may only function as a "quantifier". Thus, the addition of the *se-* prefix seems to create an independent "NP" from a "quantifier".

2. *MeN-* and *ber-* are typically referred to as "verbal formatives" (Slametmuljana 1957, p. 87). The labels "adjective" and "adverb" are used here with much reservation. I intend the reader to accept these labels as meaning that certain entities seem to function in the clause as "adjectives" (i.e. modify "nominals") and "adverbs" (i.e. modify everything else). Until I or someone else can do better, I use these labels with quote marks around them to indicate my hesitancy in using them at all. Ultimately, it may turn out that we do not want to use such categories (i.e. they may not be useful enough) for describing Indonesian grammar.

3. The term "squish" or "squishy" was, to my knowledge, first used in this way by John R. Ross (1973).

4. Keenan, in this paper entitled "Towards a universal definition of subject", talks about "degrees of subjecthood", or in other words, that a particular function in a clause may be defined as "more or less" fulfilling that function (i.e. in this case "subject" of the clause).

5. Ross's 1973 paper talks of "degrees of categorial classification" for the category "noun phrase (NP)". His methodology of having a list of tests (mostly syntactic) which are then used to pick out certain entities as being "more or less" a member of the category under consideration (in this case "noun phrase") actually predates Keenan (1976).

6. As J. Verhaar (p.c.) and others (notably Becker and Arms 1969), have pointed out the category "preposition" is rather hard to define for Indonesian. Sometimes, what we might want to say are "prepositions" (i.e. functionally) are actually "suffixes" on some verbal stem as in:

- (i) *Pemerintah ini berdasarkan agama*
 government this based (on) religion
 'This government is based on religion'

And at other times there appears not to be a "nominal" object of the "preposition" as in:

- (ii) *Dia berlari dengan cepat*
 he ran with fast
 'He ran fast'

It appears to be a normal way of "adverbial modification" to follow the verb with a *dengan* phrase such as in (ii) or:

- (iii) *Dia menulis dengan baik*
 { he } writes with good
 { she }
 'He writes well'

In a sense the words *cepat* 'fast' and *baik* 'good' are "objects of prepositions", (i.e. they follow words which we want to call (by writ of an English translation) "preposition"), and in a sense they are not (i.e. we like to think of "objects of prepositions" as being "nouns", not "adjectives" and "adverbs"). Apart from the type of "adverbial modification" represented by (ii) and (iii), "NP's" are normally the "object of the preposition" in Indonesian grammar.

7. Actually, *itu* 'that', 'the', is a "noun phrase determiner" only most of the time. There are examples (J. Verhaar, p.c.) where *itu* serves to mark the "topic" of the sentence as in:

- (iv) *Sering-sering itu, Ani datang ke rumah kami*
 often t.m. Ani came to house our
 'Often (topic marker), Ani came to our house'
- (v) *Paman saya itu, sakit-sakit terus-menerus*
 unclemy t.m. sick continually
 'My uncle (that)(topic maker), is continually sick'

8. This was a problem with Keenan's "subject properties' list" as well. Many of his tests were interdependent.

9. A.L. Becker (p.c.) prefers to think of the difference between *tidak* and *bukan* as *tidak* is used for "syntagmatic" negation and *bukan* for "paradigmatic" negation. This seems to me to be right. When *bukan* is used, there is the feeling that only one from a list of possibilities is being negated; with *tidak* there is only the simple fact of something (that which follows *tidak*) being negated.

10. J. Verhaar (p.c.) has given me a rather interesting example of a word, *sekolah* 'school', which when negated by *tidak* takes the

meaning of 'go to school' (i.e. verbal), and when negated by *bukan* normally means 'a school' (i.e. the physical structure or in other words, a noun). With such examples as *sekolah* the statement that *tidak* cannot be used to negate entities which are nominals, become circular. Is *sekolah* a "noun" or a "verb"? Luckily, there are, to my knowledge, not many examples of this sort.

11. The form *pem-balap* means either 'a person who races' or 'a machine used for racing, such as a racing car'

12. I list this form here without fully understanding its syntactic possibilities. In fact, there is another form, *pe-nyakit* 'sickness', which apparently differs from *sakit-nya* in that the former refers to disease in general, while the latter is used when referring to someone's illness in particular. I leave the form in my examples (i.e. *sakit-nya*) while I don't fully understand how it differs from *penyakit*.

13. Apparently, one of the functions of "noun classification" is to make "referentially specific" some following entity. Generic nouns may not be preceded by "noun classifiers" in Indonesian.

14. I list "indirect objects" as well as "direct objects" here although I only test for "direct objects".

15. The term "promoted" I use in the sense intended by Relational Grammarians such as Johnson, Postal, Perlmutter, Keenan, etc. In the hierarchy, "subject of, direct object of, indirect object of, oblique", "promoted" means movement to the left on the hierarchy

16. Just as we noted that there are problems defining for Indonesian what a "prepositions" might mean, the term "object of preposition" becomes a similar problem. See 6 for further discussion.

17. See note 7.

18. I have no idea why *sakit-nya* should fail this test.

19. "Noun Classifiers" are always preceded by "numerals".

References

- Alisjahbana, T. 1970. *Tatabahasa Baru Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- Adams, K and Conklin, N. 1973. "Towards a theory of natural classification", *Papers from the 9th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Becker, A.L. and Arms, D.G. 1969. "Prepositions as predicates", *Papers from the 5th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Mess, C.A. 1951. *Tatabahasa Indonesia*. Bandung: G. Kolff & Co.
- Keenan, E. 1976. "Towards a universal definition of subject", *Subject and Topic* (eds: Li and Thompson). New York: Academic Press.
- Ramlan, M. 1967. *Ilmu Bahasa Indonesia, morfologi*. Yogyakarta: U.P. Indonesia.
- Ross, J.R. 1973. "A fake NP squish", *New ways of analyzing variation in English* (eds: C.J. Bailey and R. Shuy). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Slametmuljana. 1957. *Kaidah bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Djambatan.

* * *