QUANTIFIERS IN JAVANESE AND INDONESIAN

MARMO SOEMARMO

INTRODUCTION

There have been heated discussions for the last ten years or so on
the proper analysis of quantifiers, particularly among transformational
grammarians. Competing theories use particular analyses to support
and/or invalidate basic theoretical claims and assumptions. For
instance, generative semanticists such as George Lakoff, Paul Postal,
and James McCawley claim that quantifiers are higher predicates. On
the other hand, interpretive theorists such as Noam Chomsky and Ray
Jackendoff claim that the behaviour of quantifiers is best explained
in terms of information available at the surface structures. Recently,
Georgette Ioup (1976) attempted to show that grammatical functions
(such as subject and direct object) play significant roles in the
specification of the scope of quantifiers. Her study can probably be
used to support basic theoretical assumptions in relational grammar,
a grammatical theory proposed by Paul Postal and David Perlmutter.
For an exposition on relational grammar, see the works of Johnson (1974),
Lawler (1975), deals with Achenese, and Chung (1976), deals with
Indonesian.

This paper deals with various forms and classes of quantifiers in
Javanese and Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia). The focus is on an expo-
sition of the data without any commitment to formal analysis. I will
try to present a formal analysis dealing with the syntactic and semantic
behaviour of quantifiers in Javanese and Indonesian in the near future.
The present work is thus 'theory free', if such situation exists at
all. I will, for convenience, occasionally use rewrite rules to
summarise and/or generalise certain constructions.

I hope to accomplish two goals: (a) to solicit confirmation, correction, and addition from readers who are working on Javanese, Indonesian, and other Austronesian languages, so that we eventually can accumulate an accurate and coherent picture of the data at hand; and (b) to provide theoretical linguists with theoretically unbiased presentation of data that contain sufficient information so that they will not be misled by a small portion of the data when they are searching for supporting data in these languages. Of course this work cannot claim to be comprehensive or exhaustive, partly due to the nature of quantifiers. They do not belong to one neat class, but across classes. See Akmajian and Lehrer (1976) for an example of a problem in determining the class and relationship of quantifiers and nouns.

Since Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) is a national language learned as a second language by most Indonesians (including myself), judgements of well-formedness and degrees of well-formedness vary a great deal, from one regional language speaker to another, and even among the same regional language speakers. Most disagreements centre around what one considers a borrowing may or may not be one for another. Thus, Javanism, Sundaism, and so on are commonly used to explain one's disagreement on the well-formedness of a sentence or construction. I always find it necessary to resort to a regional language such as Javanese in working with Indonesian, although such approach does not guarantee a solid judgement on well-formedness. My training in linguistics makes it impossible for me not to use intuitive knowledge as my source. I think it is safe to say that my intuition about Indonesian is as secure as anybody who speaks the language as a second/national language.

Javanese words and phrases will be written in capital letters, while Indonesian words and phrases will be written in lower case letters. In both cases the new conventional orthography will be used. The new orthography is a uniform orthography adopted by the Indonesian and Malaysian governments in 1973. Ill-formed sentences or forms will be marked with asterisks (*), questionable ones will be marked with a question mark (?), and a combination of the two (*?) will be used to mark constructions that are questionable, but more ill-formed than well-formed. Unless otherwise indicated, sentences are based on my own dialect.

FORMS AND CLASSES

Most works dealing with quantifiers concentrate on the analysis of
words and phrases that qualify nouns, such as *'all'*, *'some'* and *'every'*.
I will include different types of quantifying words and phrases as
much as possible, so that the reader can see the interrelationships
between different kinds of quantifying words and phrases to gain an
access to some (initial) knowledge of the entire system. It will be
up to the reader's theoretical orientation to decide whether the entire
system ought to be treated as a unified system or separate sub-systems.
Since words in Javanese and Indonesian, and most Austronesian languages,
consist of roots (or stems) and affixes, I will present the data on the
basis of their forms and make cross references to their classes. The
productiveness of derivational processes in these languages provides
us with overt relations across different types of quantifying words and
phrases, which in other languages may be expressed in completely dif-
ferent forms. In terms of their derivational productiveness, I will
start with two major classes to reveal the system, the indefinite
quantifiers and the definite quantifiers. The latter contains numerals
such as *'two of the men'* and *'two men'*. The rest will be included in
the former. The data will be presented in terms of their roots and
derivations, one root at a time, followed by a discussion on each form,
and a (cumulative) summary of their forms and classes.

A.   INDEFINITE QUANTIFIERS

ROOT 1: AKEH (banyak) - *'many'*

	Javanese	Indonesian	Gloss
1.	AKEH	banyak	*'a lot; many; much'*
2.	AKEH-AKEH-E	ke-banyak-an	*'most; the majority'*
3.	KA-AKEH-AN	ke-banyak-an	*'too much; overdone'*
4.	?SAK-AKEH	se-banyak	*'as many/much as'*
5.	SAK-AKEH-AKEH-E	se-banyak-banyak-nya	*'at the most'*
6.	-	ber-banyak-banyak	*'in great number'*

FORM 1: AKEH (banyak) - *'many'*

The root AKEH (banyak) is normally used as a predicate, as in:

(1) BUKUKU AKEH = AKEH BUKUKU

Buku saya banyak = Banyak buku saya

'My books are many = (Many are my books)'

Javanese and Indonesian allow the reversal of subject and predicate,
so the basic word order of affirmative simple sentences is either
subject-predicate or predicate-subject. There is some semantic con-
sequence (as well as phonological) to this reversal, but we will ignore
it for the time being. It is helpful to indicate the two main sentence
parts, so I will mark them with a slanted line (/).

When used as a modifier of a noun, Indonesian allows more freedom
(in some dialects, but not mine) than Javanese. Consider (2) and (3),
and compare the order of Q and N.

(2)   Saya / membeli buku banyak. = Membeli buku banyak / saya.
       I   bought books many
      AKU / TUKU   BUKU AKEH   = TUKU   BUKU AKEH   / AKU.
      'I bought many books.'

(3)   Saya / membeli banyak buku. = Membeli buku banyak / saya.
      AKU / TUKU   *AKEH BUKU.   = TUKU   *AKEH BUKU   / AKU.
      'I bought many books.'

Some dialects allow Q+N in Indonesian, in addition to N+Q which is the
only order allowed in Javanese. The Q+N order is not in line with the
common order of N+Modifier in both languages. For example BUKU LARANG
= buku mahal = *'expensive books'*.

Because of the availability of Q+N, surface structures of some
constructions as in (4) below can be misleading. The Q and the con-
tiguous N may be either an NP or Q is a predicate and N its subject.

(4)   Banyak anak / membeli buku. = *Membeli buku / banyak anak.
            children
      'Many children buy books.'

I can only get a generic interpretation of (4), and reversal seems to
result in an ill-formed construction. Compare:

(5)   MANUK / BISA MABUR.   = *BISA MABUR   / MANUK.
      bird   can   fly
      Burung / dapat terbang. = *Dapat terbang / burung.
      'Birds can fly.'

If a determiner is added to Q+N, then Q+N+Det is an NP which is non-
generic. The sentence becomes questionable at best.

(6)   *?Banyak anak itu / membeli buku. = ?Membeli buku / banyak anak itu.
      'The many children bought books.'

The situation is complicated by the fact that Javanese allows a special
generic sentence with determiner, as in: