

Verbal Morphology and Cohesion in Indonesian Written Texts

Fay Wouk
University of Auckland

Introduction

Indonesian, like most other languages in the western branch of the Austronesian family, has a system of opposing clause types that has traditionally been called a focus system by Austronesianists, especially Philippinists. In a focus system, for each clause type an NP with a different semantic role is the most accessible to certain syntactic processes such as relativization, topicalization, and clefting. This NP is usually referred to as the subject, topic or focussed NP. The different clause types are equally marked, morphologically, and the clause type in which the patient is the most accessible NP has a high textual frequency, often equal or greater textual frequency than the clause type in which the actor is the most accessible. While focus systems are formally a type of voice system, allowing noun phrases in different semantic roles to become syntactic subject, the relative frequency of different clause types in most focus languages is quite different from the relative frequency of active and passive in a non-focus language like English, suggesting that focus systems must have a rather different function from non-focus voice systems.

Just what that function might be remains to be fully characterized. Traditional grammatical accounts of the function of focus are vague at best, and strictly linguistic accounts show considerable disagreement in the methodology used, the language variety studied, and the conclusions reached.

In this paper I will examine the discourse deployment of focus in written Indonesian. I will show that a full understanding of its function in Indonesian requires an understanding, not only of the structure of clauses, but also of the linear and hierarchical organizational structure of the texts in which they are found. The focus system is used as a marker of continuity and discontinuity, both at the level of clauses, and at the level of overall textual organization.

Terminology

The terms *subject*, *topic*, *focus* and *passive* were chosen to describe these constructions by linguists studying Western Austronesian languages without much attention to their functional or typological implications. In Austronesian studies, "focus" does not imply new information. "Topic"

does not imply the most thematic, or continuous, or important NP. "Subject" does not imply the conflation of properties found in subjects in most accusative languages. "Passive" does not imply the function of English passive, that of maintaining continuity (Thompson 1987). The actual function of these systems in Austronesian languages has been obscured by this terminology.

Because the terms *focus*, *topic*, *subject* and *passive* all have functional implications, and because the actual nature (or discourse function) of the construction is at issue here, I will not use these terms in the remainder of this paper. Instead I will use the term trigger for the most accessible NP of the clause, and will refer to the two main clause types found in Indonesian as actor trigger and patient trigger.¹

Actor trigger clauses in Indonesian are clauses which contain a verb prefixed by some phonological variant of the prefix *meng-* (See Example 1). Patient trigger clauses are clauses which contain a verb marked by the prefix *di-* (see Example 2), the proclitics *ku-* (1st person) and *kau-* (2nd person) (see Example 3), or some clearly cliticized term of address (e.g. a name, title or kinterm) (see Example 4) (Wolff 1980, Dardjowidjojo 1978).²

1. Tini men-cari teman saya.
Tini *meng*-look:for friend 1sg
Tini looked for my friend.
2. Teman saya di-cari Tini
friend 1sg *di*-look:for Tini
Tini looked for my friend
3. Kemarin teman-mu ku-cari, kata Tini
yesterday friend-2sg I-look:for say Tini
"I was looking for your friend yesterday" Tini said
4. Teman saya Tini cari
friend 1sg Tini look:for
Tini looked for my friend

¹I use *actor* and *patient* as cover terms, not as semantic primitives. The syntactically most accessible NP in any clause type can have a number of possible semantic roles. In actor trigger clauses it is most often an agent, experiencer, or cause; in a patient trigger clause it is most often patient, but also frequently goal or beneficiary.

²Spoken Indonesian also allows constructions in which no prefix or proclitic is present. However, such constructions are considered non-standard and are rare in written Indonesian. They are not considered in this study.

Earlier Analyses

Most previous discussions of the Indonesian trigger system have not been based on the systematic analysis of texts. Grammar books usually suggest a single parameter for trigger choice, and rely on vague, undefined terms like focus and emphasis to explain its function (Wolff 1980, Dardjowidjojo 1978, Singgih 1977, Sarumpaet 1966, Winstedt 1914)³. Most modern syntactic studies focus on the correct theoretical analysis of the trigger system, and do not consider function.

Some recent studies do focus on function, and use a mixture of textual and non-textual data. However, in these studies the textual data is generally isolated from its context for analysis. Thomas (1978) considers *meng-* actor focus; *di-* is goal focus when unsuffixed, referential focus when suffixed with *-i* (see example 5) or instrumental focus when suffixed with *-kan* (see example 6). He defines focus as a sentence level syntactic phenomenon which marks an equational relationship between the verb and one argument NP.

5. Buku Muti di-tulis-i Heru
 book Muti *di-write-i* Heru
 Muti's book was written in by Heru

6. Surat itu di-tulis-kan Heru untuk Muti
 letter that *di-write-kan* Heru for Muti
 That letter was written by Heru on behalf of Muti.

Verhaar (1978a) suggests that actor trigger clauses are undetermined in time, often being habitual or durative, while patient trigger clauses are determined, generally being punctual. Verhaar (1983, 1984, 1988) argues that Indonesian is a split ergative language; within the ergative system clauses with *meng-* are antipassive, and clauses with *di-/clitic* are ergative; within the accusative system clauses with *meng-* are active and clauses with *di-/clitic* are passive. Purwo (1986) suggests that the distinction is partly aspectual, partly pragmatic. Actor trigger verbs are telic, durative and narrative; patient trigger verbs are atelic, punctual and performative.

There is considerable recent discourse work on varieties that are closely related to modern Indonesian, and less that focuses specifically on Indonesian. The work on related varieties introduced important concepts that are relevant to an understanding of the work on Indonesian, and is thus included in this review.

³ This type of explanation is entirely appropriate, given that these books are pedagogical grammars, rather than theoretical treatments, but not particularly helpful for linguistic analysis.

Discourse Studies of Related Varieties

Hopper (1979a, 1979b) discusses Early Modern Malay, basing his analysis primarily on the 19th century writings of Abdullah bin Abdul-Kadir Munshi (1932).⁴ In these texts he identifies a correlation between patient trigger and sequenced events (foreground), and between actor trigger and descriptive, introductory parts of the text (background). He also shows that patient trigger correlates very highly with the presence of a definite patient. Hopper (1982, 1988) further develops this analysis, and suggests that the trigger system of Early Modern Malay marked discourse transitivity (as defined in Hopper and Thompson 1980)⁵, with actor trigger clauses marking a low level of discourse transitivity. Patient trigger clauses are split into two groups, the ergative and the passive. The ergative and passive cannot be distinguished formally, but ergative clauses are high in discourse transitivity while passive clauses are lower in discourse transitivity.

Rafferty (1982) in analyzing the dialect of the Peranakan Chinese in Java,⁶ claims that actor trigger is used mainly in clauses which are imperfective, and which have indefinite patients, while patient trigger is used mainly in clauses which are perfective, and which have definite patients. In many ways this is similar to Hopper's analysis of Early Modern Malay, and points to a distinction in level of discourse transitivity.

Wallace (1977) analyses Betawi, the native variety of the Jakarta region. He argues that actor trigger is associated with absence or non-referentiality of a goal, imperfective, durative or habitual action, and non-indicative mode (intended, potential, attempted). Patient trigger is associated with (discourse) presence of a goal, perfective or punctual action, and indicative mode (actual, accomplished). This analysis is also similar to Hopper's analysis of Early Modern Malay, and also points to a distinction in level of discourse transitivity.

Wouk (1989) in a study of Spoken Jakarta Indonesian (a non-standard variety with systematic differences from standard written

⁴He also extends this analysis to Modern Malay, drawing on some Perak Malay texts collected in the 1950s (Brown 1956).

⁵Discourse transitivity, as defined by Hopper and Thompson 1980, involves a number of parameters, some having to do with the A, some with the O, and some with the verb. The parameters are: kinesis, telicity, punctuality, volitionality, affirmation, realis mode, agency, affectedness of O, and individuation of O. Clauses which have positive values for some or all of these parameters are high in discourse transitivity, while clauses with negative values for many of these parameters are low in discourse transitivity.

⁶Peranakan Chinese are ethnically Chinese, but the community has resided in Indonesia for several generations, and the members of the community are native speakers of a variety of Indonesian which contains a heavy admixture of Javanese.

Indonesian Verbal Morphology and Cohesion

Indonesian in the use of the trigger system), found that while there was a correlation between trigger choice and discourse transitivity in this variety, there was a stronger correlation between trigger choice and relative salience of actor vs patient, such that actor trigger is used when the actor is more salient, while patient trigger is used when the patient is more salient, where salience is a psychological notion reflected in the linguistic categories of topic and theme. Spoken Jakarta Indonesian thus appears to be unlike the other varieties studied, and shows some similarities to languages like English which have an active/passive voice system.

In summary, the studies of related varieties suggest that discourse transitivity plays an important role in the use of the trigger system. However, in the most closely related variety, Spoken Jakarta Indonesian, discourse transitivity is less important than other factors.

Discourse Studies of Written Indonesian

Dreyfuss (1981) presents a study of written Indonesian based on the work of a single author. He concludes that patient trigger forms correlate with action, being used to express actions, or in sections of the text where action takes place. This correlation with action is again reminiscent of Hopper's analysis in terms of high discourse transitivity, since action relates to the kinesis parameter.

McCune (1979) discusses the use of what he terms the Indonesian Passive of Narrative Sequence (IPNS), a clause type where the verb is prefixed with *di-* and suffixed with the third person agentive marker *-nya*. He concludes that the best predictors of this particular form are continuity of actor, punctiliar⁷ or sequential events, and predicate initial word-order, with the patient NP occurring in post-verbal position. He further suggests that predicate initial word order probably combines with some other factor, such as foregrounding or high degree of detail, in order to trigger use of the IPNS. The references to foregrounding and to punctiliar or sequential events again bring to mind Hopper's analysis of Early Modern Malay, and suggest a role for high discourse transitivity. However, McCune's analysis is restricted to a particular subgroup of patient trigger clauses, and is not claimed to hold for patient trigger as a whole.

Cumming (1988) finds that in written Indonesian, patient trigger correlates with "eventiveness" in the sense that patient trigger clauses are more likely to be temporally sequenced and realis than actor trigger clauses. However, not all eventive clauses are patient trigger. There are additional factors involved in inducing the use of patient trigger. Patient trigger is more likely to be used for eventive clauses that are found in peak, climactic episodes of a text, or in sections of great vividness, immediacy or urgency. Patient trigger is also more likely to be used when

⁷ Presumably punctiliar is identical with punctual. The term is not defined in the article in question.

the patient NP is pre-verbal, and either was mentioned in the immediately preceding clause, or has been absent from the narrative for some while and is being reintroduced.⁸ Thus, while high discourse transitivity appears to play a role in Cumming's analysis, aspects of textual structure are also important.

In summary, these studies show that in written Indonesian narratives⁹ there is a correlation between patient trigger and high discourse transitivity, particularly in terms of eventiveness. It is clear, however, that high discourse transitivity on its own is not a sufficient explanation for the use of patient trigger. Rather, it appears that in written Indonesian, patient trigger is a stylistic device which can be employed for effect in environments of high discourse transitivity. These studies suggest that the effect of patient trigger is to heighten the sense of eventiveness already present in those segments of the text where such constructions cluster.

Current Study

The current study builds on the work of Dreyfuss (1981), McCune (1979), and Cumming (1988). Its goal is to determine whether the use of patient trigger might have an additional stylistic effect beyond the heightened sense of eventiveness discussed in previous works.

In this study I have looked at data from two different genres: fiction, and expository prose. The fiction consists of excerpts from three stories by three different authors, "Sepeda" by Ajip Rosidi, "Kecewa" by M. Balfas, and "Pasar Malam Jaman Jepang" by Idrus, all taken from a collection of Indonesian readings (Siagian 1970). The non-fiction is an article from a popular women's magazine, *Kartini*. Table 1 shows the number of transitive clauses included in the study.

Table 1: Number of Clauses

	AT	PT ¹⁰	total
fiction	104	66	170
expository	70	27	97
total	174	93	267

⁸The patient is thus either maximally continuous or previously mentioned but highly discontinuous. These two extremes call for patient trigger, while moderately continuous patients, those mentioned two or three clauses back, do not.

⁹The three studies discussed looked only at narrative data.

¹⁰No distinction is made between clauses in which the verb was prefixed with *di-* and those where it was preceded by a clitic, as there were too few of the latter (3 in all) to be considered a separate category.

As Table 1 shows, actor trigger verbs are more common than patient trigger verbs in both genres; 65% of all verbs are actor trigger, and only 35% are patient trigger. Indonesian, unlike most Western Austronesian languages, including those most closely related to it, does not show a higher frequency of patient trigger clauses. However, it still shows a much higher frequency than passive in a language such as English, where active clauses far outnumber passives, with percentage of active clauses ranging from a low of 82% in non-fiction to a high of 96% in sports reportage (Givón 1979).¹¹

Syntactic Constraints on Trigger Choice

While it is the claim of this paper that choice of clause type performs a stylistic function, there are syntactic constraints on trigger choice as well, such that only a subset of transitive clauses are available for stylistic effect. Three grammatical constraints accounted for a large proportion of the data under consideration.

The first is the patient status constraint. Clauses with definite (referential and identifiable) patients may be actor trigger or patient trigger. However, if the patient is not definite, actor trigger must be used. Thus, all clauses with non-referential patients (including clausal complements as a rule) or first-mention referential patients, will be actor trigger, as will clauses with no patient at all. 87 actor trigger clauses fall into this category.

The relative clause constraint, which is found in most Austronesian languages with trigger systems, insures that the head of a relative clause will be trigger of the verb inside that clause. Examples 7 and 8 illustrate the relative clause constraint. When the actor is head of the relative clause, as in example 7, the clause is actor trigger; when the patient is the head, as in example 8, the clause is patient trigger. Example 9 gives the contrasting ungrammatical form with an object-headed relative clause containing an actor trigger verb.

7. guru yang mem-baca buku
 teacher rel *meng-read* book
 the teacher who is reading a/the book

8. buku yang di-baca guru
 book rel *di-read* teacher
 the book that the/a teacher is reading

¹¹ Additionally, the majority of English passive clauses are agentless (Thompson 1987), while the majority of Indonesian patient trigger clauses have overt agents.

9. * buku yang guru mem-baca
book rel teacher meng-read

31 of the clauses in the sample, 16 patient trigger and 15 actor trigger, were relative clauses. Relative clause constructions are not the only type of clause combining to constrain trigger choice. An additional nine clauses (two actor trigger and seven patient trigger) in other clause combining environments also had grammatically constrained trigger choice.¹²

The third constraint is the non-referential actor constraint. If the clause has a non-referential actor, it will be patient trigger, as in example 10. 19 clauses had non-referential actors.

10. Saya tidak mau di-tinggal!
I not want di-leave
I don't want to be left behind! (from Kecewa)

A fairly large proportion of the data is thus accounted for by grammatical constraints. 57% of actor trigger and 45% of patient trigger clauses had their trigger grammatically determined. In the remainder of the data, however, choice of clause type was free, and thus could be employed for stylistic effect. This portion of the data will be considered in the next section of the paper.

Stylistic Employment of Clause Types

Discourse structure appears to be highly significant in determining the choice between actor trigger and patient trigger in cases where no grammatical constraint is operating. In order fully to understand the alternation between the two clause types, texts must be analyzed both linearly, clause by clause, and hierarchically, looking at the larger structures. Such an analysis suggests that the single most important factor in choice of clause type appears to be textual cohesion, particularly with reference to the continuity of the patient. Clause type interacts with cohesion in a number of ways.

The largest amount of data to correlate with any single factor was that part which correlates with linear structure. Put most simply, if a referent is present in clause A and is the patient of clause B, clause B will be patient trigger. Thus, if the patient of a clause is textually highly continuous, patient trigger will be used. 34 patient trigger clauses (37% of all patient trigger clauses) were of this type. On the other hand, if the patient of clause B is not present in clause A, clause B will be actor trigger. Thus, if the patient is not highly continuous, actor trigger will be

¹²Most of these were what in the past would have been referred to as equi and raising, but are now more commonly called control phenomena.

Indonesian Verbal Morphology and Cohesion

used. 52 actor trigger clauses (30% of all actor trigger clauses, and 56% of those with definite patients) were in this group. This is similar to Cumming's (1988) finding, except that linear cohesion seemed to be relevant only for preverbal patients in Cumming's data, but it was relevant to all patients in my data, regardless of word order. Example 11 exhibits the pattern described above.

11. a. Lama sebelum aku bisa meng-endarai sepeda,
long before I can *meng-ride* bike
long before I could ride a bike,
- b. ibu-ku telah mem-belikan aku sebuah sepeda cilik
mother-my prf *meng-buy* me one bike small
my mother had bought me a small bike.
- c. ketika itu aku baru berumur sembilan tahun.
when that I just age 9 years
At that time I was only 9 years old.
- d. Tapi sebelum aku bisa meng-endarai-nya,
but before I can *meng-ride-it*
But before I could learn to ride it,
- e. sepeda itu sudah di-jual ibu pula
bike that prf *di-sell* mother more
my mother had sold the bike

In this example the bike is first introduced in clause b; an actor trigger verb is used, as the patient is not identifiable. It is not mentioned in clause c, which is intransitive. In clause d it is mentioned again, but the verb is actor trigger, as the bike was absent from the previous clause. In clause e the bike is mentioned again, and the verb is patient trigger, as the patient was present (in pronominal form) in the immediately preceding clause.

It is possible that this pattern represents a reanalysis of the state described in Hopper (1979a, 1979b, 1982, 1988), in which *di-* correlates with individuated patients and *meng-* with unindividuated ones. It has been shown (Givon 1983) that patients are on the whole less continuous than agents in discourse. The majority of patients in a text are present for a relatively short time, while the agents are present over longer stretches. Given this fact, mention of an individuated patient is likely to follow a previous mention immediately, while mention of an agent may well come some time later than the previous mention, especially in a language which makes use of zero anaphora. This pattern could allow for a reanalysis as a system in which it is the prior mention, rather than the individuation of the patient, that conditions choice of verb morphology.

Grammatical constraints and linear cohesion accounted for trigger choice in all the transitive clauses in the expository text. For the narratives this was not the case. A large part of the data could be accounted for in this way, but by no means all of it. Trigger choice in these texts proved to be rather more complex.

There appears to be a tendency to maintain the same referent as trigger across a series of clauses that form a single orthographic sentence. In most cases this tendency coincides with the linear ordering phenomenon described above, and is thus not noticeable as a separate stylistic phenomenon. However, in a certain number of cases this tendency runs counter to linear cohesion, creating somewhat anomalous structures from the point of view of the rest of the corpus. Although anomalous, this type of construction also creates cohesion, but it is based on continuity of subject, rather than of patient. Eight patient trigger clauses and twelve actor trigger clauses show this anomalous pattern, which is illustrated in example 12.

12. Dan Karsan diam-diam tersenyum diatas tempat
 and Karsan silently smile on place
 tidur, meng-agumi isteri-nya, me-muji-nya dan ...
 sleep meng-admire wife-his meng-praise-her and

And Karsan quietly smiled on the bed, admired his wife, praised her and ... (from Kecewa)

This sentence contains a sequence of clauses. In the first clause only Karsan is mentioned. Therefore, the second clause is actor trigger; the patient (Karsan's wife) was not mentioned in the previous clause. However, in the third clause she is patient again. Linear cohesion would predict patient trigger, since the patient was present in the preceding clause, but actor trigger is chosen.¹³

Becker and Wirasno (1979) suggest that the Indonesian trigger system is changing from an Austronesian type patient oriented language to a subject oriented language, modelling itself after a Dutch or English type active/passive system. In the majority of the data in my corpus this does not appear to be the case. However, this type of clause combining pattern, so different from the predominant pattern, is similar to the pattern of clause combining found in English, and may be due to outside influence.

Most of the remainder of the data appears to correlate with the hierarchical structure of the texts.¹⁴ Texts generally contain many boundaries, shifts in time, place or participant, which can be seen as the beginnings of new units, to some degree discontinuous with prior text.

¹³Note that the use of a patient trigger verb (*dipujinya*) would not automatically be interpreted as the wife praising the husband. Indonesian assignment of reference to anaphora often follows a pattern that Verhaar 1988 has referred to as *ergative*, where the actor of a patient trigger verb is continuous in reference with the actor in the previous clause.

¹⁴Two clauses, one actor trigger and one patient trigger, could not be accounted for in this analysis, and remain simply anomalous forms.

Indonesian Verbal Morphology and Cohesion

Some shifts, however, involve a return to some incident or referent in prior text, and are thus continuous. It seems that on the level of the text as a whole, actor trigger is used to mark discontinuity, and patient trigger to mark continuity. This represents an extension of the use of the morphology in linear structure, where patient trigger marks continuity of the patient, and actor trigger marks discontinuity of the patient. On the textual level, patient trigger increases the sense of cohesiveness, and actor trigger decreases it.

There are eleven cases where the patient is continuous from the preceding clause, and linear cohesion would predict patient trigger, yet we find actor trigger. All but one of these cases are at the beginnings of new reaction structures in the fictional texts. A reaction structure is an action or series of actions by a new participant, following either an action by some other participant or some descriptive material (Rumelhart 1975). This type of usage is illustrated in example 13.

13. Hasil perindustrian Jawa di masa perang
 product industry Java in time war
- di-perlihatkan, ban kapal terbang dan baju bagor.
di-show tyre airplane and shirt palm leaf
- Orang banyak me-megang ban kapal terbang itu
 person many *meng-hold* tyre airplane that
- sambil tercengangcengang, tapi baju bagor tak
 while amazed but shirt palm leaf not
- ada yang me-megang, seperti mereka takut
 exist rel *meng-hold* like they fear
- meng-otorkan tangan-nya.
meng-dirty hand-gen

There was a display of Javanese industrial products of the war era, airplane tyres and palmleaf shirts. Many people touched the airplane tyre in amazement, but no one touched the palmleaf shirt, as if they were afraid to dirty their hands. (Pasar Malam Jaman Jepang)

This sensitivity to new reaction structures is similar to a phenomenon found by Fox (1987) in English. English pronominal mention is a cohesive device, as I am claiming is the case for Indonesian patient trigger constructions. In English written narratives, continuous participants at the beginnings of new reaction structures are frequently encoded as full NP rather than as pronouns, just as actor trigger clauses are used in Indonesian.

There are also nine cases where linear cohesion would predict actor trigger yet patient trigger is used. Again, all but one of these cases can be explained in terms of cohesion. They fall into two groups, which may be thought of as exhibiting short-term and long-term cohesion respectively. The first type is illustrated in example 14.

14. Seorang Indonesia, baju-nya bolong-bolong, kain
 person Indonesia shirt-gen perforated cloth
 sarong-nya dari karet, berkata kepada isteri-nya,
 sarong-gen from rubber say to wife-gen
 sambil menundjuk ke baju dari bagor itu, "
 while meng-point to shirt from palm leaf that
 Ti, baju itu lengket juga apa tidak?"
 name shirt that sticky also question marker not
 Ti tertawa. Di-tarik tangan laki-nya
 Ti laugh di-pull hand husband-gen

One Indonesian, his shirt full of holes, his sarong of rubber, said to his wife while pointing at the palmleaf shirt, "Ti, is that shirt sticky too, or not?"

Ti laughed. She took her husband's hand. (from Pasar Malam Jaman Jepang)

This passage immediately follows the passage quoted in example 13. Linear structure would predict that the last sentence should be actor trigger. However, this is a tightly constructed episode consisting of one paragraph of introduction and two paragraphs of interaction between two characters. These two characters appear only in this episode. In cases like this, the use of patient trigger seems to reflect the structural cohesion between the two paragraphs. There were two such cases in the corpus.

The second group can be explained by referring to a concept formalized by Fox (1987) as a return pop. The return pop ties a structure to another which is not the preceding one. Fox found that pronominalization could be used in English, where a full NP was expected, to signal that the section of text (written or spoken) connected to something in a previous part of the text, and "popped over" the intervening section, marking that intervening section as something of a digression. Example 15, taken from Fox, illustrates this phenomenon for English conversation. The return pop occurs in line 26 of the fragment quoted.

Indonesian Verbal Morphology and Cohesion

15. 1. H. Y'know w't I did las'ni://ght?
 2. N. Wha:t,=
 3. H. =Did a te:rrible thi:::ng,
 4. N. You called Si:m,
 5. (0.4)
 6. H. No:,
 7. (.)
 8. N. What,
 9. (.)
 10. H. 't'hhhh //Well I hed-
 11. N. You called Richard,=
 12. () =hh-hh=
 13. H. =(h)y(h)Yea(h)h en I h(h)ung up w(h)u he
 14. a(h)ns//wer
 15. N. Oh: Hyla why:::/:,
 16. H. 'hhh=
 17. =W'first'v all I wasn'about t'spen'seventy five
 18. cents fer th(h)r(h)ee(h)mi(h)//nni(h)ts 'uh'eh=
 19. N. Yeah,
 20. N. =That's true,=
 21. H. ='hihhh That's a l(h)otta money plus (.) uh
 22. then it's twunny five cents fer extra m:minute
 23. a(h)//fter that.
 24. N: Yea:h,
 25. H. = 'hhhhh y/i^hknow,
 26. N. How do you know he answered.

Patient trigger clauses seem to be used in a similar way in Indonesian. There were six case of return pops in the corpus. Example 16 illustrates this use of a patient trigger clause. This passage comes after a four paragraph discussion of the narrator's first bicycle, and seems like an abrupt change of subject, as it introduces a new participant and a new problem. However, the last sentence shows that there is really an intimate connection between the two events, when the narrator's bicycle is reintroduced. It is not pronominalized; it would be difficult to identify the referent of a pronoun here. However, a patient trigger verb is used, which helps to make explicit the cohesion between this paragraph and the section prior to the digression.

16. Ketika itu ayah-tiri-ku baru keluar dari tawanan
 time that stepfather-my just out from arrest

Wouk

dan ia mem-butuhkan sebuah sepeda, sebuah sepeda
and he meng-need a bike a bike

yang tinggi, untuk pergi ke tempat-nya bekerja --
rel high for go to place-gen work

sebuah pabrik genting dan bata kepunyaan seorang
a factory tiles and brick property one

teman-nya, karena untuk bekerja sama dengan
friend-gen because for work with with

Belanda, ia tak mau. Ini-lah sebab utama,
Dutch he not want this-emph reason main

kenapa sepeda-ku di-jual ibu-ku kembali.
why bike-my di-sell mother-my return

At that time my stepfather had just been released from
emprisonment, and he needed a bike, a tall bike, to go to
where he worked -- a brick and tile factory belonging to a
friend of his, because to work for the Dutch, he wasn't
willing. This was the real reason why my mother resold
my bike.

The use of pronominal reference and the use of patient trigger clauses have
in common that both imply prior mention of a referent, and both are
normally used to mark fairly tight cohesion in a text. Thus, both are
appropriate ways of marking a return pop, a connection between current
utterance and something in prior text. This is a case where Indonesian has
an extra resource, beyond those of English, which is restricted to anaphora.
In Indonesian, in cases where anaphora are appropriate, anaphora will be
used for cohesion; verb morphology may or may not be used as well; in
cases where anaphora are inappropriate, verb morphology is still available
as a means to underline the cohesive ties between sections of text.

Conclusion

In this paper I have considered the use of patient trigger and actor trigger
clauses in written Indonesian. Previous studies indicated that in
Indonesian trigger choice was not directly conditioned by discourse
transitivity. Rather, the use of patient trigger clauses was enabled by high
discourse transitivity and stylistically conditioned. I have suggested that
an important factor in the stylistic use of the trigger system is cohesion,
with actor trigger being most frequently associated with discontinuity, and
patient trigger being most frequently associated with continuity.

Alton L. Naylor, 95
Change in
Studies, th
C.C. 1950
Susar
Change in
Dissertatio
Honolulu:
Jeffrey
"Surabay
Internation
Barbara. 19
conversat
Cambridge
Talm. 19
Pres.
(ed.)
Cross-Ling
Paul. 19
Working P
1979b.
and Syntax
New York:
1982. 'Between
Amsterdarr
1988. 'opper, Paul and
'Discourse'
Keith.
Oceanic Li
Richard
Athens, O.
Center for
Abdullah
Pertama. S
Bambang
the Indone
Fourth Int.
by P. Gera
Pacific Lin

Indonesian Verbal Morphology and Cohesion

References

- Becker, Alton L. and Umar Wirasno. 1979. 'On the Nature of Syntactic Change in Bahasa Indonesia'. *Austronesian Studies*, ed. by P. Naylor, 95-102. Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, the University of Michigan.
- Brown, C.C. 1956. *Studies in Country Malay*. London: Luzac and Co.
- Cumming, Susanna. 1988. *Syntactic Function and Constituent Order Change in Malay*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International Dissertation Services.
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1978. *Sentence Patterns of Indonesian*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Dreyfuss, Jeffrey. 1981. *Modes of text-building in the Indonesian story "Surabaya" by Idrus*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International Dissertation Services.
- Fox, Barbara. 1987. *Discourse structure and anaphora: Written and conversational English*. Cambridge studies in linguistics, 48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- (ed.) 1983. *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Linguistic Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul. 1979a. 'Some Discourse Sources of Ergativity', *Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics*, 11,2:137-153.
- 1979b. 'Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse'. *Discourse and Syntax (Syntax and Semantics 12)*, ed. by T. Givón, 213-224. New York: Academic Press.
- 1982. 'Aspect between Discourse and Grammar'. *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, ed. by P. Hopper, 3-18. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- 1988. 'How ergative is Malay?'. *McGinn* 1988, 441-454.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1980. 'Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse', *Language*, 56,2: 251-299.
- McCune, Keith. 1979. 'Passive Function and the Indonesian Passive'. *Oceanic Linguistics*, XVIII,2: 119-170.
- McGinn, Richard. (ed.) 1988. *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Center for International Studies, Center for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Munshi, Abdullah bin Abdul-Kadir. 1932. *Hikayat Abdullah, Jalid yang Pertama*. Singapore: Malaya Publishing House, Ltd.
- Purwo, Bambang Kaswanti . 1986. 'The presence and absence of meN-: the Indonesian transitive verbs'. *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, ed by P. Geraghty, L. Carrington and S. Wurm, 159-170. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- Rafferty, Ellen. 1982. *Discourse Structures of the Chinese Indonesian of Malang*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri Nusa, vol. 12.
- Rumelhart, D. 1975. 'Notes on a schema for stories'. *Representation and Understanding*, ed. by D. Bobrow and A. Collins. New York: Academic Press.
- Sarumpaet, J.P. 1966. *The Structure of Bahasa Indonesia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Siagian, Toenggoel (ed.) 1970. *Bunga Rampai Bahasa Indonesia*. Madison: Department of East Asian Languages and Literature, University of Wisconsin.
- Singgih, Amin. 1977. *Learning Bahasa Indonesia Without Teacher*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Thomas, Michael R. 1978. 'Unmarked Verbs in Indonesian'. Verhaar 1978b, 7-10.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 1987. 'The Passive in English: A Discourse Perspective'. In *Honor of Ilse Lehiste: Ilse Lehiste Puhendusteos*, ed. by R. Channon and L. Shockey, 497-511. Dordrecht: Foris (Netherlands Phonetic Archives 6).
- Verhaar, John W.M. 1978a. 'Some notes on the verbal passive in Indonesian'. Verhaar 1978b, 11-19.
- (ed.) 1978b. *Miscellaneous Studies in Indonesian and Languages in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, vol. 6.
- 1983. 'Ergativity, accusativity, and hierarchy', *Sophia Linguistica*, 11:1-23.
- 1984. *Towards a description of contemporary Indonesian: preliminary studies, part 1*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, vol. 18.
- 1988. 'Syntactic Ergativity in Contemporary Indonesian'. McGinn 1988, 347-384.
- Wallace, Steven. 1977. "'Voice, Mode or Aspect?' The Semantics of Verbal Prefixes in Jakarta Malay'. *Cornell Contributions in Linguistics, Vol 2*, ed. by F. Van Coetsem and L. Waugh, 151-178. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Winstedt, R. O. 1914. *Malay Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolff, John U. 1980. *Beginning Indonesian*. Ithaca: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program.
- Wouk, Fay. 1989. *The Impact of Discourse on Grammar: Verb Morphology In Spoken Jakarta Indonesian*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International Dissertation Services.