

Simon Musgrave, I Wayan Arka, and Gede Primahadi Wijaya Rajeg

10 Applicative constructions in Standard Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia*)

Abstract: Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia*) is a standardised variety of Malay. The language has two suffixes, *-i* and *-kan*, which can attach to verbs and function as applicative morphology: in each case, the suffix causes the argument array of the verb to be modified and it is the non-subject arguments which are affected. Both suffixes also have other functions; in one case the suffix is extensively used also as a causative morpheme. Indonesian has some features of a symmetrical voice system, and undergoer subject constructions are more common than passives in English, for example. Applicative constructions interact with the voice system; in particular, in some cases the applicative possibility is preferred in undergoer voice. For one suffix (*-kan*), it is not uncommon for the morpheme to appear but for the preposition introducing what would be expected to be an applied argument to be retained. In light of these various complications, we suggest that applicatives in Indonesian are best understood as constructions with characteristics, some more prototypical than others, which can be manipulated to accommodate syntactic and pragmatic factors.

1 Introduction

This chapter describes applicative constructions in Indonesian (ISO639-3: ind, Glottolog: indo1316, Glottolog lists Bahasa Indonesia as a dialect of Standard Indonesian with separate code stin1234), an Austronesian language. According to the census of 2010, the language is a first language for 43 million speakers with an additional 156 million speakers who have it as an additional language (Badan Pusat Statistik 2013: 421, 427). Standard Indonesian (*Bahasa Indonesia*) is the national language of the Republic of Indonesia and is a codified version of (High) Malay. Its status as a future national language was decided in 1928 and became official with the establishment of the nation in 1948. The formal standard is described in an official grammar (Moeliono et al. 2017) and there is a reliable description in English (Sneddon et al. 2010). This variety is not used consistently in everyday life and, within the nation, there is a continuum of related language varieties with the standard at the acrolectal end and localised Malay varieties at the basolectal end (e.g. Ternate Malay, Litamahuputty 2012); some of these basolectal varieties can even be considered creoles (e.g. Ambon Malay, Minde 1997). The variety

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to the editors of this volume and to an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments.

spoken in Jakarta has influence beyond the capital city and can be considered an informal standard (Sneddon 2006). We concentrate here on the standard variety but will occasionally provide relevant information about colloquial varieties.

Indonesian has productive applicative constructions marked by the verbal suffixes *-i* and *-kan* which rearrange the argument array of a verb to make a peripheral participant a non-subject core argument, an Applied Phrase (AppP) in the terminology of this volume. The two suffixes are semantically differentiated: *-i* is used typically with locations and related semantic roles, while *-kan* is typically used with beneficiaries and instruments. Many verb roots can form derived verbs using either suffix and both suffixes can be used to derive transitive verbs from intransitive roots and to derive ditransitive verbs from transitive ones. Both of the suffixes are polyfunctional. The suffix *-kan* also functions as a causative morpheme,¹ as can the *-i* suffix (although this is less common). The suffix *-i* also functions to encode extension of the action denoted by a verb, encompassing duration, iteration or intensity. There is also a construction in which the suffix *-kan* attaches to a verb but there is no restructuring of the clause; that is, the oblique which would be expected to become an AppP remains an oblique expressed as a prepositional phrase.

This chapter is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the basics of Indonesian morphosyntax necessary to understand the applicative construction. Section 3 describes the two applicative suffixes and gives examples of their various functions. Section 4 discusses the semantic contrast between the two applicatives, suggesting that the distinction is less clear cut than is traditionally claimed. Section 5 examines various possibilities where some aspect of the prototypical applicative construction with *-kan* is optional, resulting in a range of patterns which do not have all the properties of a typical applicative. Sections 4 and 5 are therefore the main basis for our overall argument that applicativisation in Indonesian is best viewed from the perspective of prototype theory: the language has a constructional template for applicatives which provides a prototype, but specific realisations of the construction may not have all the prototypical features. We suggest that these less typical patterns should still be considered as falling within the overall construction.

2 Basics of morphosyntax of Indonesian

Indonesian is a SVO language with relatively rigid word order. The default linear order is given in (1), with grammatical subject (SUBJ) (S/A) coming by default in the clause-initial position. The subject NP is also the default topic.² Word-order variation is possible,

¹ There is another homophone in the spoken language, a discourse particle marking shared knowledge and requesting agreement or acknowledgement (Wouk 1998).

² In the interests of simplicity, we do not show the internal structure of words other than verbs, except in cases where glossing would be confusing without such information. The Actor Voice prefix, *meN-*, has complex allomorphy which involves fusion of segments at the morpheme boundary in some cases.

and is pragmatically motivated. For example, a unit bearing a marked pragmatic function such as (contrastive) TOPIC/FOCUS appears at the left-most periphery position. This is exemplified by Example (2) showing a topicalised/left-dislocated non-subject NP.

- (1) [NP:S/A]_{SUBJ} – Verb – [NP:P/G]_{OBJ} – [NP:T]_{OBJ2} – [PP]_{OBL}
- (2) [*Lagu itu*]_i *barangkali* [*saudara akan menyukai(=nya)*]_{IP}
 song that perhaps 2SG FUT AV.like.APPL=3SG
 ‘That song, perhaps you will like (it).’ (Arka 2021: 200)

SUBJ selection in Indonesian is regulated by a voice system which is marked on the verb. For example, Actor Voice (AV), which selects the A³ argument (*saudara* in Example [2]) as SUBJ is indicated by the presence of a prefix *meN-*, where the last element is a nasal stop with various realisations depending on the following segment (Blust 2004: 81–84).

The Indonesian voice system retains some aspects of a symmetrical voice system as seen in the Philippine-type languages. That is, Indonesian has the so-called Undergoer Voice (UV), which appears in two constructional types depending on the formal structural properties of the verb and the A argument, exemplified in (3a–b). Traditionally in Indonesian linguistics (Chung 1976; Sneddon et al. 2010), the structures in (3a–b) are lumped together with (3c) as passive (PASS). However, recent studies in Indonesian (e.g. Arka and Manning 2008; Arka 2021) show that it is more accurate to distinguish the UV structures in (3a–b) from the (real) PASS structure in (3c) as they have different grammatical properties associated with the syntactic status of A. The A argument of the UV structure—*ku*= ‘1SG’ in (3b), or *=nya* ‘3SG’ in (3c)—is a core argument as its properties meet formal and behavioural properties of core arguments. These include its expression as a bare pronominal clitic. It occupies a core argument position immediately adjacent to the verb. It is therefore hosted by or affixed to the verb.⁴ This A core argument is in contrast to the expression of the A oblique, which is flagged by the preposition *oleh* as in (3c).

It is therefore confusing to indicate the break between morphemes, and we gloss Actor Voice forms thus: AV.[verb]. Many of our examples are drawn from the 300k sentence sample of the ind_mixed_2012 corpus (available from: https://wortschatz.uni-leipzig.de/en/download/Indonesian#ind_mixed_2012, see also Goldhahn, Eckart, and Quasthoff 2012). Examples are referenced by sentence number in that source. Examples for which no source is specified are provided by the second and third authors who are both speakers of Indonesian.

³ We use Actor (A) and Undergoer (U) to refer to the semantic macroroles associated with a transitive verb.

⁴ This possibility is restricted to first and second person actors although address terms can be used as pronoun substitutes and Musgrave (2003) argues that the pronominal clitic in this construction should be considered to be a verbal affix even though it is written as a separate word.

- (3) a. *Saya membaca buku itu*
 1SG AV.read book that
 'I read the book.'
- b. *Buku itu ku=baca*
 book that 1SG=[UV]read
 'The book, I read (it).'
- c. *Buku itu di-baca=nya*
 book that DI_{UV}-read=3SG
 'The book, (s)he read (it).'
- d. *Buku itu di-baca oleh Amir*
 book that DI_{PASS}-read by Amir
 'The book was read by Amir.' (Arka and Manning 2009: 47)

Given that an A can be a core argument but not SUBJ, we use the term “non-subject argument” in preference to “object” throughout. It should be noted that PASS is constructional in nature with verbal morphology (*di-*) being only an element of the construction. Thus, *di-* simply marks that the U is selected as SUBJ, which means that the status of the A argument is unspecified, and it can be unexpressed. When it is expressed, its status is determined by the syntactic flagging of *oleh* for PASS, or its bare clitic realisation hosted by the verb for UV (Examples [3b–c]). At the morphological level, *di-* is ambiguous between PASS and UV; hence our glossing of DI_{PASS} and DI_{UV}. The constructions marked by the prefix *di-* are only possible where the subject (the undergoer) is third person, whereas the UV construction with a proclitic pronoun is not possible with a third person SUBJ. Intransitive verbs occur with various prefixes such as *ber-* and including *meN-* but they may also be unprefixed. As noted previously, subjects precede the verb in unmarked word order for all voice constructions.

Obliques are structurally peripheral. Obliques and core arguments are clearly marked differently: obliques are realised as prepositional phrases whereas core arguments appear as bare noun phrases.⁵ As is common in Austronesian languages, pronouns in Indonesian canonically only refer to humans; this applies both to free pronouns and to clitic pronouns. This stricture applies in principle to the clitic *=nya*, but even in formal contexts, current usage allows this pronoun to have non-human reference. Additionally, *=nya* is normally treated as a 3SG form, but as there is no 3PL reduced pronoun, some flexibility in this regard is also observed.

The applicative morphemes which are our focus are suffixes, and as mentioned above, both have more than one function. *-kan* occurs commonly with both applicative and causative function; *-i* can also function as a causative (see Footnote 9), but this is much less common than the applicative use, and also functions to code extension of the

5 In Section 5, we discuss one construction where this distinction may be less clearcut.

action denoted by a verb. Indonesian has a constraint which allows only one suffix in a complete word and therefore it is not possible to form a causative derived from an already applicative verb; one of our examples (Example [11]) will illustrate this point.⁶

3 Applicative constructions in Indonesian

Both applicatives *-i* and *-kan* give rise to mono-/di-transitive argument arrays as captured in Table 1. The main difference is the semantic role of the applied argument, realised grammatically as the postverbal (first) non-subject argument of the (AV) sentence schematised in (1). The applicative suffix *-i* selects a locative-related role (goal/source/location), whereas *-kan* selects a non-locative (i.e. beneficiary/recipient or theme) role. Beneficiaries and recipients can be thought of as locations, but in these cases something moves to the location. Kroeger (2007), amongst others, argues that this distinction is important. The third argument is thematically theme for both *-i/-kan* when the derived structure is ditransitive. When the third argument is OBL, it is thematically instrument for *-i* and goal/locative for *-kan*. Each will be discussed in turn in the subsections below.

Table 1: Sub-categorisation frames for derived *-i/-kan* structures (Arka et al. 2009).

| (a) Monotransitive | | | | (b) Ditransitive | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| | NP _{SUBJ} | NP _{NSUBJ} | NP _{OBL} | | NP _{SUBJ} | NP _{NSUBJ1} | NP _{NSUBJ2} |
| <i>-i</i> | A | goal/ source/ location | instrument | <i>-i</i> | A | goal/ source/ location | theme |
| <i>-kan</i> | A | patient/ theme/ instrument | goal/ source/ location | <i>-kan</i> | A | beneficiary/ recipient | theme |

⁶ This constraint is also relevant to the question of whether Indonesian has any lexicalised applicatives. There are no plausible candidates for words derived with *-kan*; the process is transparent and productive. However, there is a handful of verbs whose citation form ends with the vowel *i* and for these the question does arise. Double vowels do not appear in Indonesian, therefore suffixation with *-i* in such cases would presumably be invisible. Two of the verbs are *beri* ‘give’ and *beli* ‘buy’, both denoting situations where themes are transferred. Both can form derivatives with *-kan*, which suggests that the words are synchronically monomorphemic, but does not tell us anything about their history, a topic which is beyond the scope of this chapter.

3.1 Applicative *-i* and other uses of the suffix *-i*

The suffix *-i* is a derivational transitivity suffix, possibly affixed to stems of different categories including a noun, an adjective or a verb; e.g., *air* (N) ‘water’ → *air-i* ‘water’ (V_{TR}), *basah* (A) ‘wet’ → *basah-i* ‘dampen’ (V_{TR}), *lompat* ‘jump’ (V_{INTR}) → *lompat-i* ‘jump over’ (V_{TR}). As seen from these examples, *-i* is a polysemous affix whose range of uses includes, but is not limited to, applicativisation and causativisation. Its effect depends on the semantics of the stem, but in both applicative and causative functions, it is often (but not always) characterised by the addition of affectedness involving locative-related meaning.

The interpretation of *-i* as causative or applicative typically depends on the semantics of the stems. Broadly speaking, a causative interpretation arises when the stem is an adjective expressing a stative event (e.g. *panas* ‘hot’ → *panasi* ‘to heat’) or a noun conceptually related to an event involving a displaced entity/theme depicted by the stem (e.g. *kulit* ‘skin’ → *kuliti* ‘to peel, to remove the skin of X’ (Example 4). An applicative interpretation arises when the stem is a verb which expresses a dynamic event, typically involving agentivity (e.g. *duduk* ‘sit’ → *duduki* ‘sit on X’) or directed motion (e.g. *datang* ‘come’ → *datangi* ‘come to X’, *jatuh* ‘fall’ → *jatuhi* ‘fall onto X’).

- (4) *Dia mengulit-i pisang itu*
 3SG AV.skin-CAUS banana that
 ‘S/he peeled (lit. removed the skin from) the bananas.’
 (Arka et al. 2009: 90)

As a transitivity suffix, *-i* changes the valence or transitivity of the stem. For example, the applicativisation of the intransitive verb *duduk* ‘sit’ (Example [5a]) results in a transitive structure (Example [5b]). In (5a), the locative ‘chair’ is oblique, prepositionally flagged by a locative preposition *di*, but in the applicative structure in (5b), it is a U non-subject argument.

- (5) a. *Ia duduk (di kursi itu)* ($INTR \rightarrow TR$)
 3SG sit LOC chair that
 ‘S/he sat (on the chair).’
 b. *Ia menduduk-i kursi itu*
 3SG AV.sit-APPL chair that
 ‘S/he was sitting on the chair.’
 (Arka et al. 2009: 88)

When the stem is transitive, the outcome of applicativisation varies. It depends on whether or not the AppP can be understood as a goal/recipient-like argument that fits with the mono- or di-transitive structure shown Table 1. For example, the applicativisation of *kirim* ‘send’ results in a ditransitive structure as seen in (6b). This is because

the oblique *dia* ‘3SG’ (6a) is a human participant, high in animacy hierarchy, which makes it easily understood as a recipient in the applicative structure (6b). The stem’s U argument, *uang* ‘money’, is naturally understood as a displaced theme. It meets the role requirement of the second non-subject argument of the ditransitive structure (6b). Example (6c) shows that the AppP can become subject in an Undergoer Voice clause.

- (6) a. *Ayah mengirim uang kepada dia* (goal) (INTR → TR)
 father AV.send money to 3SG
 b. *Ayah mengirim-i dia uang*
 father AV.send-APPL 3SG money
 ‘Father sent money to him/her.’
 c. *Dia yang di-kirim-i uang oleh Ayah*
 3SG REL DI_{PASS}-send-APPL money by father
 ‘He who was sent money by father’.

However, if the applied argument is inanimate (e.g. *sawah* ‘rice field’ in Example [7]), it typically only receives a locative role not a goal/recipient role interpretation. The derived structure is not typically a ditransitive structure. Instead, as seen in (7b), the result is a monotransitive structure with the theme argument interpreted to bear an instrument role flagged by *dengan*, grammatically OBL (cf. the subcategorisation frame [a] in Table 1). Attempting a ditransitive structure downgrades acceptability as seen in (7c) and ditransitive examples of this type do not occur in our corpus data.

- (7) a. *Mereka menanam padi di sawah*
 3PL AV.plant paddy LOC rice.field
 ‘They planted paddy in the field.’
 b. *Mereka menanam-i sawah dengan padi*
 3PL AV.plant-APPL rice.field with paddy
 ‘They planted paddy in the field.’
 c. ??*Mereka menanami sawah padi*

The suffix *-i* may encode progressive or durative aspect, possibly with intensity, without altering the valence of the stem. This is exemplified in Examples (8) and (9). *Saya* is non-subject U argument in the non-applicative structure without the suffix (8a) and also in the structure with a suffixed verb in (8b). As seen from the contrast in the free translation, the suffix *-i* here signals repetition/intensity (or durative aspect), absent in (8a). The same contrast is observed in (9a–b). It is explainable in terms of the extended affectedness of U, due to the locative meaning imposed by *-i*. That is, in the case of Example (8b), the U (*saya* ‘1SG’) is understood to be affected by the action of hitting in an extended manner, e.g. on different parts of the body, while in Example (9b), the affectedness is extended in intensity. This property of suffixes which also function as applicatives is seen in a number of Austronesian languages. Balinese has a verb *nyagur*

‘AV.hit’ and a derived verb *nyagur-in* ‘AV.hit-APPL’ which can have a progressive aspect meaning, and the Javanese applicative morpheme *-i* also codes iterative action and/or progressive aspect (Hemmings 2013).

- (8) a. *Ia memukul saya* b. *Ia memukul-i saya*
 3SG AV.hit 1SG 3SG AV.hit-APPL 1SG
 ‘S/he hit me.’ ‘S/he was hitting me.’
- (9) a. *Ia memegang pencuri itu* b. *Ia memegang-i pencuri itu*
 3SG AV.hold thief that 3SG AV.hold-APPL thief that
 ‘S/he held the thief.’ ‘S/he was holding the thief tightly.’

3.2 Applicative *-kan* and other uses of the suffix *-kan*

The *-kan* suffix has four main functions. Two of these functions result in applicative constructions where participants otherwise expressed as obliques become part of the syntactic core of the clause, that is, AppPs. The semantic roles in question in these constructions are beneficiary (§ 3.2.1) and instrument (§ 3.2.2). The third function is an applicative lookalike where the suffix function is to make clear that the non-subject argument of a verb is the patient of the action (§ 3.2.3). Finally, *-kan* functions as a causative (§ 3.2.4).

3.2.1 Beneficiaries

There are numerous verbs for which a beneficiary can be a participant in the action, and that participant can be encoded either as an oblique in a prepositional phrase (typically with *untuk* ‘for’) with an unsuffixed verb (Example [10a]), or as an AppP with a suffixed verb. A typical example is the verb *bawa* ‘carry’. Example (10b) shows that the derived verb in this case is ditransitive, and Example (10c) shows that the beneficiary can become subject in an Undergoer Voice construction:

- (10) a. *Tae Kyu pulang membawa bunga untuk Pal Kang*
 Tae Kyu return.home AV.carry flower for Pal Kang
 ‘Tae Kyu came home carrying flowers for Pal Kang.’
- b. *orang-orang Majus membawa-kan Yesus mur serta emas*
 person~PL magus AV.carry-APPL Jesus myrrh with gold
 ‘The Magi brought Jesus myrrh and gold.’

- c. *Seorang mukmin cukup di-bawa-kan satu dalil*
 someone resident enough DI_{PASS}-carry-APPL one proposition
saja dari sekian banyak dalil
 only from so.much many proposition
 'It is enough if a community member is brought one idea from the many ideas.'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_300K-sentences.txt: 158190, 121749, 277948)

We have referred to the semantic role involved here as "beneficiary", reflecting standard descriptions, but in fact the AppP can be affected by the action in either a positive or a negative way. That is, this applicative with *-kan* can be a malefactive construction:

- (11) a. *Ternyata pembantu=nya membawa-kan dia kopi beracun*
 it.appears servant=3SG AV.bring-APPL 3SG coffee poisonous
 'It turned out that his servant brought him poisoned coffee.'
 b. *kita hanya memberi-kan mereka ancaman jika mereka*
 1PL.INCL only AV.give-APPL 3PL threat if 3PL
melaku-kan sesuatu hal yang negatif
 AV.behaviour-CAUS a.certain thing REL negative
 'We will only threaten them if they do something negative.'

There is a small number of verbs which have derivatives with both applicative and causative *-kan* suffixes, for example, *jahit* 'sew':

- (12) a. *tetapi saya harus menjahit celana ini!*
 but 1SG must AV.sew pants this
 '...but I must sew these pants.'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_1M-sentences.txt: 344166)
 b. *orang~orang (...) ikut menjahit-kan baju mereka kepada Anteh*
 person~PL join AV.sew-CAUS shirt 3PL.POSS to Anteh
 '...people (from village afar) came to have their shirt sewn by Anteh.'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_1M-sentences.txt: 378654)
 c. *Tukang jahit itu menjahit-kan saya kemeja baru*
 craftsman sew that AV.sew-APPL 1SG shirt new
 'That tailor sewed me a new shirt.'
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 87)

Note that Example (12c) has two non-subject core arguments, that is, the derived verb here is ditransitive. In contrast, Example (12b) is a monotransitive clause; the agent of

7 <https://www.kompasiana.com/linistianah/5a0544565a676f79ee7047b2/sering-mengancam-anak-lihatlah-dampak-negatifnya>

the base construction is coded as an oblique with the derived verb (see also discussion of Example [14] below).

3.2.2 Instruments

With some verbs, the AppP is the entity used to carry out an action, the instrument. Examples of this type are the verbs *pukul* ‘strike’ (Example [13a]) and *tutup* ‘cover; close’ (Example [13c]):

- (13) a. *Hye Sung memukul kursi dengan tangan=nya*
 Hye Sung AV.strike chair with hand=3SG
 b. *Hye Sung memukul-kan tangan=nya ke kursi*
 Hye Sung AV.strike-APPL hand=3SG to chair
 Both: ‘Hye Sung struck the chair with his hand.’
 c. *aku memang menutup wajah dengan telapak tangan*
 1SG certainly AV.cover face with palm hand
 d. *aku memang menutup-kan telapak tangan di wajah*
 1SG certainly AV.cover-APPL palm hand LOC face
 Both: ‘I would certainly cover my face with the palm of my hand.’
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_300K-sentences.txt: 267508, 269340)

There are a few verbs, for example *tulis* ‘write’, which have *-kan* forms both for an instrument (Example [14b]) and for a beneficiary (Example [14c]):

- (14) a. *Dia banyak menulis naskah drama.*
 3SG many AV.write manuscript drama
 ‘(S)he writes many drama/play manuscripts.’
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_1M-sentences.txt: 388787)
 b. *Dia menulis-kan spidol=nya ke baju saya*
 3SG AV.write-APPL marker=3SG to shirt 1SG
 ‘(S)he wrote with a marker on my shirt.’
 c. *Dia menulis-kan ayah=nya surat*
 3SG AV.write-APPL father=3SG letter
 ‘(S)he wrote a letter for their father.’
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 87–88)

Similar to the facts discussed in relation to Example (12) above, there is a contrast here in the valency of the two derived verbs. The example with a benefactive applicative (Example [14c]) is ditransitive, while the example with the instrumental applicative (Example [14b]) is monotransitive.

3.2.3 Transitive clauses with *-kan*: valency increase and morphological lookalikes

In Section 2 above, we introduced the Indonesian voice system, including the use of the prefixes *meN-* and *di-*. The possibility of both prefixes occurring before a stem is a diagnostic for transitive verbs. Some verbs do not have a prefixed (i.e. transitive) form without the suffix *-kan*. An example of this type is the root *kerja* ‘work’ which derives an intransitive verb with the prefix *be-* (Example [15a]), and a transitive verb with the suffix *-kan*, then also allowing prefixation with *meN-* or *di-* (Examples [15b–c]):

- (15) a. *Cuma kini, sejak jatuh sakit, Julia tidak lagi be-kerja*
 only now since fall ill Julia NEG again BE-work
 ‘But now, since she fell ill, Julia has not worked again.’
 b. *ia mengerjakan terjemahan baru keempat Kitab Injil*
 3SG AV.work-APPL translation new fourth book Injil
 ‘He is working on a new translation of the fourth gospel of Injil.’
 c. *Masih banyak hal yang perlu di-kerja-kan dan*
 still many thing REL necessary DIPASS-WORK-APPL and
di-persiap-kan
 DIPASS-ready-CAUS
 ‘There are still many things which need to be carried out and prepared.’
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_300K-sentences.txt: 87349, 145728, 218944)

Another verb of this type is *tinggal* ‘leave’. Example (16a) shows that a prefixed form of this verb is possible without the *-kan* suffix, but this is only a transitive verb in a small number of fixed idioms such as *meninggal dunia* ‘die’ (lit. ‘leave the world’). Suffixation with *-kan* derives a transitive verb which can be used with any appropriate non-subject argument and shows the expected range of voice possibilities (Examples [16b–c]):

- (16) a. *Banyak orang bilang, orang baik biasanya meninggal cepat*
 many person say person good commonly AV.leave fast
 ‘Many people say, good people usually pass away quickly.’
 b. *Para tamu itu memaksa Aidit meninggal-kan rumah*
 COLL friend that AV.force Aidit AV.leave-APPL house
 ‘Several friends made Aidit leave his home.’⁸

⁸ Note that this example uses a periphrastic causative construction; the constraint on multiple suffixation means that a derived causative verb is not possible.

- c. *Elemen traumatis yang di-tinggal-kan oleh semua tragedi*
 element traumatic REL DI_{PASS}-leave-APPL by all tragedy
kemanusiaan abad ini. . .
 humanity era this
 'The traumatic elements which have been left by all the human tragedies of
 this era. . .'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_300K-sentences.txt: 81349, 43695, 24484)

The following section (Section 4) has further discussion of another set of examples involving emotion and cognition predicates, where both applicative suffixes can be used to increase valency.

With other verbs, *-kan* can be added with no valency change. That is, such verbs have prefixed forms both with and without the suffix and both are transitive, for example *sebut* 'mention':

- (17) a. *Aristoteles menyebut tiga cara untuk mempengaruh-i manusia*
 Aristotle AV.mention three way for AV.influence-APPL mankind
 'Aristotle mentions three methods to influence people.'
 b. *Kita akan menyebut-kan dua hal saja*
 1PL.INCL FUT AV.mention-APPL two matter only
 'We will mention only two issues.'
 c. *Bacalah dosa~dosa yang di-sebut-kan Kristus*
 read.EMPH sin~PL REL DI_{UV}-mention-APPL Christ
 'Just read the sins which are mentioned by Christ.'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_300K-sentences.txt : 12737, 180106, 152941)

Such constructions are examples of a morphological lookalike: the morphology of an applicative construction is present, but there is no restructuring of the argument array of the clause. Traditional accounts (e.g. Sneddon et al. 2010: 73) subsume these uses of *-kan* under the description "marking the object as patient".

3.2.4 Causative *-kan*

The suffix *-kan* can be used to add an additional agent-like participant to a clause. This is possible both with intransitive verbs, resulting in a transitive clause (Example [18]), and with transitive verbs, where the result is another transitive clause in which the agent of the base construction is coded as an oblique (Example [19]).

- (18) a. *Siti bangun*
 Siti wake
 'Siti woke up.'

- b. *Ibu membangun-kan Siti*
 mother AV.wake-CAUS Siti
 ‘Mother woke Siti up.’
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 78)

- (19) a. *Wanita itu mencuci pakaian saya*
 woman that AV.laundry clothes 1SG
 ‘That woman washes my clothes.’
 b. *Saya mencuci-kan pakaian pada wanita itu*
 1SG AV.laundry-CAUS clothes at woman that
 ‘I have my clothes washed by that woman.’
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 79)

Table 2 shows that causative *-kan* also functions to derive transitive verbs from nouns and adjectives:

Table 2: Verbalising *-kan*.

| Base | Gloss | Derived verb | Gloss |
|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| <i>kabar</i> | ‘news’ | <i>mengabar-kan</i> | ‘report’ |
| <i>sekolah</i> | ‘school’ | <i>menyekolah-kan</i> | ‘send to school’ |
| <i>bersih</i> | ‘clean’ (adjective) | <i>membersih-kan</i> | ‘clean’ (verb) |
| <i>bebas</i> | ‘free’ | <i>membebas-kan</i> | ‘release’ |

4 The semantic contrast between the two applicative morphemes

As mentioned initially and exemplified in the previous section, the two applicative suffixes differ in terms of the semantic roles preferred for the AppP: locative/goal-related roles by *-i* and other roles (patient/recipient/instrument) by *-kan*. The suffixes *-i/-kan* can be affixed to the same stem, and as noted by Kaswanti Purwo (1995), Sneddon et al. (2010) and Kroeger (2007), we therefore have linking alternations in Indonesian similar to the spray-load alternation in English. This is exemplified in (20) and (21). The base verb in Example (20), *muat* ‘hold, contain’, has an unsuffixed transitive form, seen in Example (20c), while the base verbs in Examples (21) and (22) are intransitive.

- (20) a. *Buruh itu memuat-kan beras ke kapal*
 worker that AV.load-APPL rice to ship
 ‘The workers loaded the rice onto the ship.’

- b. *Buruh itu memuat-i kapal dengan beras*
 worker that AV.load-APPL ship with rice
 'The workers loaded the rice onto the ship.'
 (Arka et al. 2009 : 89)
- c. *Kapal itu sedang memuat batu bara*
 ship that CONT AV.hold stone ember
 'The ship is loading coal.'
 (Echols and Shadily 1994: 377)
- (21) a. *...air sudah menempel pada dek*
 water already AV.stick at deck
 '...water already stuck at the deck.'
 (Leipzig Corpora ind_mixed_2012_1M-sentences.txt: 372288)
- b. *Anak~anak menempel-kan poster ke tembok*
 child~PL AV.stick-APPL poster to wall
 'The children stuck a picture to the wall.'
- c. *Anak~anak menempel-i tembok dengan poster*
 child~PL AV.stick-APPL wall with poster
 'The children stuck a picture to the wall.'

Given the different roles selected by *-i/-kan*, the different effects as seen in (22) are expected:

- (22) a. *Dia datang lagi dalam kehidupan=mu*
 3SG come again within life=2SG
 '(S)he came into your life again.'
- b. *Mereka mendatang-kan polisi*
 3PL AV.come-KAN police
 'They arrived with the police.' (comitative-applicative *-kan*)
 'They called for the police / made the police come.' (causative *-kan*)
- c. *Mereka mendatang-i polisi*
 3PL AV.come-APPL police
 'They came to / approached the police.' (applicative *-i*)

There is an intriguing overlap with the goal-related role of *-i* and the recipient/benefactive role of *-kan*, which supports the idea that applicativisation is constructional in nature. This is related to the ditransitive construction, exemplified in (23), where *-i* or *-kan* is affixed to the same verb *kirim*, and the AppP is human, *Tini*. The differences in meaning appear to be tenuous, especially between *mengirimi* (reading [i]) and *menirimkan* (reading [ii]). Reading (ii) might also imply (i) (i.e. a direct goal/recipient and beneficiary role). Reading (iii) is only available for *-kan* (where *Tini* is the owner/source of the book, benefiting from the assistance in sending the book).

- (23) *Saya [mengirimi]_(i)/[mengirimkan]_{(ii)/(iii)} Tini buku*
 (i) 'I sent Tini a book.' (Tini=the goal/recipient; the book was directly sent to Tini.)
 (ii) 'I sent a book for Tini.'
 (Tini is the (intended) beneficiary; the book might have been sent via somebody else.)
 (iii) 'I sent a book (to somebody) for the benefit of Tini.'

Furthermore, evidence that the applicative is constructional and that the suffix *-i/-kan* is only one element in the construction comes from the fact exemplified in (24). Here, the applicative suffix is optional because the larger constructional template already encodes the structure [NP_{SUBJ} V NP_{NSUBJ:THEME} PP_{OBL:goal}] (cf. subcategorisation [a] in Table 1). In short, when the constructional template is satisfied, and it is consistent with the stem's (non-applicative) subcategorisation frame, then the suffix *-kan* is optional.

- (24) *Ayah mengirim(-kan) uang kepada saya* (monotransitive)
 father AV.send-APPL money to 1SG
 'Father sent money to me.'

Voskuil (1996) argues that the two applicatives in Indonesian reflect semantic distinctions which are also visible in other languages. He claims that the *-i* applicative is similar to the prefix *be-* in Dutch and the suffix *-an* in Tagalog in that all of these morphemes derive change of state verbs along the lines of the zero-derived verb *butter* in English. *-kan*, on the other hand, is similar to the Tagalog prefix *i-* in that both of them derive change of location verbs like the English *pocket* class. Voskuil also sees this semantic distinction reflected in the fact that dative type relations are encoded with *-i* applicatives, while benefactives are encoded with *-kan*.

This approach, in which the semantic properties of derived verbs are the result of the interaction of the root and the rather general properties of the applicative morphemes is taken even further by several scholars who attempt to include causative *-kan* in the analysis. Vamarasi (1999) argues that, at least in the case of intransitive verbs, the effect of the suffix *-kan* depends on the class of the base verb: for actor-oriented verbs (unergatives), *-kan* behaves as an applicative adding a non-subject argument. And for undergoer-oriented verbs (unaccusatives), *-kan* behaves as a causative, adding an agent subject. Kroeger (2007) suggests that *-kan* has three functions: a morphosyntactic one which is the benefactive applicative; a morphosemantic one, which covers the instrumental applicative and the causative with transitive bases, as well as constructions with an optional suffix (see Section 6); and a category changing function which covers causatives with intransitive bases. Which function applies depends on semantic properties of the base. Cole and Son (2004) take this approach even further, claiming that *-kan* has a single function: "licensing of a new argument in the argument structure that is not licensed syntactically by the base verb" (p. 339).

All of these approaches give important insights into the functions and behaviour of the two applicative morphemes in Indonesian, but they all encounter problems when

we include the class of emotion and cognition verbs.⁹ The basic pattern for this class of words in Indonesian is for the experiencer to be the subject in the clause and for the stimulus to be encoded in a prepositional phrase (some verbs allow a bare NP stimulus):

- (25) *Saya takut dengan anjing*
 1SG afraid with dog
 'I am afraid of dogs.'

To form a prefixed verb, that is to be part of the full transitive system, such verbs almost all require an applicative derivation. Some verbs have *-i* derivatives, some have *-kan* derivatives, some allow both possibilities and some allow both applicative and causative derivations with *-kan*. The verb introduced above, *takut* illustrates the range of possibilities:¹⁰

- (26) a. *Hanya Tuhan yang sewajarnya kita takut-i*
 only lord REL truly 1PL.INCL UV.fear-APPL
 'We need fear only the Lord.' (*-i* applicative)
 (Echols and Shadily 1994: 544)
- b. *Tapi yang di-takut-kan oleh Mustika bukanlah wanita yang*
 but REL DI_{PASS}-afraid-APPL by Mustika NEG.EMPH woman REL
di-kejar~kejar oleh Sandy
 DI_{PASS}-chase~CONT by Sandy
 'But what was feared by Mustika was not the woman who was being chased by Sandy.' (*-kan* applicative)
 (Fredy S 1991: 30)
- c. *Berarti ia melangkah ke dalam bahaya yang menakut-kan*
 meaning 3SG AV.step to inside danger REL AV.afraid-CAUS
 'Meaning that he stepped into a terrifying danger.'
 (Christie 1986: 274)

These examples show that, at least when associated with this class of verbs, either applicative suffix can be used to derive a transitive verb. The semantic role of the participant which becomes a core argument is the same; it is always a stimulus. While

⁹ See Musgrave (2003: Section 4.1.3) for discussion of whether these words should be considered verbs or adjectives.

¹⁰ A causative verb can also be derived from this base with the suffix *-i*, that is, the full set of possibilities can be seen with one verb:

Ia menakut-i dan membentak orang bawah=nya
 3SG AV.afraid-CAUS and AV.snap.at person below=3SG
 'She intimidated her subordinates and spoke harshly to them.' (Echols and Shadily 1994: 544)

the suffixes are typically associated with certain semantic roles when they function as applicatives, these examples suggest that they can also function equally as transitivisers in this context.

There is also a handful of adjectives which can be the base for derived verbs with both *i* and *-kan* and for which there is little difference in meaning between the two derivations. Examples of this type are *habis* ‘finished’ (Examples [27a–b]) and *lengkap* ‘complete’:

- (27) a. *Ia menghabiskan cerita=nya dengan nasihat*
 3SG AV.finished-APPL story=3SG with advice
 ‘(S)he finished their story with a warning.’
 b. *Ia menghabiskan uang jaja=nya untuk membeli mainan*
 3SG AV.finished-APPL money snack=3SG for AV.buy toy
 ‘(S)he used up their snack money buying toys.’
 (Moeliono et al. 2017: 143)

Usage-based research (i.e. using corpora) also suggests that the semantic differentiation of the two applicative suffixes is not as clear as has traditionally been assumed, but is also dependent on voice alternations. A corpus-based study on the Indonesian verb *kena* ‘be hit’ (Rajeg, Rajeg, and Arka 2020) shows that the *-i* and *-kan* forms of this verbal base exhibit statistically distinct semantic preference in active (*meN-*) and passive (*di-*). The predominant sense of *mengena-kan* (AV) is the physical ‘to wear cloth/body-accessories’ (Example [28a]) while the predominant sense of the passive *di-kena-kan* (PASS) is the metaphorical ‘to be imposed/be subject to (a regulation, obligation, etc.)’ (Example [28b]). This ‘impose/subject to’ sense of *kena-kan* in passive is also the predominant one for *kena-i* in PASS (*dikenai*) (Example [28d]), but the active form of *kenai* (*mengennai* [AV]) predominantly expresses ‘to hit’ (Example [28c]). Example (26e) illustrates the use of the verb *kena* without a suffix.

- (28) a. *Dia masih mengena-kan celana seragam warna abu-abu*
 3SG still AV.KENA-APPL trousers uniform colour ash~LIKE
 ‘(S)he is still wearing the grey uniform pants.’
 b. *Kalau terlambat se-hari saja, Anda langsung dikenai-kan*
 if late NSP-day only 2SG direct DIPASS.KENA-APPL
denda atau bunga tambahan
 fine or interest extra
 ‘If you are even one day late, you will be fined or charged interest.’
 c. *...panah=ku tepat mengenai badan=nya*
 arrow=1SG exact AV.KENA-APPL body=3SG
 ‘...my arrow will precisely strike their body.’

- d. *saya akan di-KENA-i biaya sebesar 60 persen*
 1SG FUT DI_{PASS}-*kena*-APPL fee as.large.as 60 percent
 ‘I will be charged a fee up to 60 per cent.’
 (ind_mixed_2012_1M: 938247, 975688, 955107, 302404)
- e. *Akibatnya Putri kena tegur manajer kafe*
 as.a.result Putri be.hit reprimand manager cafe
 ‘As a result, Putri gets reprimanded by the cafe manager.’
 (www.indosiar.com, collected 26/04/2012)

Two points are worthy of comment here. First, active and passive forms of the same verb may have distinct semantic preference. Second, for *kena* specifically, the passive *di-*forms of the applicative forms *kena-i* and *kena-kan* are semantically synonymous, and felicitously interchangeable, (given their strong association with the same meaning), but the applicative forms are not semantically interchangeable in active because the active forms have distinct semantic preference. This also shows that verbs with applicative morphemes may have different semantic preference in certain voice morphology (cf. Rajeg, Rajeg, and Arka 2022 for another study on the interaction of verb semantics and Indonesian voice morphology with motion verbs).

We also note a study (Rajeg, Denistia, and Musgrave 2019) which looked at the distribution of Indonesian verbs derived from nouns in a semantic vector space model, a way of quantifying relationships between lexemes based on their usage in a body of text. All the nouns allowed derivation of prefixed verbs without any suffix, with the *-i* suffix and with the *-kan* suffix. In almost all cases, the three verbs clustered together closely in the semantic space; where this did not happen, one of the derivatives had acquired a specialised meaning (not an unusual phenomenon in the realm of derivational morphology). The study shows no consistent pattern in the difference between each of the derived verbs and the base verb; that is, *-i* applicatives are not consistently closer to the base verb than *-kan* applicatives or vice versa. The study also shows that the contexts of use of the base verb and the derivatives are generally similar and this is further evidence that semantic differentiation between the different applicatives and a base verb is not always strong.

5 Optionality with *-kan*

There are two ways in which the *-kan* applicative construction has optional aspects. First, there are some verbs which are monotransitive with or without the suffix and for which the U argument does not change. This contrasts with the valency remapping possibilities exemplified previously for the verb *muat* ‘contain’ (Example [20]). Second, in some cases it is possible to include the suffix but without having one of its prototypical applicative functions. That is, in such cases, the oblique which would be expected to become an AppP remains an oblique.

5.1 Optional suffix

Section 3.2.1 discussed *-kan* suffixation where the primary function of the morpheme was to emphasise that the non-subject argument of the verb was a patient. For some verbs where this happens, the suffix is optional; there may be no difference in meaning between the two possibilities or, as in the following example, the suffix intensifies the meaning. Echols and Shadily (1994: 470) gloss *merusak* as ‘damage, ruin’, while *merusakkan* is glossed as ‘destroy, devastate, break something entirely’:

- (29) a. *hal~hal yang bisa merusak pikiran manusia*
 matter~PL REL can AV.damage thought humanity
 ‘...matters which can hurt people’s thinking. . .’
 b. *hal~hal yang najis seperti itu yang merusak-kan*
 matter~PL REL dirty like that REL AV.damage-APPL
pikiran kita
 thought 1PL
 ‘...matters which are similarly dirty that can destroy our thinking. . .’
 (ind_mixed_2012_1M: 94890, 95351)

There are also verbs for which the suffix is optional in Actor Voice (with the prefix *meN-*), but obligatory in passive clauses:

- (30) a. *Dia mengajar(-kan) Bahasa Indonesia*
 3SG AV.teach-APPL language Indonesia
 ‘(S)he teaches Indonesian.’
 b. *Bahasa Indonesia di-ajar-kan di sini*
 language Indonesia DI_{PASS}-teach-APPL LOC here
 ‘Indonesian is taught here.’
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 261)

Again, these are verbs for which *-kan* emphasises the role of the non-subject argument; that is, they are a subset of those for which *-kan* is optional.

For one of the verbs exemplified here, corpus data suggests that the unsuffixed and suffixed forms occur at very similar rates.¹¹

¹¹ Data collated from datasets made available by Wortschatz Leipzig (<https://wortschatz.uni-leipzig.de/en/download/Indonesian>). We are grateful to Karlina Denistia for sharing her morphologically parsed frequency list, allowing us to extract these data.

Table 3: Rates of occurrence of unsuffixed and suffixed forms for two verbs.

| Verb | Gloss | Unsuffixed | | Suffixed with <i>-kan</i> | |
|--------------|----------|------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|
| | | Raw count | Percent | Raw count | Percent |
| <i>rusak</i> | ‘damage’ | 13,646 | 97.9 | 295 | 2.1 |
| <i>ajar</i> | ‘teach’ | 13,715 | 51.6 | 12,865 | 48.4 |

The comparative frequencies reported in Table 3 vary considerably but they do give a quantitative indication of what optionality can mean here although we have not separated causative and applicative uses of *-kan* for those verbs and these figures do not take account of voice. Further analysis along these lines will be time-consuming. It requires making judgments for each verb as to whether one or both functions of the suffix are possible, and then for cases where both functions are possible, judgments have to be made about individual examples. Comprehensively parsed and tagged data would reduce some of this work, but achieving that would also involve a considerable effort.

5.2 *-kan* with retained oblique

Section 3.2.2 showed *-kan* as an applicative which changed the syntactic status of a beneficiary. With a base verb, the beneficiary is encoded as a prepositional phrase, an oblique, but with the derived applicative verb, the beneficiary is a core argument, an AppP. In some case, however, a derived verb with *-kan* can occur in a clause in which the beneficiary is still an oblique:

- (31) *Pelayan mengambil-kan se-gelas air untuk tamu*
 waiter AV.take-APPL NSP-glass water for guest
 ‘The waiter fetched a glass of water for the guest.’
 (Sneddon et al. 2010: 86)

Sneddon et al. point out that if the beneficiary is clearly understood in context, then a clause without any overt expression of that role is grammatical, and they suggest that this may explain the apparently redundant construction seen in Example (31). The construction has been stigmatised by some (e.g., Johns 1978: 232), or attributed to Javanese influence (Verhaar 1984). A construction of this kind is typologically unusual, but there is an even more surprising possibility here. As Kroeger (2007) notes, *-kan* in this construction can reduce the valence of a verb. The verb *beri* ‘give’ is ditransitive in its base form (Example [32a]), but it can be suffixed with *-kan* and then have the beneficiary

expressed as an oblique (Example [32b]), making the overall construction monotransitive.¹²

- (32) a. *John memberi Mary buku itu*
 John AV.give Mary book that
 ‘John gave Mary the book.’
 b. *John memberi-kan buku itu kepada Mary*
 John AV.give-APPL book that to Mary
 ‘John gave that book to Mary.’
 (Kroeger 2007)

The preceding discussion has set up distinctions between different situations where parts of the applicative pattern with *-kan* are optional. It is also possible to analyse these possibilities in a more unified way. Such an analysis would suggest that the presence of *-kan* sometimes (but not always, see e.g. Example [30]) has the function of emphasising that the semantic status of the non-subject argument of the action as being an affected participant. The affectedness can be prototypically evaluated negatively (giving rise to the patient-marking *-kan*), or positively (giving rise to beneficiary-marking *-kan*). These evaluations are also constructional in the sense that the proper interpretation depends on a specific constructional context. Prototypically, the monotransitive frame (cf. Table [1a]) selects the patient-making function of *-kan*, and the ditransitive frame selects the beneficiary interpretation. When the base verb is already monotransitive (Example [30a]), then it is expected that the patient *-kan* appears to be redundant, as it does not add a non-subject argument. Its presence in this example is arguably semantically motivated: it encodes emphasis to express a higher degree of affectedness, prototypically linked to the first non-subject argument. This prototypical linking of first non-subject argument with high affectedness is critical when the same argument must be selected as subject for pragmatic or syntactic reason. Therefore, it is not surprising to see why *-kan* is obligatory in the passive (Example [30b]) as *(meng)ajar* is polysemous having a monotransitive frame, exemplified in (30a), and a ditransitive frame [*mengajar* NP_{recipient/beneficiary} NP_{theme}], not exemplified here. The obligatory use of *-kan* with the patient selected as subject in (30b) serves as evidence for the complex semantic-syntactic functional basis of *-kan* in the wider grammatical (voice) system in Indonesian. That is, *-kan* is required as it functionally disambiguates different frames associated with *(meng)ajar*.

The advantage of adopting a unified prototype analysis within the construction theory is that we can account for a surprising yet attested demotion effect of the applicative *-kan*, as seen in (32b). In this line of analysis, *-kan* is a polysemous suffix with a set of semantic-constructional properties that include three critical features: (a) high degree

¹² Denis Creissels (p.c.) suggests that this construction could be analysed as an antipassive.

of affectedness (syntactically related to transitivity; cf. Hopper and Thompson 1980), (b) patient/recipient/beneficiary semantic role selection (in contrast to the locative selection of *-i*), and (c) constructional positive/negative evaluation (allowing specific role(s) selection of (b)). Critically, role selection (b)–(c) by *-kan* is not a selection of a unique or exclusive role in the sense that the participant made salient by *-kan* may simultaneously carry more than one of these roles. Thus, Yesus in (10b) is a participant bearing recipient and beneficiary roles simultaneously.

In a prototype theory analysis, forms can vary from a highly representative one exhibiting all the typical features to a less typical or atypical one. In addition, there is no one-to-one form-meaning association associated with a feature realisation. For example, the beneficiary role can be expressed via the applicative *-kan* construction, in which typically it is first non-subject argument, but it can also be prepositionally flagged by *untuk* ‘for’ or *kepada* ‘to’. Empirical evidence of the type seen in (32b) is expected on our prototypical analysis: the beneficiary is associated with more than one exponent or coding (*-kan* and *kepada*), and the same coding (*-kan*) encodes more than one semantic role (theme and beneficiary). From a derivational point of view, the structure of the type exemplified in (32b) would look like involving a demotion. From a non-derivational constructional analysis in prototype theory, however, it is an expected structure, albeit non-typical, as certain meanings are simultaneously given emphasis—in this case, affectedness of the patient *buku itu* ‘the book’ and positive/benefactive evaluation of the recipient/goal ‘Mary’.

The prototype theory analysis would also suggest that the presence of *-kan* points to a reading in which some party benefits from the action, even if that entity is not encoded as a core argument. This account would therefore allow for some flexibility of encoding of participants in a clause with an Actor Voice verb, but would predict that passive clauses would require explicit indication of the syntactic status of the participant which is subject.

These possibilities suggest that taking a prototype theory approach to applicatives is useful (cf. Michaelis and Ruppenhofer 2000). From a derivational point of view, the prototypical construction involves a restructuring of the argument structure of a predicate, with valence increasing if it does change, and taking the AppP from a range of semantic possibilities. The type of construction seen in Example (32) is not prototypical in this way, but it has some flavour of the prototype (in this case, the semantic specificity of the construction).

6 Summary

Indonesian has two suffixes, *-i* and *-kan*, which can function as applicatives, but both also have other functions. Both suffixes are used to derive verbs from base words, which may be verbs or may belong to another word class in some cases. As applicatives,

the suffixes are semantically specific to some extent: *-i* typically makes a location the AppP, while *-kan* has three specific functions: to emphasise that the AppP is a patient, to make a beneficiary the AppP or to make an instrument the AppP. However, there are examples, particularly when the suffixes are used with emotion and cognition verbs, which suggest that the valence changing function of the applicative suffixes is not tied closely to the typical semantics. This property, along with various possibilities where the suffix *-kan* is optional and where its presence does not result in a restructuring of the argument array, suggest that applicativisation in Indonesian can be considered to be a constructional template with some prototypical realisations and some realisations which lack some prototypical properties.

A number of our examples are drawn from corpus data and we believe that working with such data is an important way forward to better understanding some of the issues we have raised in this chapter. These include the possible similarities or differences between *-kan* and *-i* dependent on voice morphology of the applicative verb, and the patterns of co-occurrence of applicative *-kan* with a retained oblique argument. However, such research is challenging because there is no way to separate the different functions of the applicative morphemes, particularly *-kan*, using simple searches. Future research on applicatives in Indonesian should be part of more extensive research on the complex interface of morphosyntax and pragmatics. The discussion in this chapter has been mainly focused on the morphosyntactic properties of *-kan/-i* applicatives, with some discussion on the pragmatic-syntactic motivation in relation to the passivisation responsible for the tenacity of the applicative *-kan* (Example [30b]). The discourse pragmatics of applicatives is an understudied area in Indonesian linguistics. An in-depth study of the pragmatics of applicatives must be ideally based on a corpus of natural language use, which covers different text types (written and spoken) and registers (standard/formal and colloquial). Challenges to such a study include critical issues in producing a large corpus, properly annotated with rich tags allowing us to retrieve information, have breakthroughs in delineating complex variables, and answer questions regarding the complex interface of the morphosyntax-discourse-pragmatics of Indonesian applicatives.

Abbreviations

| | |
|------|-------------------|
| A | Actor |
| APPL | applicative |
| AV | Actor Voice |
| CAUS | causative |
| COLL | collective |
| CONT | continuous aspect |
| EMPH | emphasis |
| FUT | future |

| | |
|-------|------------------------|
| INCL | inclusive |
| INTR | intransitive |
| LIKE | having some quality of |
| LOC | locative |
| NEG | negation |
| NP | noun phrase |
| NSP | non-specific |
| NSUBJ | non-subject |
| OBL | oblique |
| PASS | passive |
| PP | prepositional phrase |
| PL | plural |
| REL | relativiser |
| SG | singular |
| SUBJ | subject |
| TR | transitive |
| U | Undergoer |
| UV | Undergoer Voice |

References

- Arka, I Wayan. 2021. Pivot and puzzling relativisation in Indonesian. In I Wayan Arka, Ash Asudeh & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Modular design of grammar: Linguistics on the edge*, 181–202. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Arka, I Wayan, Mary Dalrymple, Meladel Mistica, Suriel Mofu, Avery Andrews & Jane Simpson. 2009. A linguistic and computational morphosyntactic analysis for the applicative *-i* in Indonesian. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG09 Conference*, 85–105. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Arka, I Wayan & Christopher Manning. 2008. Voice and grammatical relations in Indonesian: A new perspective. In Peter Austin & Simon Musgrave (eds.), *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*, 45–69. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Badan Pusat Statistik. 2013. *Penduduk Indonesia Hasil Sensus Penduduk 2010 (Result of the Indonesian Population Census 2010)*. Badan Pusat Statistik. <https://web.archive.org/web/20150402221528/http://www.bps.go.id/index.php/publikasi/14>.
- Blust, Robert A. 2004. Austronesian nasal substitution: A survey. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43(1). 73–148. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2004.0004>.
- Christie, Agatha. 1986. *Satu, Dua, Pasang Gesper Sepatunya*. (Trans.) Alex Tri Kantjono. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia.
- Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In Charles N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 57–98. New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, Peter & Min-Jeong Son. 2004. The argument structure of verbs with the suffix *-kan* in Indonesian. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43(2). 339–364. <https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2005.0003>.
- Echols, John M. & Hassan Shadily. 1994. *Kamus Indonesia Inggris: An Indonesian-English dictionary (revised and edited by John U. Wolff and James T. Collins with the assistance of Hassan Shadily)*. 3rd edn. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia.
- Fredy S. 1991. *Perasaan yang ditinggalkan*. Jakarta: Gultom Agency.

- Goldhahn, Dirk, Thomas Eckart & Uwe Quasthoff. 2012. Building large monolingual dictionaries at the Leipzig corpora collection: From 100 to 200 languages. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Thierry Declerck, Mehmet Uğur Doğan, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Asunción Moreno, Jan Odijk & Stelios Piperidis (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'12)*, 759–765. Istanbul: European Language Resources Association. <https://aclanthology.org/L12-1154/>
- Hemmings, Charlotte. 2013. Causatives and applicatives: The case for polysemy in Javanese. In *Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 16, 167–194. London: SOAS.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2). 251–299.
- Johns, Yohanni. 1978. *Bahasa Indonesia: Langkah Baru, a new approach*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1995. The two prototypes of ditransitive verbs: The Indonesian evidence. In Werner Abraham, Talmy Givón & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Discourse, grammar and typology: papers in honor of John W. M. Verhaar*, 77–99. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kroeger, Paul. 2007. Morphosyntactic vs. morphosemantic functions of Indonesian *-kan*. In Annie E. Zaenen, Jane Simpson, Tracy Holloway King, Jane Grimshaw, Joan Maling & Chris Manning (eds.), *Architectures, rules, and preferences: variations on themes by Joan W. Bresnan*, 229–251. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Litamahuputty, Bathseba Helena Johanna. 2012. *Ternate Malay: Grammar and texts*. Leiden: University of Leiden dissertation. <https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/19945> (28 August, 2023).
- Michaelis, Laura & Josef Ruppenhofer. 2000. Valence creation and the German applicative: The inherent semantics of linking patterns. *Journal of Semantics* 17(4). 335–395. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/17.4.335>.
- Minde, Don van. 1997. *Malayu Ambong: Phonology, morphology, syntax*. Leiden: CNWS.
- Moeliono, Anton M., Lapoliwa, Hans, Hasan Alwi, Sry Sattya Tjatur, Wisnu Sasangka & Sugiyono. 2017. *Tata bahasa baku bahasa Indonesia (Standard Grammar of Indonesian)*. Edisi keempat. Jakarta, Indonesia: Badan Pengembangan dan Pembinaan Bahasa, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Musgrave, Simon. 2003. *Non-subject arguments in Indonesian*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne dissertation.
- Rajeg, Gede Primahadi Wijaya, Karlina Denistia & Simon Musgrave. 2019. Vector Space Models and the usage patterns of Indonesian denominal verbs: A case study of verbs with *meN-*, *meN-/kan*, and *meN-/i* affixes. *NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Languages in and around Indonesia* 67. 35–75.
- Rajeg, Gede Primahadi Wijaya, I Made Rajeg & I Wayan Arka. 2020. Corpus-based approach meets LFG: The puzzling case of voice alternations of *kena*-verbs in Indonesian. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG'20 conference, on-line*, 307–327. Stanford: CSLI Publications. <https://doi.org/10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.12423788> (2 April, 2022).
- Rajeg, I Made, Gede Primahadi Wijaya Rajeg & I Wayan Arka. 2022. Corpus linguistic and experimental studies on the meaning-preserving hypothesis in Indonesian voice alternations. *Linguistics Vanguard* 8(1). 367–382. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingvan-2020-0104>.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian* (Pacific Linguistics 581). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sneddon, James N., Alexander Adelaar, Dwi Noverini Djenar & Michael C. Ewing. 2010. *Indonesian reference grammar*. 2nd edn. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.
- Vamarasi, Marit Kana. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia* (Pacific Linguistics, Series D, Vol. 93). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Verhaar, John W. M. 1984. Affixation in contemporary Indonesian. In Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (ed.), *Towards a description of Contemporary Indonesian: Preliminary studies, Part 1 / NUSA Linguistics Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia*, Vol. 18, 1–26. Jakarta: Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Voskuil, Jan Eckhard. 1996. *Comparative morphology: Verb taxonomy in Indonesian, Tagalog and Dutch*. Leiden: University of Leiden dissertation.
- Wouk, Fay. 1998. Solidarity in Indonesian conversation: The discourse marker *kan*. *Multilingua / Journal of Cross-Cultural and Interlanguage Communication* 17(4). 379–406.