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Preface

This volume consists of papers presented at the seventh meeting of AFLA (Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association), held at the Vrije Universiteit on May 11-13, 2000.

For the first time in the history of AFLA, this meeting was held outside the North-American continent, and contained contributions by speakers from eleven different countries: New Zealand, Australia, Indonesia, Brunei Darussalam, Taiwan, the USA including Hawaii, Canada, the UK, France, Germany, and The Netherlands.

Apart from the languages that are traditionally well-represented at Austronesian conferences, we were happy to see that the program also contained work on relatively small or lesser described languages, such as the minority languages of Taiwan, North-West Borneo, Eastern Indonesia, Papua and Oceania.

Special themes of this conference were Iconicity and Argument marking. The papers in this volume show that the program covered a broad range of subdisciplines -- from discourse grammar, phonology, morphology, syntax, to semantics -- and that the authors are working within various theoretical frameworks. But despite the obvious differences in expertise, interest and background, the atmosphere on the conference was typically AFLA: lively and constructive, with an average rate of attendance of about 80%. The papers in this volume deserve the same rate of attention.

This meeting has again furthered the unwritten mandate of AFLA to encourage the formal study of Austronesian languages, especially work by speaker linguists and junior scholars. Six scholars presented analyses of their native language, and more than half of the 45 participants subscribed as ‘student’. This suggests that the future of Austronesian linguistics looks very bright indeed.

The eighth edition of AFLA will be held in the spring of 2001 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Boston, USA. The principal organizer will be Ileana Paul.

Marian Klamer, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
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A Selection of the papers of AFLA 2, in 1995 is published as:
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Emotion Predicates and Grammatical Functions in Indonesian
Simon Musgrave.
Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics
The University of Melbourne

1. Introduction

This paper deals with a group of predicates in Indonesian and their status in regard to the syntactic transitivity system of that language. These predicates are part of a larger group which are characterised by their syntactic behaviour and by their semantics. Syntactically, these predicates appear to be intransitive in that they do not take the transitive verb prefixes men- and dit-, but they can have a second argument which is coded as a prepositional phrase. Semantically, with one exception, these predicates denote emotional and cognitive states. Typical examples are the predicates puas ‘content, satisfied’ and sahu ‘respect, admire’:

1. Dan mereka juga sudah puas dengan kasus wanita and 3pl also PERF content with case woman yang hilang itu? REL lost that 'And were they also satisfied with the case of the woman who disappeared?' (SDPGS: 128)

2. ia bawayu dan sahu akan kesadaran Sandy 3sg proud and respect about NOM.aware.NOM Sandy 'she was proud and respected Sandy’s attention' (PYD:19)

Some of these predicates can also appear in a construction where the second argument, which I will refer to often as the stimulus (of the emotion or cognition), is coded as a simple NP. That is, the clause has what look like two direct arguments as seen in the following examples:

3. Kamu lupa rumahku? 2sg forget house.1sg 'You have forgotten my house?' (SDM: 96)

---

1 Examples in this paper which are not taken from texts reflect the judgments of M. Umar Muslim and Katerina Sukanto, for whose patience I am very grateful. I am also grateful to Helen McKay for providing me with numerous examples drawn from the corpus of Indonesian journalism which she has collected. Several discussions with Peter Austin and one with Bill Foley were important in shaping this material, as was the feedback of an audience at The University of Melbourne particularly that of Nick Evans and Rachel Nordlinger. Remaining errors are my own responsibility.

2 The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1,2,3 - 1st, 2nd, 3rd person, sg - singular, pl - plural, APPL - applicative, EX - exclusive, FUT - future, INTU - intensifier, LOC - locative preposition, NEG - negation, NOM - nominalizer, PERF - perfect aspect, PROG - progressive aspect, RED - reduplication, REL - relative clause marker. The verbal prefixes men- and dit- are left unglossed throughout. The abbreviations used for sources of examples are explained at the conclusion of the paper.
4. *Ia kuatir suratnya tidak sampai*
   *SEG fear letter*3 *NEG arrive*
   'She was afraid her letter would not arrive.' (ES: 313)

5. *Aku takut wanita yang aku cintai ternyata*
   *1SG fear woman REL 1SG love APPL apparently*
   *tidak mencintainiku*
   *NEG meN love APPL 1SG*
   'I am afraid of the woman that I love, apparently she doesn't love me.' (PYD: 12)

6. *Cuma aku tidak suka omongannya yang sok suci,*
   *only 1SG NEG like gossip 3 REL as if pure*
   'I just don't like his gossip that takes the moral high ground.' (PYD: 87)

7. *Saya nggak senang wartawannya*
   *1SG NEG like journalist 3*
   'I don't like journalists.' (McKay)

However, as will be shown in detail below, such clauses are not syntactically transitive. The question this paper seeks to answer then is what grammatical function is assigned to the stimulus argument in a clauses such as examples 3 to 7?

I attempt to answer this question using the theoretical resources of Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG). This framework assumes a constrained list of grammatical functions (GFs): subject (SUBJ), object (OBJ), oblique (OBL) and second object (OBJ2). The last two GFs are subscripted with a theta because in the case of OBJs their thematic role is assumed to be restricted within any particular language (Bresnan and Kancrva 1989), and in the case of OBLs their thematic role is indexed by the adposition or case marker which licenses them. These GFs are not configurationally defined. They are elements of f(functional)-structure, a structure which is distinct from but parallel to c(onsituent)-structure (Bresnan, to appear: 55-63). Syntactic properties other than configurational ones are therefore of primary interest in this investigation.

The group of predicates of interest here includes the following words:

---

*The possessive clitic -nya is used here to indicate that the referent is identifiable.*
8. berang  
    angry, irate  
    mimp  
    dream  
    bosan  
    bored  
    mirip  
    resemble  
    gila  
    crazy, obsessed  
    peduli  
    care about, pay attention  
    kangen  
    miss, long for  
    percaya  
    believe  
    kasih  
    love  
    sayang  
    love, pity  
    kasihan  
    love, pity  
    senang  
    happy, like  
    kuatir  
    fear  
    suka  
    like  
    lupa  
    forget  
    takut  
    fear  
    marah  
    angry  
    yakin  
    sure

This list is not exhaustive; rather it includes just those words for which I have clear examples from texts. Also, several words are left out of this list which might have a claim to be included. These words (benci 'hate', ingat 'remember' and percaya 'believe') all occur in the construction of examples 1 and 2. But they also all have related transitive verbs which are not derived with an applicative suffix (menmbenci, meminggat and mempercaya). Therefore it is not possible to say whether clauses with these predicates and a NP stimulus are examples of the construction seen in examples 3 to 7, or whether they are rather examples of the unpreteded transitive verb construction exemplified in example 15 below. Given this unclarity, it is preferable to omit these predicates from my discussion.

The translations given above suggest that many of these words have an adjectival character. Whether Indonesian has adjectives as a lexical category or not is a disputed question (see Cumming 1991 and Mahdi 1998 for differing views), and the evidence is particularly unclear for the words under consideration. For example, ter- prefixation derives adjectival superlatives for most of the words with which it is possible (e.g. tergila 'most crazy', termarah 'most angry'), but some verbal derivatives occur also (e.g. terlupa 'forget accidentally'). Indonesian allows all major phrasal categories to function as the predicate of a clause, that is verbs (see examples such as 12), nouns, prepositions and putative adjectives can all head the predicate constituent:

9. Ini keputusan saya  
    this NOM.decide.NOM 1sg  
    'This is my decision.'

10. Mereka di Jakarta sekarang  
    3pl LOC Jakarta now  
    'They are in Jakarta now.'

11. Mencari pekerjaan di kota tidak begitu mudah  
    meN.find NOM.work.NOM LOC city NEG like that easy  
    'Finding work in the city isn't very easy.'

It is uncontroversial that all of these predicate types assign a SUBJ grammatical function, and a maximally general account of Indonesian syntax must be based on the assumption
that if they assign other clause-level grammatical functions, these should also be part of the inventory provided by our theory. Therefore, the question at issue here remains the same under either categorial analysis. I will leave the question of category open here, and will continue to use the neutral term *predicate* in this paper.

The data presented in this paper does not represent standard Indonesian. Many of the examples are drawn from contemporary, popular novels, one set in Jakarta (SDM) and one set in Surabaya (PYD). The majority of the characters in both novels are educated people, and in conjunction with the judgments of the native speakers with whom I have worked, this data may be said to represent the careful speech of educated Indonesians.

Section 2 of the paper examines the evidence that constructions such as those in examples 2 to 7 are distinct from normal transitive clause in Indonesian, and shows that the stimulus is neither a SUBJ nor an OBJ. Sections 3 and 4 examine evidence which might show that the stimulus is an OBL<sub>1</sub> or an OBJ<sub>1</sub> respectively, concluding that the second possibility is to be preferred. Section 5 discusses some theoretical consequences of this analysis and compares these to the consequences of instead claiming that bare NP stimuli in Indonesian are examples of some grammatical function not yet recognised by LFG.

2. Transitive Clauses – SUBJ and OBJ

The overwhelming majority of transitive verbs in Indonesian can appear in four types of clause:

12. \( \text{Dia membaca buku itu} \)
    \( \text{3sg mEN.read book that} \)
    S/he read the book.

13. \( \text{Buku itu dibaca (oleh) Ali} \)
    \( \text{book that di.read (by) Ali} \)
    The book was read by Ali.

14. \( \text{Buku itu saya baca} \)
    \( \text{book that 1sg read} \)
    The book, I read.

15. \( \text{Dia baca buku itu} \)
    \( \text{3sg read book that} \)
    S/he read the book.

Various restrictions apply to the constructions exemplified in 12 to 15 which need not concern us here. Clauses with emotion predicates look the same as the type exemplified in 15, but the other clause types are not possible:

---

<sup>4</sup> There is also the possibility that clauses such as examples 9, 10 and 11 should be analysed as containing a zero copula, a possibility which I ignore here.

<sup>5</sup> The two native speakers whose judgments are reported here are both Javanese. The issue of whether the phenomena discussed here are affected by the speaker’s first language (if that is not Indonesian) remains for future research.
I am fed up with monotonous life in Surabaya.' (PYD: 180)

The type of clause illustrated in example 13 is not possible with a first person actor, but substitution of a third person actor does not make this construction possible with this predicate:

This monotonous life in Surabaya, I am fed up with it.'

The type exemplified in 14 is not possible either, although the direct manipulation of example 16 yields a sentence which does have a reading:

'This monotonous life in Surabaya, I am fed up with it.'

This clause requires an intonation distinct from that associated with clauses of the type seen in example 14 with a pause after the initial NP which is a topicalised constituent, and the addition of an auxiliary verb to the sentence makes the distinction absolutely clear. In a construction of the type in example 14, the actor pronoun remains adjacent to the main verb even when an auxiliary or modal is included, but in emotion predicate clauses, the actor pronoun appears to the left of an auxiliary:

20. Buku itu akan saya baca.
book that PROG 1sg read
'I will read that book.'

'This monotonous life in Surabaya, I will be fed up with it.'


This evidence shows that these predicates are not syntactically transitive.

This status alone may be enough to show that the stimulus argument of an emotion predicate is not an OBJ. If OBJ is defined as the non-SUBJ argument of a transitive verb, then stimuli are not objects because the predicate that they are associated with is not syntactically transitive. A more stringent test requires OBJs be able to become the SUBJ of a related clause, typically a passive. Leaving aside the issue of whether the related clause types in Indonesian should be described as passive, it is clear that stimuli also fail this test as seen in example 18. Many of the emotion predicates derive true transitive verbs with an applicative suffix, and a comparison of their properties with the basic predicates is instructive. The applicativised verbs appear with both men- and di- prefixes, with the alternatives used to make an argument available for relativisation as in the following examples:

---

6 I assume that, as SUBJ and OBJ are syntactic concepts, syntactic transitivity is the relevant notion for this argument.
23. *Kamu punya ibu yang menayangimu.*
   2sg have mother REL meN.love.APPL.2sg
   'You have a mother who loves you.' (SDM: 84)

24. *Untuk menemui anak yang begitu disayanginya.*
   for meN.meet.APPL child REL so di.love.APPL.3
   'In order to meet a child who is so loved.' (SDM: 208)

The contrast in syntactic behaviour between the derived transitive verb which does have an OBJ and the emotion predicate is clear.

The possibility that the stimulus is the SUBJ of its clause can also be eliminated for various reasons. Firstly, it would be surprising that an argument alternated between being an OBL and a SUBJ with no verbal morphology. Secondly, it can be seen from example 23 that the experiencer is the SUBJ of the corresponding applicative verb with meN- prefix, the clause type which corresponds to an active clause. Applicativization does not affect SUBJs, therefore the experiencer should be the SUBJ of the basic predicate. A clause can only have one SUBJ, therefore the stimulus cannot be one. Finally, Indonesian has a third person pronoun, *ia*, which is restricted (more or less) to appear in SUBJ position. This pronoun can occur as experiencer of an emotion predicate clause:

25. *Ia kuatir suratnya tidak sampai.*
   3sg fear letter.3 NEG arrive
   'She was afraid her letter would not arrive.' (ES: 313)

Once again, the fact that a clause can only have one SUBJ forces the conclusion that the stimulus cannot be SUBJ.

This section has demonstrated that emotion predicates are not transitive verbs in Indonesian. Therefore, a bare NP stimulus argument following such a predicate cannot be an OBL. And the (remote) possibility that such arguments are SUBJs has also been eliminated.

3. **OBL₇**

Having established that a NP stimulus of an emotion predicate cannot be assigned the GFs SUBJ or OBJ, I now turn to examine the arguments as to whether such elements might be classified as OBL₇. The following pair of examples, which are adjacent in the text in which they occur, suggests that there is no clear semantic difference between the two constructions for speakers:

   father love to.2 Risa
   'Father loves you, Risa'.

   Risa also love father
   'Risa loves Father too.' (SDM: 293)
Therefore, it might be possible to argue that the stimulus in example 27 and similar clauses is still an OBL\textsubscript{e}, but one with non-standard coding. There are two pieces of evidence which suggest that this would be a wrong conclusion.

Firstly, there is once more a definitional issue. Indonesian is not a case-marking language, and therefore the obvious distinction between core and non-core arguments is the presence of prepositions. This is not a definitive criterion however. The literature includes examples both of NPs with the coding properties of obliques being treated as direct arguments, and of NPs with the coding properties of direct arguments being treated as obliques. Examples of the first type are animate, referential objects in Spanish, which are preceded by the preposition \textit{a} (Hopper \& Thompson 1980) and various subjects in Icelandic with 'quirky' case-marking (Zaenen, Malin & Thrainsson 1985). An example of the second type is the use of accusative case in Icelandic to mark some temporal adjuncts (Smith 1996). Such examples show that coding properties alone are not sufficient to establish the syntactic status of an argument. Behavioural tests are necessary also, and I now turn to two such tests which show that the stimulus of example 27 and similar clauses does not have the properties of an oblique argument.

The first way in which NP stimuli behave like direct arguments is that a quantifier can be floated from them. This is not possible with a PP stimulus, or a PP which is an adjunct:

28. \begin{flushleft} Anak-anak itu suka gula-gula itu semuanya. \end{flushleft}
child.RED that like sugar.RED that all
'All the children like the sweets.' OR
'The children like all the sweets.'

29. \begin{flushleft} Anak-anak itu suka dengan gula-gula itu semuanya \end{flushleft}
child.RED that like with sugar.RED that all
'All the children like the sweets.' NOT
'The children like all the sweets.'

30. \begin{flushleft} Orang-orang Sasak datang dengan anak-anaknya semuanya \end{flushleft}
man.RED Sasak come with child.RED.3 all
'All the Sasak people came with their children.' NOT
"The Sasak people came with all their children.'

In each case, the quantifier can be read as having floated from the SUBJ, and evidence to be presented below will show that other direct arguments also have this property. But only with the NP complement of an emotion verb can the quantifier be read as having floated from the other NP in the clause; when that NP is within a PP the quantifier cannot be construed with it\textsuperscript{7}.

The second piece of evidence comes from extraction facts. Indonesian subjects can always be extracted leaving a gap and this generalisation is agreed on by all sources. The facts regarding other arguments of transitive verbs are in dispute and will be discussed below. For emotion predicates, I am only aware of one discussion of extraction in the literature,

\textsuperscript{7} One of my consultants allows both readings of example 29, but the second reading seems to be marginal and is strongly rejected by the other consultant.
Stephens (1970), and this source claims that extraction of NP stimuli is grammatical. This judgment is shared by the native speakers I have consulted. Gapped extraction from PPs is completely impossible however, neither preposition-stranding nor pied-piping is available in Indonesian. The status of the PP involved, selected or not, is not relevant:

31. **gula-gula yang anak-anak suka itu**
    * sugar.RED REL child.RED like that
    'the sweets that the children like'

32. **gula-gula yang anak-anak suka dengan itu**
    sugar.RED REL child.RED like with that

33. **gula-gula dengan yang anak-anak suka itu**
    sugar.RED REL child.RED like that

34. **anak-anak yang orang Sasak datang dengan itu**
    FOR 'the children that the Sasak people came with'

Clearly, the behavioural properties of NP stimuli are different from those associated with the grammatical function OBL in Indonesian. It is not possible to maintain an analysis which treats these constituents as obliques with unusual coding properties. Therefore, it seems that the only possible analysis within LFG's inventory of grammatical functions is to treat the stimuli as OBJs and I turn to an examination of the evidence for this position in the following section.

Although not part of the main argument being developed here, it is of interest to note that even when stimuli are coded as PPs, in the construction of examples 1 and 2, they have some properties which are not typical of obliques in general. In this construction, for any one predicate various prepositions are possible introducing the second argument:

35. **tak percaya akan diri sendiri**
    NEG believe about self self.INT
    'lack self-confidence' (E&S: 422)

36. **Kau kira sekarang orang akan percaya dengan**
    2sg guess now man FUT believe with
    bualmu itu?
    boasting.2 that
    'Do you think anyone will believe your boasting now?' (PYD: 200)

37. **Kami tidak percaya kepada mereka.**
    1pl.EX NEG believe to 3pl
    'We don't believe (in) them.' (McKay)

---

8 Kana (1986) discusses emotion predicates in some detail (see also below), but does not consider extraction.
9 Extraction with a resumptive pronoun is possible: see Sneddon (1996): 289-291.
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38. **Salahnya, dulu saya tidak percaya padamu**
   mistakenly formerly 1sg NFG believe to
   'Mistakenly, I did not believe you previously.' (SDM: 168)

This behaviour is seen across the whole group of predicates involved, including those which never occur with a NP stimulus, and there does not appear to be any meaning difference depending on the preposition choice. Two factors do influence the choice of preposition. If the following NP is human, then *kepada or pada* is preferred\(^\text{15}\). Register is the other factor which has consistent effects on preposition choice with, for example, *akan* only occurring in formal registers and *sama* (not exemplified here) only occurring in informal registers. These data suggest that in this construction the stimulus is being assigned a semantic role directly by the predicate, with the preposition making no semantic contribution. This behaviour is not typical of true OBL\(_g\)s, which display semantic interdependence with the preposition or case-marker which licenses them.

4. OBL\(_g\)

As mentioned above, OBL\(_g\) is the grammatical function of the second object of ditransitive verbs for LFG. Indonesian has a small number of underived verbs which are ditransitive, and a large number derived with the applicative suffixes *-i* and *-kan*. I will discuss here three properties of the second objects of such verbs: access to SUBJ in a related clause, quantifier tacit and extraction and compare them with the properties of NP stimuli.

The second object of a ditransitive clause with a *meN*-prefixed verb cannot become subject of a clause with a *di-* prefixed verb:

39. *Surat itu dikirim itu*
   letter that *disend*APPL woman that
   *(The letter was sent the woman.) (Chung 1976: ex.63a)*

In the case of derived ditransitive verbs such as that in example 39, the same thematic argument would be OBJ in a related clause with an underived, *meN*-prefixed verb and has access to SUBJ position in the related clause with a *di*-prefixed verb:

40. *Surat itu dikirimi kepada wanita itu*
   letter that *disend* to woman that
   'The letter was sent to the woman.'

The motivation for applicative is to make the third argument available to syntactic processes which require core status; there is no motivation to maintain the status of other arguments. In respect of access to SUBJ, the behaviour of the OBL\(_g\)s and the NP stimuli is similar. NP stimuli cannot become SUBJ of a related clause either unless the verb is morphologically altered. They can become SUBJ of a related clause headed by a *di*-prefixed derived verb (example 24) and the behaviour of the two argument types diverges here. Second objects cannot be SUBJ or OBJ with derived verbs while stimuli can. However, the relevant verbal derivation, applicative, promotes an oblique argument to core status, therefore the source of the applicativised emotion verbs must be the construction

\(^{15}\) One consultant reports that this is taught as a prescriptive rule in the Indonesian education system.
with a PP stimulus and the comparison between the two types is not in fact direct on this point\(^\text{11}\).

In the previous section, examples were given which showed that a quantifier could float from a SUBJ. This is also possible from OBJs and from OBJ\(_{\text{es}}\):

41. \textit{Saya mukul anak-anak itu kemarin semuanya}  
1sg hit child.RED that yesterday all  
'Thit all the children yesterday.'

42. \textit{Saya memberinya hadiah itu semuanya}  
1sg meN.give gift that all  
'I gave her all the presents.'

The descriptive generalisation is that quantifiers can float from any direct argument in Indonesian. And as previously shown, a quantifier can also float from an NP stimulus (example 28, repeated here):

43. \textit{Anak-anak itu suka gula-gula itu semuanya.}  
child.RED that like sugar.RED that all  
'All the children like the sweets.' OR  
'The children like all the sweets.'

In this case, the stimuli behave like direct arguments; they are not SUBJ or OBJ, so OBJ\(_{\text{es}}\) is the remaining possibility.

Many descriptions of Indonesian state that extraction (relative clause formation and question formation) is only possible with SUBJs. The facts are a good deal more complicated than this as soon as anything other than the prescriptive standard is investigated; a more complete account is given by Voskuil (1996: Ch 8). For the purposes of this discussion, I will assume that all direct arguments can be extracted in the absence of verb affixation\(^\text{12}\). Thus an OBJ can be extracted from a clause of the type seen in example 15 (auxiliary added to disambiguate the construction)\(^\text{13}\):

44. \textit{buku yang dia akan baca itu}  
book REL 3sg FUT read that  
'the book that she will read'

As for OBJ\(_{\text{es}}\), judgments vary. As might be expected, such arguments cannot be extracted when the verb carries a prefix, and no native speaker I have consulted will allow extraction when the verb is derived with an applicative suffix. In the case of undervived, unprefixed

\(^{11}\) I ignore here the issue of applicative derivations in Indonesian which take a transitive verb and derive another transitive verb with a different meaning e.g. memegok 'catch someone by surprise', memengoki 'catch someone roundhanded'.

\(^{12}\) The construction seen in example 14 is a special case: despite the lack of a verb affixes, only the SUBJ can be extracted. Musgrave (in preparation) offers a tentative account of why this should be so.

\(^{13}\) Michael Ewing (p.c.) informs me that he has observed numerous examples of such constructions in recorded conversation of educated Indonesians.
ditransitive verbs, judgments vary. At least some speakers will permit extraction of the second object from clauses of this type:\textsuperscript{14}:

45. \begin{tabular}{l}
Saya & akan & beri & dia & buku & itu \\
1sg & FUT & give & 3sg & book & that \\
'\text{I will give him the book.}'
\end{tabular}

46. \begin{tabular}{l}
buku & yang & saya & akan & beri & dia & itu \\
book & REL & 1sg & FUT & give & 3sg & that \\
'the book that I will give him'
\end{tabular}

As demonstrated above (example 31), this type of extraction is also possible with a NP stimulus.

47. \begin{tabular}{l}
orang & yang & saya & suka. & itu \\
person & REL & 1sg & like & that \\
'the person that I like'
\end{tabular}

On this test, the NP stimulus possesses the syntactic properties of a direct argument more clearly than OBJs. I have demonstrated that NP stimuli cannot be plausibly assigned any of the other three GFs recognised by LFG, and that their syntactic properties are very similar to those of OBJs. Within the theory as currently formulated, this would seem to be the only possible analysis. The only alternative is to add a GF to the inventory, and the final section of this paper examines which of these two possibilities is preferable from a theoretical point of view.

5. Theoretical Implications

The data presented in the previous sections show clearly that the NP stimuli associated with emotion predicates in Indonesian are direct arguments of the predicate, but they are not OBJs as usually understood. Previous studies have ignored this issue, or presented unsatisfactory accounts. Stephens (1970) aims only to draw attention to the existence of what he terms a class of 'pseudo-transitive' verbs in Indonesian, and offers no account of the syntax of the clauses in which they occur. Kana (1986: 283-289), working in the Relational Grammar framework, analyses such arguments as initial 3s or Locatives, without appearing to consider these as genuinely different possibilities. The possibility that such arguments are Locatives, presumably a variety of oblique, seems to be contradicted by the evidence presented in section 3 of this paper. This analysis must also explain the fact that out of the range of prepositions which are used to introduce the stimuli of emotion verbs, locative prepositions are noticeably absent. In my database, the basic locative preposition \textit{di} never occurs with these predicates. I have two examples using the locative noun \textit{atas} 'top surface' alone; it is normally used in association with \textit{di}. Otherwise, the common prepositions used code movement towards (\textit{pada, kepadan}) or accompaniment (\textit{dengan, sama}). Kana's alternative, that the NP stimuli are initial 3s, is essentially the position argued for in this paper.

\textsuperscript{14} This is not true for the verb \textit{ajar} 'teach' for my primary consultant. I have no explanation of this fact.
In classic LFG, as presented in Kaplan and Bresnan (1982), OBJs are called OBJ-2s and it is explicitly stated that this grammatical function can only be assigned if the function OBJ has already been assigned. Clearly, the analysis argued for above is not possible within this scheme. However, in LFG as currently practised (Bresnan, to appear), it is not clear that the constraint still holds. Grammatical functions are now decomposed into feature bundles and all have equal status from this point of view. The differences in occurrence of the various GFs can be ascribed to the operations of Lexical Mapping Theory (LMT) on the lexical entries of the verbs of a language, rather than being stated as direct constraints on GFs.

Further consideration of LMT suggests both a way of thinking about the properties of Indonesian emotion predicates which makes them seem less strange, and a good reason for preferring the analysis of NP stimuli as OBJs to the alternative. On the first point, LMT is based on the decomposition of GFs into the features [+/-o(bject)] and [+/-r(estric ted)]. The predicates in question can have a second argument which is either an OBL or an OBJ. These form a natural class in LMT, both having the feature [+r]. So the proposed analysis reduces to claiming that this class of predicates lexically specifies that their second argument is [+r]; then some predicates have a second lexical entry with the additional information that they license a second direct argument. The operations of LMT will do the rest of the work, assigning the GF OBL in the first case and OBJ in the second case. LMT treats all four GFs as equal in essence, and from this point of view the relative unimportance of the GF OBJ in the grammars of languages is surprising. The present analysis might be viewed then as adding empirical support to the view of GFs implicit in the LMT.

On the second point, it might be suggested that the evidence presented here justifies proposing a more fine-grained analysis of non-subject arguments in Indonesian than is allowed by LFG. The syntactic properties of NP stimuli and OBJs are not identical, and the considerable overlap might be due only to the fact that both are types of direct argument. There might be more than three types of non-subject argument in the language. However, the LMT offers a strong theory-internal argument against adopting such an analysis. Two binary-valued features allow exactly the four GFs assumed by the theory, and introducing a new GF would disrupt this aspect of the theory. To do so must mean that the two features used thus far do not exhaust the relevant information, and another feature would be required. This in turn would mean that rather than adding one GF, at least two would have to be added, on the assumption that the new feature would be dependent on one of those already assumed. If the new feature was independent of the existing ones, then four new GFs would be added to the system. To my knowledge, there is no empirical support for reducing the constraints on the theory in this way. In the absence of such evidence, I conclude that it is preferable to retain the current inventory of GFs, and to analyse the NP stimulus associated with an emotion predicate in Indonesian as an OBJ.

A slight change of viewpoint suggests an alternative viewpoint which may be worth exploring. The picture of GFs which most of us are familiar with is very definitely based on the transitive clause - there are SUBJs, OBJs and OBLs and anything else is rather awkward to deal with. The data presented here certainly do not exhaust the complications of GFs in Indonesian (some additional problems are discussed in Arka and Manning (to appear)), and the best picture of Indonesian syntax may in fact be one which sees the major
oppositions as being between SUBJ, other direct arguments and OBLs with OBJ of a transitive clause being the awkward element to deal with. While the arguments presented here are valid for this limited data, a different treatment may be appropriate for more complete data and Musgrave (to appear) aims to provide such a treatment.

Sources of Examples

McKay - Corpus of Indonesian journalism collected by Helen McKay
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