On the Distribution and Function of the Nasal Prefix *N-* in Basilectal Jakarta Indonesian

Lanny HIDAJAT

Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya

The present study examines why the nasal prefix *N-* in Basilectal Jakarta Indonesian (bJI) is produced less frequently than the null affix (Ø-), although both prefixes function as active voice markers. This study firstly investigates the possibility that *N-* in bJI is also a progressive aspectual marker. *N*-verbs have the characteristics of non-stative verbs—which could qualify *N-* to become a progressive aspectual marker. However, the following two facts contradict the supposition: firstly, *N-* verbs can be modified by a perfective aspectual marker *dah/udah*. Secondly, in some contexts, the presence of the prefix *N-* can derive the past tense interpretation. In the present study, I argue that Ø- and *N-* have different discourse functions. This argument is based on the fact that *N*-verbs are generally used in narratives; in contrast, Ø-verbs are inappropriate to be used in narratives. Furthermore, *N*-verbs generally cannot be used in direct (positive) imperatives; on the other hand, Ø-verbs freely in direct and indirect imperatives. In addition, in a question in which the active verb co-occurs with a modal, when the active verb is affixed by the nasal prefix, it is the modal which is being questioned. In contrast, when the verb is affixed by the null affix, the question focuses on the action. In line with the above argument, it is assumed that adult speakers produce active verbs with the null affix more frequently than those with the nasal prefix when talking to young children because of the nature of child directed speech.

1. Introduction[1]

The present study investigates why basilectal Jakarta Indonesia (bJI) speakers do not produce the nasal prefix (*N-*) as frequently as the null affix (Ø-) although both prefixes actually function as active voice morphology (Tjung, 2006; Cole, Hermon, and Tjung, 2006; Hidajat, 2010).[2] As reflected in the following two sentences, the verbs in bJI active transitive sentences can be marked by either *N-* or Ø-:

(1) **The verb *cuci* 'wash' is marked by *N-* in an active transitive sentence:**
*Oh,   Tante Yanti   **nyuci**   mangkoknya?*
EXCL   aunt   yanti   *N*-wash   bowl-DET
'Oh, I am washing the bowls?'   (EXPYAN; 23:7)

(2) **The verb *cuci* 'wash' is marked by Ø- in an active transitive sentence:**
*Michael   **cuci**   piring.*
Michael   Ø-wash   plate
'You (Michael) wash the plates.'(RINMIC; 18:0)

Although both *N-* and Ø- are active voice morphology, they have a different effect on the verb argument structure. As reflected in the following sentences, an object DP can be extracted out of VP when the verbs are affixed by Ø; however, it is blocked when the verbs are affixed by *N-* (Tjung, 2006; Cole et al., 2006; Hidajat, 2010).

---

[1] Parts of this paper originally appeared in the working paper presented at the workshop on TAM markers and evidentiality in Indonesian Languages, Tokyo, February 17-18, 2011. This paper adds analysis of the discourse functions of Ø-verbs and N-verbs in basilectal Jakarta Indonesian.

[2] See Gil (2003) for the claim that *N-* merely marks the presence of the Actor in the semantic argument structure of a verb.

(3) **Object DP is questioned:**
   a. Ø-Verb
       Apa$_i$ [$_{CP}$ yang [$_{TP}$ anak   itu   **baca** t$_i$]]?
       what   COMP   child   that   Ø-read
       'What is the child reading?'

   b. *N-verb*
       *Apa$_i$ [$_{CP}$ yang   [$_{TP}$ anak   itu   **ngebaca** t$_i$]]?*
       what   COMP   child   that N-read
       'What is the child reading?'

(4) **Object DP is relativized:**
   a. Ø-Verb
       Buku$_i$ [$_{CP}$ yang [$_{TP}$ anak   itu   **baca**   t$_i$]]   mahal
       book   COMP   child   that   Ø-read   expensive
       'The book that the child is reading is expensive.'

   b. *N-verb*
       *Buku$_i$ [$_{CP}$ yang [$_{TP}$ anak   itu   **ngebaca**   t$_i$]]   mahal*
       book   COMP   child   that   N-read   expensive
       'The book that the child is reading is expensive.'

                                (Sentences in (3) and (4) are from Tjung, 2006:22-24)

Based on Cole, Hermon, and Yanti's (2008) Voice Agreement Hypothesis (VAH), Hidajat (2010) argues that the object extraction asymmetry between *N-* and *Ø-* occurs because the morphological constraint of *N-* is different from *Ø-*. Unlike *Ø-*, *N-* bear the *phi* features of N constituent, i.e. [N nom]. Subsequently, when the active verbs are marked by *N-*, the object DP cannot be extracted out of VP because its feature, i.e. [N acc], conflicts with [N nom].[3]

Results of several analyses of naturalistic corpora of bJI child directed speech (CDS) reveal that bJI speakers tend to produce active sentences with *Ø-* more frequently than with *N-*. In their CDS corpus, Tjung (2006) and Cole et al. (2006) found 417 simple actives marked by *Ø-*. On the other hand, there were only 99 simple actives marked by *N-*. Correspondingly, in her CDS corpus, Hidajat (2010) found 3,160 active verbs marked by *Ø-* and there were only 377 active verbs marked by *N-*.[4] These findings raise a question: why do bJI speakers prefer to produce active sentences with *Ø-* than with *N-*?

One possible explanation for why bJI active verbs marked by *Ø-* are more frequently produced than those marked by *N-* is that *N-* is unlikely to be affixed to a polysyllabic stem which begins with voiced consonants (Sneddon, 1996).[5] Consequently, there are fewer active verbs that can appear with *N-* than those that can appear with *Ø-*. However, it turns out that adult bJI speakers actually often produce polysyllabic active verbs which

---

[3] See Cole et al. (2008) for a detailed explanation Voice Agreement Hypothesis.

[4] Both the CDS corpus analyzed by Tjung (2006) and Cole et al. (2006) and the one analyzed by Hidajat (2010) were extracted from the JFS database, which is a corpus of naturalistic data containing over one million utterances. Many of these utterances are of ten JI-speaking children and their caregivers who were studied longitudinally over the course of four years (Gil and Tadmor, 2007). However, the CDS corpus analyzed by Tjung (2006) and Cole et al. (2006) and the one analyzed by Hidajat (2010) were derived from different data sets.

[5] See Hidajat (2011:174) for a review of Sneddon's (1996) discussion of the affixation of N- to a polysyllabic stem.

begin with voiceless consonants with Ø- instead of *N*-. As exemplified in Table 1, in the adult utterances found in the JFS database, some polysyllabic active verbs with voiceless initial, such as *potong* 'cut', *cuci* 'wash' , and *tulis* 'write', occur more frequently with Ø- than *N*-. This fact suggests that phonology is not the only factor which induces bJI speakers' preference for Ø- over *N*-.

Polysyllabic active verbs with voiceless initial	Polysyllabic active verbs with voiced initial
potong 'Ø-cut' : *motong* 'N-cut' = 237 : 82	*baca* 'Ø-read': *ngebaca* 'N-read' = 518 : 2
cuci 'Ø-wash' : *nyuci* 'N-wash' = 212 : 69	*gunting* 'Ø-scissors': *ngegunting* 'N-scissors' = 149 : 2
tarik 'Ø-pull' : *narik* 'N-pull' = 134: 21	*dorong* 'Ø-push': *ngedorong* 'N-push' = 52 : 0
tulis 'Ø-write': *nulis* 'N-write' = 354 : 261	
sapu 'Ø-broom': *nyapu* 'N-broom' = 5 : 14	

Table 1. Number of occurrences of active verbs with Ø- compared with N-

To account for why bJI speakers produce *N*- less frequently than Ø-, this study first explores the possibility that bJI *N*- does not only have a syntactic function, but also an aspectual marking function, i.e. the progressive viewpoint aspectual marker. This supposition is based on the argument that the prefix *meN*- in Malay is actually a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker (Soh and Nomoto, 2009). To my knowledge this is the first research which investigates the possibility that bJI *N*- also functions as a progressive aspectual marker. Is it possible that bJI speakers prefer to produce active verbs with Ø- than *N*- because *N*-verbs cannot be used in the sentences which are incompatible with a progressive-like meaning?

The data analyzed in this study were taken from several sources. Some of the data were from spontaneous child directed utterances from the Jakarta Field Station (JFS) database (Gil and Tadmor, 2007).[6] In this paper, the JFS data were presented together with the speaker code and age. Some other data were from various *chicklits* published by publishing companies in Jakarta and the neighboring areas. The excerpts from *chicklits* were searched by using *Google Buku*. There are also a number of examples which were self-elicited. The grammaticality of the examples which were self-elicited was verified with other JI speakers.

2. On the stativity of *N*-verbs

N- potentially qualifies as a progressive marker because *N*-verbs have the quality of non-stative verbs. The non-stative nature of *N*-verbs is evidenced by the fact that *N*- is

---

[6] Most of the data were from the HIZ and RIS data sets. (HIZ and RIS are codes referring to the particular children involved.) The data sets were produced when the children under observation were between two and three year old.

rarely affixed to stative verbs. *N-* generally can be affixed to eventive transitive and ditransitive verbs, as shown in the following sentences:

(5)   a.   **N- is affixed to the accomplishment verb *kejar* 'chase'**
           Ni   ulernya   lagi   ngejar   ayam...
           this   snake-DET   PROG   N-chase   chicken
           'This snake is chasing the chicken.'   (EXPOKK; 25:5)

      b.   **N- is affixed to the semelfactive verb *pukul* 'hit'**
           Kalo   Mbak   Rininya   mukul   Tante,   boleh,   nggak?
           if   EPIT   Rini-DET   N-hit   aunt   may   NEG
           What if Rini hits me, is it okay or not?   (EXPYAN; 23:7)

      c.   **N- is affixed to the accomplishment verb *kasi* 'give'**
           Ica   ngasi   apa   sama   Tante Dini?
           Ica   N-give   what   with   aunt Dini.
           Lit. You gave what to Aunt Dini?   (EXPERN; 25:2)

However, *N-* generally cannot be affixed to stative transitive verbs, such as *kenal* 'recognize', *tau* 'know', and *inget* 'remember', except to a few, such as *kira* 'reckon' (becomes *ngira*) and *sangka* 'suspect' (becomes *nyangka*), as shown in the following sentences:

(6)   a.   **N- is affixed to stative *kira* 'reckon'**
           kita   ngira   dia   mundur   karena   egois
           1pl   N-reckon   3sg   move.back   because   selfish
           'We thought that she withdrew (from the election) because she is selfish.
                                                     (Torashyngu, 2008: 133)

      b.   **N- is affixed to stative *sangka* 'suspect'**
           ... dia   nyangka   kalo   adiknya   tuh   selebritis   yang
             3sg   N-suspect   if   younger.sibling-DET   that   celebrity   REL

           lagi   menyebarkan   popularitas…
           PROG   ACT-spread-APPL   popularity
           '…he thinks that his younger sister is a celebrity who wants to be more popular…'
                                                     (Alina, 2007:163)

N- has a wider distribution with stative verbal roots when they are also affixed by the suffix *-in*.[7] This is presumably because stative verbs turn into non-statives when they are affixed by the suffix *-in*. As shown in (7b), the stative verb *inget* 'remember' can appear with *N-* only when it is also affixed by *-in*. The suffix *-in* causes the stative *inget* 'remember' to turn into the causative *ngingetin* 'to remind someone of/about something'.[8] This means that, in the case of *N-stative root-in*, *N-* is actually affixed to causative verbs instead of stative verbs.

---

[7] The suffix *-in* has multiple functions in bJI. It can bring forth causative interpretation, benefactive interpretation, as well as iterative interpretation. In addition, it can also be an object marker and a locative marker (see Sneddon (2006) for some details regarding *-in*). According to Cole and Son (2004), Sneddon (2006), and Son and Cole (2008), the suffix *-in* in JI replaces the suffix *–kan* and the suffix *-i* in standard Indonesian.

[8] The causative *ngingetin* 'remind' can also appear without the nasal prefix N-. Both *ngingetin* and *ingetin* mean 'remind'. This fact shows that the causative alteration is the result of affixing *-in* instead of N-.

(7) a. *... kapan   terakhir   kali dia (*ng)inget   sama gue.*
        when   ACC.PASS-end very 3sg (*N)-remember with 1sg
        'When was the last time he remembered me?'   (Nie, 2006: 38)

   b. *Dia   ngingetin   gue   sama   Jingga…*
      3sg   N-remember-APPL   1sg   with   Jingga
      'She reminds me of Jingga'   (Fitrina, 2006: 195)

Another piece of evidence which supports the non-stativity of *N*-verbs is that sentences with *N*-verbs can co-occur with subject-oriented adverbs like *sengaja* 'intentionally', as shown in (8), and become complements of *maksa* 'force' and *ngebujuk* 'persuade', as shown in (9).[9]

(8) a. *Tara kan gak sengaja   nendang muka Fandy.*
       Tara PART NEG on.purpose N-kick   face Fandy
       'Tara did not kick Fandy's face on purpose.'
       (First Reader Team, 2007: 201)

   b. *…terus   tangannya pelan-pelan megang tangan gue.*
      continue   hand-DET   RED-slow   N-hold   hand   1sg
      '…then his hand slowly held my hand.'   (Aprianti, 2008:11)

(9) a. *Gue sempet mikir   mau maksa   dia ngulang   ngambil S3*
       1sg manage N-think want N-force   3sg N-repeat N-take   S3

      jurusan   belanja   sayuran   aja.
      direct-NOM shopping   vegetable just
      'I've thought about forcing him to take another Ph.D. program in shopping for vegetables.' (Dewi, 2008: 8)

   b. *Pertama, kita   bisa   ngebujuk   anak-anak   untuk*
      first   1pl   can   N-persuade   RED-child   for

      nyetak   label   nama…
      N-print   label   name
      'First, we can persuade our friends to print name labels.' (Hilman, 1995:28)

N-verbs also qualifies to be non-stative because, similarly to sentences with active verbs marked by Ø, sentences with *N*-verbs can appear in pseudo-cleft sentences, as shown in (10b). In contrast, stative sentences cannot appear in pseudo-cleft sentences, as shown in (10c).[10]

(10) a. *Dan satu2nya   yang elo bisa lakuin   adalah ikut*
        and RED-one-DET   REL   2sg can   Ø-do-APPL that.is Ø-follow

---

However, it is important to point out that the meaning of *ingetin* is slightly different from *ngingetin*. In the case of *ningetin*, the action of reminding can be done either intentionally (remind someone about) or unintentionally (remind someone of), as in example (7b). In contrast, *ingetin* can only mean that the action of reminding is done intentionally.

[9] Testing the stativity of N-verbs by modifying them with subject-oriented adverbs, such as *sengaja* 'intentionally' or *pelan-pelan* 'slowly', and making them as the complement of *maksa* 'force' and *ngebujuk* 'persuade' is based on the stativity tests proposed by Lakoff (1966, as cited in Levin and Rappaport Hovav, 1995: 170).

[10] Testing the stativity of N-verbs by using pseudo-cleft sentences is based on the stativity tests proposed by Dowty (1979, as cited in Soh and Nomoto, 2009)

> *"berjalan" menuju   sesuatu,   Nad.*
> BER-walk ACT-direct   SE-one   TRU-Nadya
> 'And the only thing that you can do is keep moving on, Nadya.'
> (Huwae, 2007:32)

b. *Yang   hendak Stefani lakuin   adalah nyari   Damar lewat*
   REL   intend Stefani Ø-do-APPL that.is N-look.for Damar go.by

   imajinasinya.
   imagination-DET
   'What Stefani will do is looking for Damar through her imagination.'
   (Aprilia dan Wong T, 2006: 44)

c. *Yang   hendak   gue   lakuin   adalah   *suka/   *sayang /*
   REL   intend   1sg   Ø-do-APPL that.is   Ø-like Ø-compassion

   **inget   sama   elo.*
   Ø-remember   with   2sg
   'What I will do is *like/ *care about/ *remember you.' (self-elicited)

One feature of *N*-verbs which disqualifies them from being non-stative verbs is the fact that they are generally not allowed in imperatives, in particular direct (positive) imperatives. BJI speakers judge the sentences in (11) ungrammatical if the verbs are affixed by *N-*.

(11) a. *Kejar   kak   Icanya!*
        Ø-chase TRU.older.sibling Ica-DET

        **Ngejar kak   Icanya!*
        N-chase TRU.older.sibling Ica-DET
        'Chase Ica!'   (EXPDAL; 28:4)

b. Potong   kuenya!
   Ø-cut   cake-DET

   *Motong   kuenya!
   N-cut   cake-DET
   'Cut the cake!'   (MOTHIZ; 34:4)

It is important to point out that *N*-verbs are not totally restricted from direct imperatives. Some active verbs, such as *tulis* 'write' and *hadap* 'face', can occur with or without *N-* when they are used in direct imperatives, as exemplified below:

(12) a. **Tulis**   *A B C!*
        Ø-write   A B C
        'Write A B C!'   (MOTRIS; 22:8)

b. *Nulis,   Hizkia!*
   N-write   Hizkia
   'Write!'   (EXPBET; 24:6)

(13) a. **Hadap** *ke situ   aja, di   situ   aja!*
        Ø-face   to   there just LOC   there   just
        'Just face there, just stay over there!'   (EXPLIK; 25:5)

b. *Sini,   sini   **madep** ke sini!*
   here   here   **N-face** to   here
   'Here, face here!'   (DEBHIZ; 35:7)

In addition, similarly to Ø-verbs, *N*-verbs are not restricted from the negative (indirect) imperatives, as exemplified below:

(14) a.   *Jangan **ngambil** yang   dari   sini!*
          don't   **N-take**   REL   from here
          Don't take it from here!   EXPERN; 26:2)

     b.   *Jangan **ambil**   ikanku!*
          don't   Ø**-take** fish-1sg
          'Don't take my fish!'   (DEKPRI; 29:7)

Based on the fact that some *N*-verbs can be used in direct imperatives and they occur freely in negative imperatives, I assume that it is not the semantic aspect of *N*-verbs that prevents them from occurring in direct imperatives. In other words, the fact that *N*-verbs generally cannot be used in direct imperatives does not contradict the nature of *N*-verbs as non-stative verbs.

The fact that *N*-verbs are non-stative qualifies *N-* to be a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker; however, there are two facts which refute this supposition. The first fact is that sentences containing *N*-verbs can be modified, not only by *lagi*, which is a progressive aspectual marker (PROG), but also by *dah/udah*, which is a perfective aspectual marker (PFCT), as shown in (15).[11] Note that *dah/udah* can also modify active sentences containing verbs which are affixed by the null affix, as shown in (16).

(15) a.   *Ya   kan   Ica   udah   make   juga   tuh.*
          yes   PART Ica   PFCT   N-use   also   that
          'But you've already had one on you.'   (MOTRIS; 24:2)

     b.   *Kamu   dah   nyuci?*
          2sg   PFCT   N-wash
          'Have you washed?'   (JINBRIS; 39:6)

(16) a.   *Nih, nih, Opanya   udah, udah pake baju   tuh.*
          this   this grandpa-DET PFCT   PFCT Ø-use garment that
          'Look, look, Grandpa has got dressed, look.   (EXPYAN; 23:1)

     b.   *Udah   cuci   piring.*
          PFCT   Ø-wash plate
          '(They) have washed the dishes' (JIAPIT; 31:11)

The supposition that *N-* is a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker is also negated by the fact that the presence of *N-* can derive the past tense interpretation when it is affixed to some categories of verbs (in particular, the verbs of perception). In contrast, the presence of Ø cannot derive the past tense interpretation (cf. Kaswanti Purwo's (1988) argument for the distinction between *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in Standard Indonesian). As exemplified in the following conversation, according to bJI native speakers, the situation in which B had already seen the child by the time A told B to see the child is possible only when the verb *liat* 'see' is affixed by *N-*.

(17) A: *Liat   anak itu, lucu banget.*
          Ø-see   child   that funny very
          Look at that child, she is very cute.

---

[11] Thanks to Peter Cole (p.c.) for pointing out this issue.

B₁: *Iya,   gw   ngeliat.*
    yes   1sg   *N*-see
    'Yes, I see her.' or 'Yes, I have seen her already.'

B₂: Iya,   gw   liat.
    yes   1sg   Ø-see
    'Yes, I see her.' But not *'Yes, I have seen her already.'

Note the above sentences are adapted from the examples in Kaswanti Purwo (1988:210).

To reiterate, one way to account for why bJI speakers use Ø- as an active marker more frequently than *N*- is by assuming that it also has a semantic function, i.e. a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker. Although this supposition receives support from the fact that *N*-verbs are non-stative verbs, it is negated by the following two facts: first, *N*-verbs can be modified by the perfective aspectual marker *dah/udah*. The second fact is that affixing *N*- to some categories of verbs can derive the past tense interpretation.

3. The discourse function of *N*-verbs and *Ø*-verbs—a contrastive study

The discussion so far leads to the conclusion that *N*- is not a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker. If this is the case, then our next question is 'what hinders bJI speakers from affixing *N*- to active verbs as frequently as the null affix aside from the phonological reason?' In accordance with the fact that *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in Standard Indonesian (henceforth, SI) occurs in different discourse contexts (Kaswanti Purwo, 1988), I argue that *N*- and Ø in bJI actually have different discourse functions. As pointed out by Kaswanti Purwo, the verbal nuance of *men*-verbs is different from the verbal nuance of Ø-verbs in several contexts, as reflected in Table 2.

men-verbs	Ø-verbs
Responding to the hearer/narrating something.	Proposing something to the hearer.
Presence of modal.	Absence of modal.
No emphasis on (main) verb.	Emphasis on (main) verb.
Asking for confirmation of a fact.	Asking for permission to perform an action.
Indirect imperative.	Direct imperative.
Action less directly affects the addressee.	Action more directly affects the addressee.
Backgrounding device.	Foregrounding device.
[Verbs of perception in a series of actions] 3ʳᵈ person narratives.	[Verbs of perception in a series of actions] 1ˢᵗ person narratives.

Table 2. The verbal nuance of *men*-verbs in contrast to Ø-verbs in different contexts (Kaswanti Purwo, 1988: 231)

Some of the differences in verbal nuance between *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI, as listed in Table 2, are shared by *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI, in particular those concerning their use in narration and imperatives and their effect when co-occurring with modal verbs, as will be discussed below.

With respect to their use in narration, similarly to *men*-verbs, *N*-verbs can indicate that a speaker is narrating something (such as his/her experience). On the other hand, Ø-verbs are more appropriate to use in the context in which a speaker gives a swift response to the stimulus from the interlocutor. Consequently, as already shown in the sentences in (17), when verbs of perception are affixed by *N-* (i.e. *ngeliat* 'see'), they can have either a punctual or past tense interpretation. In contrast, when they are affixed by the null affix (i.e. *liat* 'see') the interpretation is only punctual.

With respect to the use in imperatives, the distribution of *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI is also similar to the distribution of *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI. As discussed earlier, *N*-verbs are generally restricted from direct (positive) imperatives. In contrast, Ø-verbs can occur freely in both direct (positive) and indirect (negative) imperatives.

Furthermore, *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI are also interpreted differently when they occur with a modal. For instance, the two sentences below have different interpretations, as indicated by the English translation:

(18) a. **_Mo_** *dia ngambil bukunya sekarang?*
want 3sg N-take book-DET now
'Is he willing to take that book now?'
Context: the person did not want to take the book, but now he wants to take it.

  b. *Mo dia* **_ambil_** *bukunya sekarang?*
want 3sg Ø-take book-DET now
'Is he going to take that book now?'
(Sentence in (18) are from Kaswanti Purwo, 1988:212)

In the sentences in (18), the verb co-occurs with the modal *mo/mau* which can mean either 'want' or 'will (future marker)'. However, when the verb is affixed by *N-*, *mo* can only mean 'will' (18a) and when it is affixed by Ø it can only mean 'want' (18b). In addition, stress placement in these sentences is different—in (18a), stress falls on the modal while in (19b), stress falls on the verb. The difference in the placement of stress indicates that, when the verb is affixed by *N-*, it is the modal which is being questioned; on the other hand, when the verb is affixed by the null affix, the question focuses on the action depicted by the verb (cf. *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI (Kaswanti Purwo, 1988)).

However, it is important to point out that not all the distinctions between *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI are exhibited in the distinctions between *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI. Firstly, *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs do not function as a foregrounding/backgrounding device. As exemplified in the sentences below, either *N*-verbs or Ø-verbs can be used for both foregrounding and backgrounding.

(19) a. **N-verb is backgrounded, Ø-verbs is foregrounded**
Karena pas ngeliat ke belakang, ternyata Rasta udah
because precise N-see to back ACC.PASS-definite Rasta PFCT

kabur lewat jendela
Ø-escape go.by window
'Because, when she turned around, it turned out that Rasta had already run away through the window.'(Hilman and Zettira ZR., 2000:22)

b. **Ø-verbs is backgrounded; *N*-verb is foregrounded**
   Pas   gue   liat   di   sana, bener aja   si   Lalan
   precise 1sg   Ø-see   LOC there true   just PERS Lalan

   lagi   nyoba- nyoba   timbaan
   PROG RED-N-try   draw.water-NOM
   'When I went to that place, I found Lalan was trying a bucket.'
   (Basri, 2008:65)

c. ***N*-verb is first backgrounded and then foregrounded**
   ".. *Waktu ngeliat dia   pertama kali, gue   ngerasa ngeliat*
        time   N-see   3sg   first   time 1sg   N-feel N-see

   sesuatu   yang   sama   ama   gue…"
   something REL   same   with   1sg
   'When I saw her for the first time, I felt like we were similar.
                                                  (Endah, 2009:137)

d. **Ø-verbs is first backgrounded and then foregrounded**
   "Tadi… waktu gue   cari   di   koridor, gue   lihat   dia
   earlier time 1sg Ø-find LOC corridor 1sg   Ø-see 3sg

   lagi   mesra-mesraan   sama   cewek."
   PROG RED.NOM-intimate   withfemale
   'When I looked for him in the corridor, I saw him getting intimate with a
   woman.'   (Dewianna, 2006:19)

In bJI, *N*-verbs can occur in the main clause, as in (19b) and (19c), as well as in the
sub-clause, as in (19a) and (19c). Correspondingly, Ø-verbs can occur in both the main
clause, as in (19a) and (19d), and in the sub-clause, as in (19b) and (19d). Unlike *N*-verbs,
men-verbs in SI are more likely to occur in the sub-clause because they function as a
backgrounding device in the narrative discourse. Furthermore, unlike Ø-verbs in bJI,
Ø-verbs in SI generally occur in the main clause because they have the foregrounding
function (Kaswanti Purwo, 1988).

The second distinction between *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI which is not exhibited in the
distinctions between *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI is related to the form of the verb of
perception in the first and third person narratives. According to Kaswanti Purwo
(1988:215), "in first person narratives the Ø-verb is used to express the description of a
series of action but in the third person narration the *men*-verb is used." Unlike in SI, both
N-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI can be used to express the description of a series of action in
either the first person or third person narration, as exemplified in the sentences below:

(20) a. **First person narratives with Ø-verbs**
        *Pas   di   luar, gue   **liat**   empat orang   itu   udah gak*
        precise LOC out   1sg   Ø-see   four   person that PFCT NEG

        *ada.   Wah,   pada ke mana, nih? Tak lama, gue   **denger***
        exist. EXCL   PL   to   which   this   NEG long   1sg   Ø-hear

        bunyi   kereot-kereot   yang   udah   familiar banget.
        sound RED-IMIT   REL   PFCT familiar very
        'When I went out, I saw that the four people had gone. Where were they going
        to? Before long, I heard the familiar creaking sounds.'   (Basri, 2008: 65)

b. **First person narratives with *N*-verbs**

*Padahal   aku   masih   pengen diem   di   sini.   **Ngedengerin***
in.fact   1sg   still   want   reside   LOC   here   N-hear-APPL

*suara   Andrea. **Ngeliatin**   wajahnya.*
sound   Andrea N-see-APPL face-DET
'I actually still want to stay here…to listen to Andrea's voice, to see his face.'
(Muharam R., 2006: 28)

c. **Third person narratives with Ø-verbs**

*"Walaupun   dia   nggak   **liat**   saya,   nggak   **denger**   saya,*
although-PART   3sg   NEG   Ø-see   1sg   NEG   Ø-hear   1sg

*nggak   **sadar**   saya ada, tapi dia masih tetep   sahabat saya…!"*
NEG   Ø-aware   1sg exist but   3sg still   constant   friend   1sg
'Although he never sees me, nor hears my voice, he never realizes that I am
there, he is still my best friend…!'   (Nelwan, 2008: 132)

d. **Third person narratives with *N*-verbs**

*Abis   itu   dia   **ngeliat** dirinya langsung. Dia   **ngeliat**   ke*
finished   that 3sg   N-see   self-DET direct   3sg   N-see   to

*bagian   bawah.**Noleh**   ke   kiri, ke kanan, **nyoba**   liat*
divide-NOM   under N-turn.head.around to   left to right N-try   Ø-see

ke   punggung.
to   upper.back
'After that, he immediately looked at himself. He looked down. He turned his
head to the left and to the right. He also tried to see his back.'
(Andries, 2006: 39)

As revealed in the above discussion, *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI have some differences in
their discourse functions; although their differences are not as many as the differences
between *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI. *N*-verbs can be used to indicate a narration,
infrequently occur in direct (positive) imperatives, and, when they co-occur with a modal
in questions, it is the modal which is being questioned, instead of the action. On the other
hand, Ø-verbs are inappropriate to be used for narratives, occur freely in direct and
indirect imperatives, and, when they co-occur with a modal in questions, the question
focuses on the action.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

Hidajat (2010) argues that bJI speakers produce active sentences with the null affix more
frequently than with *N*- based on analysis of naturalistic corpora of bJI CDS reported in
several studies (Tjung, 2006; Cole et al., 2006; Hidajat, 2010). In this study, I assume that
the difference in the frequency of use of *N*-verbs compared with Ø-verbs in bJI CDS is
the impact of the differences in the discourse functions *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in
combination with the nature of CDS. As pointed out by Matychuk (2005) (drawing on
Lightfoot, 1991), CDS has a regulatory function; hence, it is full of questions and
imperatives. In addition, adults often give phatic responses when talking to young
children to indicate that they listen and attend to what the children say (Harris, 1990, as
cited in Matychuk, 2005). As already discussed in the previous section, *N*-verbs cannot be
used in direct (positive) imperatives. Furthermore, Ø-verbs derive the past tense
interpretation; therefore, they are not suitable for a situation where the speaker's response

to a stimulus and the action is punctual. Accordingly, bJI adult speakers are less likely to produce *N*-verbs when talking to young children.

The above assumption implies that active verbs are infrequently affixed by *N*- only in CDS. This assumption, to some extent, receives support from the results of the analyses of two corpora of JI adult-to-adult speech which show that the frequencies of the active verbs marked by *N*- found in the adult to adult speech corpora are much higher than the ones found in child speech and CDS corpora, as reflected in Table 3 (Tjung, 2006; Cole et al., 2006). However, it is important to point out that the participants in those two corpora are adults of high education; therefore, the linguistic data in the two corpora are potentially the mesolectal variety of JI instead of the basilectal variety.[12] To verify the above assumption, further study should analyze the frequencies of imperatives, phatic responses, and *N*-verbs in one or more corpora of JI adult-to-adult speech, in which the participants are adults of low socioeconomic status and educational background, and compare them to the ones found in the corpora of bJI CDS.

Corpus	Ø-verbs		*N*-verbs	
	Simple Sentence	Relative clause	Simple Sentence	Relative clause
CHILD	315/563 (56%)	412/623 (66.13%)	87/563 (15.45%)	127/623 (20.38%)
CDS	417/827 (59.42%)	254/425 (59.76%)	99/827 (11.98%)	81/425 (19%)
Adult to Adult speech (1)	199/713 (27.90%)	56/191 (29.32%)	231/713 (32.40%)	52/191 (27.22%)
Adult to Adult speech (2)	127/367 (34.60%)	109/371 (29.38%)	99/367 (26.97%)	98/371 (26.4%)

Table 3. The frequency of active transitive verbs with the null prefix and the nasal prefix *N-* in four corpora of JI as reported by Tjung (2006) and Cole et al. (2006)[13]

To conclude, the nasal prefix *N*-, which is an active voice marker in bJI, cannot also function as a progressive viewpoint aspectual marker for two reasons. First, *N*-verbs can be modified by a perfective aspectual marker *dah/udah*. Furthermore, in some discourse contexts, affixing *N*- to some categories of verbs can produce the past tense interpretation. In this paper, it is argued that, similarly to *men*-verbs and Ø-verbs in SI, *N*-verbs and Ø-verbs in bJI have different discourse functions; hence, they occur in different discourse contexts. In line with this argument, it is assumed that bJI adult speakers produce Ø-verbs more frequently than *N*-verbs only when talking to young children. The reason why bJI adult speakers infrequently produce *N*-verbs in CDS is

---

[12] To account for the differences found in the CDS and adult-to-adult speech, Tjung (2006) and Cole et al. (2006) assume that JI adult speakers generally use the basilectal variety when talking to children and the mesolectal variety when talking to other adults. JI speakers acquire the mesolectal form of JI as the results of learning SI in school.

[13] Data in Table 3 are extracted from Tjung (2006:63,67,115, 116, 119) and Cole et al (2006:72,75,78,80,81).

because of the nature of CDS which is full of imperatives (and also questions) and phatic responses.

Abbreviations and conventions

ACC.PASS	accidental passive	ACT	active voice marker (SI)
APPL	applicative	DET	determiner
EPIT	epithet	EXCL	exclamation
FUT	future	IMIT	imitation
LOC	location	*N-*	nasal prefix
NEG	negation	NOM	nominalizer
PART	particle	PASS	passive
PERS	personify	PFCT	perfective
PROG	progressive	RED	reduplication
REL	relative pronoun	TRU	truncation
Ø-	the null affix		

References

Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Tjung, Y.N. (2006). Is there *pasif semu* in Jakarta Indonesian? *Oceanic Linguistics, 45,* 65-90.

Cole, P., Hermon, G., and Yanti. (2008). Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua, 118,* 1500-1553.

Cole, P. and Son, M.J. (2004). The argument structure of verbs with the suffix –*kan* in Indonesian. *Oceanic Linguistics,* Volume 43.2 (pp. 339-364). University of Hawai'i Press.

Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Gil, D. (2003). The acquisition of voice morphology in Jakarta Indonesian. In N. Gagarina and I. Gülzow (Eds.), *Discovering the World of Verbs*. Kluwer Academic, Netherlands. pp. 215-266.

Hidajat, L. (2010). *The Acquisition of Verb Argument Structure in Basilectal Jakarta Indonesian.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, Newark, DE.

Hidajat, L. (2011). The Analysis of the Semantic Function of the Prefix *N-* in Basilectal Jakarta Indonesian. paper presented at the international workshop on TAM markers and evidentiality in Indonesian Languages, Tokyo, February 17-18, 2011.

Kaswanti Purwo, B. (1988). Voice in Indonesian: a discourse study. In M.Shibatani. (Ed.), *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 195–242.

Levin, B. and Rappaport Hovav, M. (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 26, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Matychuk, P. (2005). The role of child-directed speech in language acquisition: A case study. *Language Sciences*, 27, 301-379.

Sneddon, J. (1996). *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Routledge, New York.

Sneddon, J. (2006). *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra, ACT: Pacific Linguistics.

Soh, H. L. and Nomoto, H. (2009). Progressive aspect, the verbal prefix *meN-*, and stative sentences in Malay. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48(1): 148-171.

Son, M.J. and Cole,P. (2008). An Event-Based Account of -kan constructions in Standard Indonesian. *Language 84(1): 120-160.*

Tjung, Y.N. (2006). The Formation of Relative Clauses in Jakarta Indonesian: A Subject-Object Asymmetry. Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware, Newark, DE.

Sources of data

Alina, A. N. (2007). *The Scrapbook: Buku Harian si Biro Jodoh*. Jakarta Selatan: Gagas Media.

Andries, M. (2006). *Bunglon Man*. Bekasi: TriStar Media.

Aprianti, H. (2008). *Boy Hunter*. Jakarta Selatan: Gagas Media.

Aprilia, K. dan Wong T, A. (2006). *In My Heart/Perasaan Cinta, Dech*. Jakarta: Media Remaja.

Basri, N. (2008). *Banci Kalap*. Jakarta Selatan: GagasMedia.

Dewi, B.H. (2008). *Diary Dodol Seorang Istri.* Depok: PT Lingkar Pena Kreativa.

Dewianna, Y. (2006). *On Air Love*. Jakarta: Puspa Swara.

Endah, A. (2009). *Ojek Cantik*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Fitrina, S. (2006). *Scorpio Time*. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.

First Reader Team. (2007). *Cowok di Mata Cewek.* Jakarta Selatan: Gagas Media.

Gil, D. & Tadmor, U. (2007). The MPI-EVA Jakarta Child Language Database. A joint project of the Department of Linguistics, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and the Center for Language and Culture Studies, Atma Jaya Catholic University.

Hilman, H. (1995). *Lupus 'n Work*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hilman, H. (2005). *Lupus: Mission: Muka Tebel*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Hilman & Zettira, Z. (2000). *Rasta & Bella*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Muharam R. (2006). *Bidadari 'So What'*. Jakarta: Puspa Swara.

Nelwan, K. (2008). *L*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

Nie. (2006). *Love's Bet!* Jakarta: Puspa Swara.

Torashyngu, L. (2008). *D'Angel: Rose*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.