

8 *Inconsistent distinction of possessive and qualitative nominal attribution in Indonesian*

WARUNO MAHDI

1 Introduction¹

In languages permitting the use of a noun as qualitative attribute, as contrasted with its use as possessive attribute, the distinction is usually marked (analytically or synthetically). In Indonesian (and other Malay dialects) too, in which the noun lends itself to both constructions, marking is provided to distinguish between the two, but its use is optional, and in formal style even avoided, leading to ambiguity. This paper studies modalities of the use of the marked and unmarked constructions, and various alternative means for specifying the attributive relation to be expressed, and inspects the historical development of the various means of expression involved.

In the much too short period during which I had the good fortune of knowing Jack Prentice, I not only learned to value the few opportunities we had to exchange opinions on various questions of Austronesian and Indonesian linguistics, but also became indebted to him for effective help and support for a publication of mine with some perhaps not altogether conventional views on certain questions of Indonesian grammar. It is perhaps only fitting that this contribution in his honour should deal with a feature of Indonesian grammar related to one of the questions at issue in that publication, that of the noun functioning as qualitative attribute.

¹ I am indebted to the Director of the Division of Physical Chemistry of the Fritz Haber Institute of the Max Planck Society, Gerhardt Ertl, for the generous permission to use Institute facilities in my private linguistic studies. Thanks are also due to Zhong Baoning, a one-year post-doctoral at the Institute in 1996, for checking my Chinese glosses, and to Vietnamese students studying in Voronezh between 1968 and 1976, from whom I collected my Vietnamese data including the glosses in this paper.

Abbreviations used in this paper are: Art – personal article or equivalent; Cl – classifier; Dct – deictic; PC – possessive copula; PNA – possessive nominal attribute; QNA – qualitative nominal attribute; UNA – unspecific nominal attribute.

2 Possessive and qualitative nominal attribution

Many languages of East and Southeast Asia permit the use of a noun as qualitative attribute (as in English *the table leg*) beside its more universally observable attributive use to express possession (*the table's leg*). I shall refer to the two syntagmatic modes as qualitative and possessive nominal attribute (QNA and PNA) respectively. It should perhaps be stressed that it is the formal grammatical apposition that is meant here. On the plane of content, of course, a *table leg* and a *table's leg* are essentially one and the same. From a purely semantic point of view, therefore, a PNA and a QNA may express the same material relationship, or sometimes also one in which the either qualitative or possessive nature of the relationship is deemed irrelevant. In some languages, perhaps, there only was one unspecific nominal attribute (UNA) which gradually specialised into a QNA after the emergence of a distinct PNA.

In more classical grammatical tradition, PNA is a generally quite well described feature. In languages with case marking of the noun, it is usually marked as the genitive case. In those without such marking, the possessive is typically indicated with the help of a preposition or some other auxiliary or grammatical word. I shall subsume all such analytical means of specifying the possessive nature of nominal attribution under the general term 'possessive copula' (PC).

The treatment of QNA, on the other hand, seems to be somewhat more problematic. In some languages the use of a noun as qualitative attribute is not possible or at least unusual. Instead, the mediation of a preposition or some other auxiliary word may be used (e.g. French *chemin de fer* 'railway', lit. 'path of iron'), or the entire group of <attribute + target> becomes one compound word (e.g. German *Eisenbahn* 'railway' lit. 'iron-path'). The more standard procedure, at least from the point of view of classical grammatical tradition, seems to be replacing the noun which is to serve as attribute by the corresponding adjective (e.g. Russian *zheleznaja doroga* 'railway', lit. 'iron-ADJ path', cf. *zhelezo* 'iron').

For this reason, perhaps, the phenomenon of a noun directly serving as qualitative attribute (e.g. English *stone* in *stone house*) had occasionally been the cause of some theoretical embarrassment, as a result of which analogies with certain de-noun adjectives were drawn (e.g. with that in *wooden house*), which suggested a noun—adjective derivational paradigm involving affixless conversion (*stone*—*stone* by analogy to *wood*—*wooden*). The comparison seems, nevertheless, not always to adequately reflect the actual grammatical relationship, because the 'adjectival' mode in the pair may not generally share a number of features characteristic of adjectives. More significant is perhaps the circumstance, that any noun in such languages seems to lend itself at least potentially to the attributive construction. It is thus best treated as an intrinsic feature of the noun, rather than as involving derivational conversion into a different word class (part of speech).

In most languages featuring both nominal constructions being treated here, the possessive, when not marked by genitive case endings, can as a rule be distinguished from the qualitative in that the former requires the mediation of a PC between the PNA and the target of attribution. It is thus typically:

$$N_1 - PC - N_2 \text{ versus } N_1 - N_2,$$

where N_1 and N_2 are respectively the target and attribute nouns in languages with 'post-attributing' word order, or vice versa in those with 'pre-attributing' order.

Typically, the PC derives etymologically from a third person singular possessive pronoun, or from a noun meaning 'thing, possession, belonging'. In English, the possessive 'suffix' '-s', which one could essentially also treat as an enclitic, seems to have derived from *his*. The use of *his* as PC, which apparently evolved during the thirteenth to sixteenth centuries, is believed

to have been the result of re-interpretation of the Middle English genitive ending *-es*, often spelled *-is* or *-ys*, and pronounced accordingly (Baugh & Cable 1978:240). Influence of the use of *sein* 'his' and *ihr* 'her' as PC for the masculine and feminine respectively in Low German vernacular may perhaps have encouraged this development. It was the language of traders of the Hanseatic League who had been very active in the North and Baltic Seas.

In some Austronesian languages of insular Southeast Asia, the PC derives from the third person singular possessive pronoun too. It is often a clitic, which I shall indicate with a hyphen before an enclitic, or after a proclitic. Examples of PC in these languages are Malay *-nya*, Javanese *-ne/-e* (the latter after a word with final consonant). In mainland Southeast Asia, the PC typically derives from a word meaning 'thing, possession', e.g. Vietnamese *củ²a²* (originally 'thing, possession'), Thai *khóng* ('thing'). In some languages of East Indonesia and Melanesia, the etymology points to 'possession' as original meaning, e.g. Moluccan Malay *punya*³ (see below), Bislama *bilong* (from English *belong*). In Chinese, the PC *de* appears to derive from *dì* 'target' which is written with the same character.

When the noun can be used as a qualitative attribute, the PC obtains additional significance as formal marker distinguishing explicit possessive nominal attribution from the qualitative. In some of the languages, explicit PNA appears to be conditioned by the definiteness of the target or of the possessor, which may be expressed with the help of a preceding classifier⁴ (Cl), sometimes preceded in turn by a deictic (Dct) or a numeral.

Thai:

- (1) *duang séeng khóng tàwan*
 Cl light-ray PC sun
 'the light rays of the sun'
- (2) *séeng tàwan*
 light-ray sun
 'sunlight, sunbeam'

Chinese:⁵

- (3) *zhè gè jiàoshi -de bàngōngshì*
 Dct Cl teacher PC office
 'the office of this teacher'
- (4) *yī gè jiàoshi -de bàngōngshì*
 one Cl teacher PC office
 'the office of a teacher'
- (5) *jiàoshi bàngōngshì*
 teacher office
 'teachers' [office] room'

² The superscript question mark directly following the syllabic vowel indicates the *ho²i* or 'question' tone, and not a glottal stop.

³ In Ambon and neighbouring regions this is usually contracted to *pung*.

⁴ Also known as 'generic determinator' (Simon 1953:329, 337), or 'qualifier' (Honey 1956:539–540, 543).

⁵ For typographical convenience, I use dieresis in place of macron provided in Pinyin transcription of Chinese for the even tone.

Thai is 'post-attributing', Chinese 'pre-attributing'. In the latter gloss, the teachers' room in a school is meant, i.e. the room reserved for teachers to meet or rest in during breaks.

Personal pronouns differ from nouns in that they cannot normally occupy the position of qualitative attribute. When serving as attribute, it is thus invariably a possessive one, so that the PC becomes redundant. In some of the languages, for which this holds, no PC is used at all before a pronoun in possessive mode, in some others, its use is optional. In Vietnamese, for example, the construction with personal pronoun involving the PC seems to be restricted to instances when the target is rendered definite by a preceding classifier (compare also the Thai glosses above):

- (6) *cái nhà cu²a tôi*
 Cl house PC me
 'the house that is mine'
- (7) *nhà tôi*
 house me
 'my house'

In the instance of nouns, however, the general rule seems to be that a PC is required, because its absence would automatically imply qualitative attribution, or at least render the attributive relation unspecified.

3 The development in Indonesian

In Indonesian we have a remarkable exception to the general rule assumed above, in that the use of a PC in possessive nominal attribution is optional, and under certain stylistic conditions even avoided. Whereas the construction with PC is unambiguously possessive, that without a PC may essentially be interpreted as either qualitative or possessive:

- (8) *pintu -nya rumah*
 door PC house
 'door of the house'
- (9) *pintu rumah*
 door house
 '1. house door, 2. door of a/the house'
- (10) *kamar -nya guru*
 room PC teacher
 'the teacher's room'
- (11) *kamar guru*
 room teacher
 '1. teachers' room, 2. the teacher's room'

The construction with *-nya* originally was a feature of Bazaar Malay, where it probably evolved through influence of Javanese *-né* (alternating with *-é* after words ending in a consonant). In Classical (High) Malay, a PC was not normally used, and rare instances of the contrary should probably be seen as contaminations from Bazaar or other Low Malay dialects. Consequently, the construction with PC was not provided in School Malay (see van Ophuijsen 1910:49), the language which was officially prescribed since the first decade of the twentieth century for Malay classes in government schools and for Malay publications by

the government Commission for Popular Literature till the end of the colonial period.⁶ This artificially preserved dialect, however, did not reflect the language actually spoken by the reading public. The historical language tradition it reflected was gradually losing actual significance since the fall of Malacca in 1511, drawing to its end as an isolated court language of the petty Sultanate of Riau, which was practically powerless since 1824. In spite of some noteworthy mid-nineteenth-century compositions in that language, e.g. by Raja Ali Haji (Viceroy of Riau), it was apparently close to becoming extinct when it was revived, almost exclusively by non-native speakers, in the first two decades of this century (Mahdi in preparation).

3.1 The original and Moluccan possessive constructions with *Punya*

The declining role of literary and courtly High Malay was compensated for by the dramatically increased importance and distribution of Low Malay vernaculars in all places of business and trade or other interethnic exchange all over the archipelago. The omnipresence of these variants was already noted in a letter written on behalf of the church council of Batavia by the Malay Bible translator Melchior Leydecker on November 15, 1697, to the Christian Synod of North Holland, in which the writer referred to them as *Bahàsa Katsjòkan* or a 'mixed or crooked crippled language' (p.13 in the text of the letter reproduced in Valentyn 1698:9–30).⁷ During the period of Dutch rule, a but loosely uniform tradition of Low Malay developed as administrative or 'Service Malay' (Dutch *Dienst Maleis[ch]*), in which the Moluccan Malay possessive construction with *punya* as PC (see Collins 1983:28–30)⁸ was a prominent feature. The following may serve as an example:⁹

Lain tidak, kita punya tabék sama saudara, dan kita punya anak pangéran-pangéran kirim tabék sama sudara dan kasih selamat jalan sama saudara.

'And nothing but **our** farewell wishes are with you, and **our** sons, the princes, send their farewell wishes to you and wish you a good journey.' (Sultan of Madura to Cornets de Groot, 24 September 1830)¹⁰

It is remarkable in that it preserves the 'pre-attributing' word order which, as already noted by Brandes (1884:20–22; see also Kanski & Kaspruch 1931), is a typical feature of languages of East Indonesia (and New Guinea, see Bradshaw 1982), being in contrast with

⁶ This was not very strictly implemented until around 1919, and even then only in publications for indigenous readers.

⁷ In the literature, this 1697 description of the Malay language situation by Leydecker is often mistakenly credited to Werndly (1736:xlvi–x) who reproduced it almost verbatim without mentioning his source. The language situation was therefore already extant in the seventeenth century, instead of only first in the 18th. That literary High Malay was only marginally intelligible to speakers of a local Malay vernacular in Ambon is also evident from Dutch correspondence from the first half of the seventeenth century (Mahdi in preparation).

⁸ In Ambon, as the author indicates, the PC is now as a rule contracted to *pung*.

⁹ For convenience of readers not familiar with the various historical Latin-script spellings used for Malay and Indonesian, this and all further Malay glosses will be transliterated and brought into accordance with modern Indonesian spelling. A treatment with original spellings will follow elsewhere (Mahdi in preparation). With the same view of making the reading easier for the reader, I shall everywhere retain the distinction between *e* and *é*, which has been dropped in the spelling rules currently in force.

¹⁰ Quoted from Francis (1892:39–40).

the otherwise ‘post-attributing’ order in Malay. Indeed, Collins (1980:30–31) already pointed out that the word order in the Moluccan Malay possessive construction resembled that in Asilulu, the original indigenous language of Ambon, and Dix Grimes (1991:106–107) demonstrated its parallelism with the possessive construction in Buru.

The Dutch missionary school at Ambon in the Moluccas played a crucial role in the implementation, advancement, and propagation of Latin script Malay as language of school instruction, correspondence, and publication. It is therefore not surprising, that this and other features of Moluccan Malay gained such wide distribution in Malay administrative correspondence throughout the archipelago (Mahdi in preparation). It is already attested in one of the earliest sketches on Malay, apparently written in the Moluccas, and appended to the Malay dictionary of Wiltens and Danckaerts (1623:135):

Béta tahu dia punya gila
‘I know of **his** madness’

It, of course, also occurs in the dictionary itself, the authors both having had considerable Ambon experience:

itu punya harga ada begitu
‘**its** price is like that’ (p.23 under *ghelden*)
for seventeenth century Dutch *dat ghelt soo veel*.

itu-lah engkau punya salah
‘that is **your** fault’ (p.49 under *schult*)
for seventeenth century Dutch *dat is uwe schult*.

and

raja punya negeri
‘land of a/the king’ (p.13 under *coninckryck*)
telor punya kulit
‘shell of an egg’ (p.17 under *dop van een ey*)
rumah punya tuan
‘master of the house’ (p.29 under *huysheer*)

Note for the last phrase that, in a nuclear or High Malay dialect, it would be understood to mean either ‘the house that is yours’, or ‘the house of the master, that belongs to the master’.

The Moluccan attributive construction was also used throughout the Malay New Testament translation of Daniel Brouwerius (see van Boetzelaer & van Dubbeldam 1941:35), being essentially in the same locally spoken dialect, but with considerably more Portuguese elements:

Maka dia [a]da berjalan ke hadapan muka Dia dengan Elias punya Spirito dan kuasa, pada balikkan bapak-bapak punya hati kepada anak-anak-nya, dan orang nakal kepada orang adil punya budiman, pada hadirkan rakyat berhadir pada Allah Taala

‘And he shall go before him in the **spirit and power of Elias**, to turn the **hearts of the fathers** to the children, and the disobedient to the **wisdom of the just**: to make ready a people prepared for the Lord’ (Brouwerius 1668:108 verso): (Luke 1:17)¹¹

¹¹ The English is the King James Version.

Originally, the word *punya* apparently developed from *empunya* 'owner' (< *empu* 'master' + *-nya* 'its/his/her'), as Dempwolff (1941:20) suggested. But it consequently seems to have acquired the meaning 'possession' at an early stage. This is apparent from the derived verb *berpunya* 'be of means, be wealthy', literally 'have possession' (compare the verb *bergigi* 'have teeth', from *gigi* 'tooth'). A doublet ***berempunya* 'be of means' does not exist.¹² A possible mechanism of how the semantic shift could have occurred will be proposed below.

At least some of the writers of Service Malay appear to have been aware of the etymology of the word, for in official correspondence one sometimes wrote *empunya* instead of *punya* in the Moluccan possessive construction, thereby treating the two forms as still being doublets. An early example is a letter dated October 16, 1717, from the Dutch governor in Ternate, J. Bottendorp, to three local heads in Manado, published by de Clercq (1894:52), in which both doublet forms are used alternately:

... maka kamu orang sudah berjanji dan sudah mengaku bahwa jikalau tuan kompeni *empunya Selup*,¹³ atau lain lain perahu yang tuan kompeni *empunya*,¹⁴ sudah sampai di Labuhan Manado, niscaya segera segera kamu orang hendak suruh manusia dibawa kepada **tuan kompeni empunya loji**, pada menolong muat selup atau perahu itu, dengan beras, padi atau lain lain jenis muatan, pun demikian lagi sekalian kerjaan **tuan kompeni kamu sudah mengaku hendak menyuruh kamu punya manusia dibuat, dan dipedulikan kerjaan itu.**

'... you have promised and have agreed that if **the honourable Company's**¹⁵ sloop or any other boat of the honourable Company arrived in the harbour of Manado, you would for sure quite immediately order men to be brought to **the honourable Company's quarters**, to help load the sloop or boat with husked or unhusked rice, or other kinds of cargo, and likewise with all other tasks of the honourable Company you have agreed to order **your men** to do those tasks, and to attend to them.'

¹² The noun *empunya* does serve as base for a possessive verb, i.e. *berempunya* 'have an owner', which is however not a semantic doublet of *berpunya* 'be of means'.

¹³ Spelled *Siloup* in the original. Here it is provisionally translated literally, as 'sloop', but as de Clercq indicated, no ships of the kind referred to in Europe as *sloop* were engaged in the traffic between Manado and the Moluccas. The indigenous *selup* (Francillon 1988 even suggested this as possible ultimate precursor of the European cognates of the word) was possibly one of several ship types built in local shipyards using traditional technology, but with constructional elements inspired by that of European ships. The name of the Buginese *pinisi*, for example, ultimately derives from English *pinnace*. The ship type was originally known as *palari*, and acquired its new name when it sported a European-inspired fore and aft rigging (see Gibson-Hill 1950:121). That new name it seems to have acquired through Malay *penis* (also *pinas*, from French *pinasse*, see Gibson-Hill 1949:109–111). The latter may in turn have been introduced into Malay from India, where a certain type of yacht in the nineteenth century was often referred to as *pinnace* (see Mookerji 1912:251 and plate facing p.252). None of the respectively designated ship types (Buginese, Malay, Indian) are identical with that which is known either as *pinnace* in English, or as *pinasse* in French. Incidentally, the latter two — although obviously cognate — likewise refer to different types of watercraft.

¹⁴ This particular use of either *empunya* or *punya* practically only occurred in Malay as spoken or written by foreigners, Dutch as well as Chinese, so I shall not discuss it any further here. The passage under consideration, of course, also diverges from the speech of a native speaker in other respects.

¹⁵ The Dutch United East India Company.

The apparent distinctive use of *empunya* after noun or proper name, and *punya* after pronoun here is coincidental, and not representative for the whole of the text. Later examples of the use of *empunya* instead of *punya* as PC in Service Malay are provided in Francis (1892:11–13, 39, 41–42).

The Moluccan possessive construction with *punya* was also taken up in twentieth century intellectual Bazaar Malay as an emphatic alternative to the more neutral style possessive with *-nya* as PC. As an expression of emphasis it has been retained in Indonesian, and in the precursor language tradition of prewar Indonesian intellectuals, where it could be frequently encountered in newspapers and publicist literature since the 1920s, and has already been attested in the literary language since the 1940s, as, for example, in the poetry of Chairil Anwar:

Kami sudah beri kami punya nyawa
 'We have given already **our lives**'
 (Ch. Anwar, *Krawang-Bekasi*, 1948)¹⁶

The original nuclear Malay construction which may perhaps have initially inspired the Moluccan Malay PNA, but having the for Malay normal 'post-attributing' word order, likewise continues to persist in Indonesian, as can be illustrated by another poem of Chairil Anwar:

Taman punya kita berdua
 'That **garden, of us** two, a pair,
tak lebar luas, kecil saja
 is but small, with not much room to spare
satu tak kehilangan lain dalam-nya.
 one couldn't ever lose another there.'
 (Ch. Anwar, *Taman*, 1943)¹⁷

The construction shows the typical way of forming relative clauses in Malay, like in the use of *ciptaan* 'creation', *tempat* 'place' and *waktu* 'time' in the following:

taman punya kita berdua
 garden possession we be-twosome
 'the garden which is ours, of us two'

taman ciptaan kita bersama
 garden creation we be-together
 'the garden which we created together'

taman tempat kita bermain
 garden place we be-at-play
 'the garden where we play'

hari-hari waktu kita bersama
 days time we be-together
 'the days when we are/were together'

¹⁶ Published in Anwar (1949:43–44).

¹⁷ Published in Anwar (1949:15).

The first strophe in the cited poem of Chairil Anwar thus literally translates as '[the] garden [being the] possession [of] us [who are a] twosome'. The construction is now relatively rarely used, and has in any case not become a standard means of expressing possession.

Based on data from Dempwolff (1941:19), Collins (1983:30–31) proposed the following development of the possessive construction with *punya*:¹⁸

- (1) *rumah ini saya empu-nya*
'this house, I am its owner (master)'
- (2) *rumah ini saya pu-nya*
> 'this house, I am its owner (master)'

> *rumah ini saya punya*
> 'this house is mine'

In the latter meaning, however, sentence (2) is not an authentic item of high or nuclear or standard Malay (where it would have been *rumah ini punya saya* 'this house is mine'), but reflects the syntax of Low Malay. It is thus not comparable with sentence (1). The development could nevertheless have proceeded along the lines suggested by Collins, if one takes the following sentences of the high or standard dialect:

- (3) *rumah ini empu-nya saya*
'this house is owned by me' (lit. 'house this, master its [be] me')
- (4) *rumah ini pu-nya saya*
> 'this house is owned by me' (id.) >

> *rumah ini punya saya*
> 'this house is mine'

We must merely assume a syntagmatic re-interpretation of (4) which one may describe as shift in the literal meaning from 'house this owner-its [be] me' to 'house this [be] possession my'.

3.2 The Bazaar Malay possessive construction with *-nya*

When not speaking Dutch, the culturally western-exposed indigenous middle class emerging at the beginning of the twentieth century, which was to form the social basis of the independence movement, quite naturally availed itself of the living language, Bazaar Malay, rather than of the obsolete School Malay. In the former, the neutral style PNA was usually formed with the PC *-nya*. The following samples of this intellectual Bazaar Malay are taken

¹⁸ As already indicated by Dempwolff (1941:20), *empu* is not used in the modern language in this way, and a *pu* as short form of the former does not even exist now. It seems realistic, however, to assume the proposed existence and use of the forms at a much earlier period. The annals of the (Northern) Song dynasty note that people in the nuclear Malay lands often 'had the surname *pu*' (Groeneveldt 1877:63). In China, the surname is preposed to the personal name, and in other occasions too, a preposed foreign titular term had been described as surname in Chinese sources. One may therefore conclude from the Chinese report, that *pu* had been used for 'master, Mr' before names of Malays around the turn from the first to the second millennium AD.

from the 1913 statutes of the Islamic League (*Sarékat Islam*) as published in the weekly *Hindia Serikat*, vol. 1 (1913), p.173:¹⁹

memberi pertolongan kepada lid-lid-nya perhimpunan
‘to provide assistance for **members of the organisation**’

memajukan kepandaian dan segala sesuatu yang menjadikan selamat dan senang hidup-nya bumiputera
‘to promote education and all things which bring welfare and happiness in the **life of the indigenous population**’

Already in Bazaar Malay, however, the use of the PC in a PNA was not consistent, and when the attributive relation to be expressed was either clear from the context or deemed irrelevant, the PC could be left out. The following example is from the same source:

memajukan nafsu bumi putera pada hal perdagangan
‘to promote the **enthusiasm of indigenous people** for commerce’

In practice, the strict use of School Malay was only enforced in government schools for the indigenous population and (since 1919) in publications of the Commission for Popular Literature. Schools for the non-indigenous, so-called ‘foreign orientals’ successfully resisted its implementation, and Malay courses and textbooks for Europeans ignored it altogether. It was not even always implemented in official government publications. The following example from a form appended to the 1918 Instructions on the Implementation of the Landleasing Regulations for Surakarta and Yogyakarta illustrates the use of the PC *-nya* in a legal text:²⁰

bahwa jikalau ada perselisihan tentang batas-nya tanah-tanah sewaan, ...
‘that if a dispute should arise over the **boundaries of the lands** leased, ...’

The following analogical example is from an official (government edition) translation of laws pertaining to jurisdiction in Aceh and subject territories (Peratoeran 1913:4):

Pasal 3. Sri Paduka yang dipertuan Besar Gouverneur Generaal menentukan pegawai-pegawai mana yang akan menjalankan pekerjaan magistraat dan hingga mana tiap-tiap bilangan-nya mereka itu.

‘Article 3. His High Excellency the Governor General determines which civil officers shall exercise the duties of magistrate and the extent of **their** respective **competences**’.²¹

Up to around 1919, when the editors of the Commission for Popular Literature began to require more stringent conformity of the language with the standards of School Malay laid down by van Ophuijsen, the Bazaar Malay PNA with *-nya* even found its way into publications of the Commission:

Ini perban dibikin menurut modél-nya tuan Utermohlen, ...
‘This bandage is made according to the **fashion of Mr Utermohlen, ...**’
(M.Pw. Soeardja 1915)²²

¹⁹ These examples seem ‘less Bazaar’ because of the spelling ‘correction’ to modern orthography. The original retained the Bazaar Malay schwa in the ultimate, particularly in the suffix *-ken* (here re-spelled *-kan*).

²⁰ *Besluit* No.39 of January 15, 1918, published in 1919 as No.2029 in *Bijblad op het Staatsblad van Nederlandsch-Indië* 54:180–242. The quoted fragment is from p.224.

²¹ This is presumably what was meant: *bilangan* must be a calque from Dutch *gezag* ‘authority, power’ (from *zeggen* ‘to say’), although Malay *bilangan*, from *bilang* ‘(to) tell’ (*membilang* ‘to count’), actually means ‘number’, in some dialects perhaps also ‘that which is told’.

Kalau kita perhatikan perantaraan kedua macam-nya benda itu yaitu jarum gangsa dan gading ...

'If we consider the mediation of the two **kinds of things**, that is the brass and ivory needle ...' (Rassat 1918:34)

The development of spoken Indonesian was a continuous gradual 'amelioration' of intellectual Bazaar Malay through introduction of ever more elements of the more prestigious School Malay, while that of written Indonesian tended to depart from School Malay by incorporating ever more elements of Bazaar. As a result of its Bazaar pedigree, the PNA with PC *-nya* retains a certain colloquial connotation, and there continues to be a tendency to avoid it in formal or bookish style. Nevertheless, already in the 1930s, in spite of the still widely prevailing orthodox use of School Malay in serious publications, the PNA with *-nya* began to present itself in this genre too. And a sentence like the following by the prominent writer and grammarian Alisjahbana (1935:365) no longer caused a sensation:

Tuan tiada tahu arti-nya hidup

'You do not know the **meaning of life**'

In absence of the PC, the meaning could also be interpreted as 'you do not know the **living meaning**'.

The versatility of the construction, the possibilities its use opened for expressing various abstract relationships, made it an ubiquitous feature of spoken intellectual Bazaar Malay, particularly when educated speakers grappled for adequate Malay equivalents of the Dutch expressions and phrase constructions more familiar to them. An additional factor seems to have been the circumstance that *-nya* as PC also tended to stress the nominal grammatical meaning of the preceding word, particularly in view of the well-known tendency to nominalise expressions of quality and process in intellectual speech. The following example is from Ki Hadjar Dewantara's report to the First Bahasa Indonesia Congress in 1938 (cited from Kridalaksana 1991:240):

Sungguhnya pun rakyat Indonésia itu hingga kini terbagi menjadi beberapa bahasa daérah, akan tetapi mulai dahulu kala hingga sekarang terbukti, seluruh-nya rakyat yang saling berhubungan, suka lah mempergunakan bahasa Melayu sebagai bahasa persatuan.

'Though indeed the Indonesian people is till now divided into [speakers of] several local languages, but beginning from olden times until now it has become evident, that the **entirety of the people** which is in mutual communication, has willed to use Malay as the common language.'

The PNA with *-nya* has meanwhile become a feature of the literary language as well, to which the following example bears testimony:

Ia pun lelah

He was tired now

dan mengerti arti-nya rumah.

and understood the **meaning of home**.'

(W.S. Rendra, *Ada Tilgram Tiba Senja*, 1957)²³

²² In BGD (1915:1).

²³ Quoted from the reprint in Rendra (1971:32–34). The quoted fragment is from p.33.

Nevertheless, in formal language, there still is a tendency to avoid it, and one can easily find books and texts (of a scientific, legal, publicistic, or belletristic nature) in which PNA with the PC does not occur even once. When it occurs, it is often in instances where the PC additionally helps to stress the nominalised meaning of the target when this is a nominalised form of either an adjective (as in the first following sample sentence) or a verb (second sample sentence):

Kelihatan orang-orang itu bekerja dengan tenang, tak merasa wegah karena luasnya tanah yang mesti digarap, tak merasa sungkan karena panasnya hari yang membakar jangat, ...

'You could see the people quietly doing their work, not being discouraged by the **expanse of the land** that had to be tilled, not being deterred by the **heat of the sun** that scorched their hides, ...' (Tjakar, Mencari, 1954)²⁴

Otaknya belum kuasa menganyam rangkaian peristiwa yang serobot-menyerobot mencekam waktu: Jatuh-nya Okinawa, bertekuk lutut-nya Nippon yang padahal sangat dia bangga-banggakan dalam hati-nya, meletus-nya perjuangan kemerdekaan, révolusi yang mengamuki keluarga raja-raja ...

'His mind had not yet the power to align the chain of happenings which were fighting it out, each snatching away the actuality of the day for itself: the **fall of Okinawa**, the **buckling-through-its-knees of Japan** which he had actually been so proud of in his heart, the **breaking out of the struggle** for independence, the revolution which was ravaging the princely families ...' (Partahi H. Sirait, Si Penakut, 1959)²⁵

But of course, whenever there is no editor watching over strict adherence to prescribed style, the colloquial PC *-nya* quickly finds its way into official documents and correspondence even in the least excusable contexts, like in the following example of a standard closing phrase in a summons of the office of the district attorney (*kejaksaan negeri*) of Tasikmalaya, West Java:²⁶

Atas kehadiran-nya Saudara diucapkan terima kasih.

'We thank you for **your presence** [at the indicated time]'

(District Attorney of Tasikmalaya to Agustiana, Jan. 6, 1997)

The example is remarkable because the word *saudara* is functioning as second person personal pronoun, before which the use of *-nya* as PC is not normative and is markedly colloquial.

Personal pronouns, which in Indonesian do not share the paradigm of nouns (see Mahdi 1993:199–200), cannot serve as QNA, so the nature of the attribution is unambiguous even in absence of a PC. Though it does occur, the use of *-nya* before a personal pronoun tends to be stylistically very colloquial even in Bazaar Malay. In anecdotes it may even serve as a means of attaching a folksy tag to a character.

3.3 Dutch-inspired possessive construction with preposition

Certain reserve in the use of possessive constructions with PC has been felt since the 1920s, when Bazaar Malay-speaking Indonesian intellectuals were made particularly

²⁴ Quoted from the reprint in Rosidi (1970:40–58) of the translation (it appeared originally in Sundanese). The quoted fragment is from p.41.

²⁵ Quoted from the reprint in Hoerip (1986:203–215). The quoted fragment is from p.204.

²⁶ The text was broadcasted on the internet on January 27 1997, on INDONESIA-L mailing list moderated by John MacDougall.

conscious of language style through the official contrasting between a 'learned' School Malay and a supposedly 'backward' or at least 'unenlightened' Bazaar. The first alternative means of explicitly specifying possessiveness of the attribution to be taken up in the speech of intellectuals having knowledge of European languages, was the replacement of the implied PNA by a prepositional phrase introduced by *dari* 'from' or *daripada* 'of'.²⁷ It apparently was a mechanical translation of Dutch *van* 'from, of', and its use was particularly widespread in the 1920s and 1930s, for example:

Ledenvergadering umum daripada Perhimpunan Indonesia, yang diadakan pada tanggal 14 Oktober 1928 di Amsterdam,

Mengambil pengetahuan daripada ...

'The general meeting of the Indonesian Association, which was conducted on October 14, 1928, in Amsterdam,

Taking notice of ...' (a resolution of the Perhimpunan Indonesia, 1928)²⁸

... mereka kita ambil sebagai prototipe, contoh dari kaum terpelajar, walaupun saya tahu, bahwa di luar golongan sekolah tinggi ada juga orang yang setimbang kepandaian-nya

'... we take them as the prototype, as an example of the educated, although I know, that outside the group with higher education there must also be people of comparable intelligence' (Amir 1939:149)

The same 'solution', using the preposition *dari* (often spelled *deri* or *derri*), had of course also been occasionally used by Dutch writers and translators. This does not seem to have developed into any sort of 'standard' procedure (there not having been the imperative to avoid Bazaar Malay PNA with PC), but in most instances was probably the fruit of the speaker's or writer's own 'resourcefulness' under understandable conditions of limited mastery of Malay. In the following passage, taken from the *Biang Lala* (a Dutch edited Malay newspaper appearing in Batavia) of January 7, 1869, the use of *dari* (spelled *deri* in the original, in one instance as *dei*: probably through a typographical error) as PC alternates with the Moluccan possessive with *punya*:

Pemeriksaan dari kali kuning di negeri Cina sudah disanggung oleh pertolongan dari satu perhimpunan dari hakim Inggeris, di Asiatic Society. Dia punya pesuruhan, tuan Cooper, sudah datang sampai di batas dari Tibet ...

'The exploration of the Yellow River in China has been made possible through the support of an association of English judges²⁹ in the Asiatic Society. Their agent, Mr Cooper, has come as far as the border of Tibet ...'

The use of the two prepositions has not become a standard means of expressing possession in the modern language, but, like the two constructions with *punya* (original and Moluccan), and also that with *-nya*, it remains in a reserve, which a speaker or writer may revert to when the particular occasion calls for it. To avoid monotonous repetition in a somewhat lengthy listing, the author in the following example makes use of all available constructions: that with

²⁷ *Daripada* occurred occasionally as PC in some Classical Malay manuscripts, but was not explicitly provided for that in School Malay. The proposal to use the preposition *oléh* 'by' to indicate possession, made by van Ophuysen (1910:50), does not seem to have been followed by indigenous speakers or writers.

²⁸ From the text of the resolution published in Perhimpunan Indonesia (1928:327).

²⁹ This is the meaning of *hakim*, but perhaps the writer actually meant *mualim* 'learned person, scholar'.

preposition *dari*, with the PC *punya* (with original 'post-attributing' word order), and with the PC *-nya*:

Beberapa di antara-nya bahkan sampai lama kemudian masih segar di benak saya. Misalkan saja 'Muséum' oléh Asrul Sani, 'Kuli Kontrak' oléh Mochtar Lubis, 'Inem' karangan Pramoedya Ananta Toer, 'Layar Berkembang' tulisan Suparto Brata, lalu 'Umi Kalsum' dari Djamil Suherman, 'Kisah Malti' punya Achdiat K. Mihadja, 'Anak Révolusi'-nya M. Balfas dan 'Lebih Hitam dari Hitam' tulisan Iwan Simatupang.

'Some of these have remained still fresh in my mind even till a long time afterwards, for example Muséum by Asrul Sani, Kuli Kontrak by Mochtar Lubis, Inem composed by Pramoedya Ananta Toer, Layar Berkembang written by Suparto Brata, and further Umi Kalsum from Djamil Suherman, Kisah Malti of Achdiat K. Mihadja, M. Balfas's Anak Révolusi, and Lebih Hitam dari Hitam written by Iwan Simatupang.' (Hoerip 1985:vii)

In general, the officially recommended treatment is not to use *-nya* as PC except in instances or contexts in which its implementation is felt necessary to remove uncertainties or avoid ambiguity, and the same also holds for the use of the preposition *dari* pada 'of' for expression of possession (see Badudu 1989:144). With regard to the latter, however, it should probably also be noted that it does not necessarily express possession, but that *rumah dari* pada batu 'a house of stone' refers to nothing other than *rumah batu* 'a stone house', which is quite different from *rumah-nya batu* 'a stone's house'.

4 The pragmatics around the use of PNA, QNA and UNA

It has already been mentioned that in consequence of the optionality of the use of the PC in a PNA in Indonesian, a nominal attribute not mediated by a PC could either be a PNA or a QNA. There are, however, a number of circumstances that may reveal the actually implied nature of attribution.

In the absence of contextual or 'common-sense' indications of the nature of the attribute, the attribution must be considered either ambiguous, or unspecific. The former may answer more to an analytical theoretical approach, but it is the latter, in my opinion, which more closely characterises the pragmatics involved. Classical Malay literature, in which neither *-nya* nor another PC was normally used, evolved in the decadent feudal atmosphere of Late Medieval and even later Malay courts, for which perhaps anything worthy of being put down in writing had either to be above the confining concreteness and profane materialism of the real world, or be brought into a form more fitting for lofty poetic style. A far-reaching degree of normativism in the choice of canonical attributes, metaphors, and similes (e.g. a princess would be 'beautiful as a rose' by force of being a princess, regardless of actual appearance) seems to have contributed further to the redundancy of means to express the specific relation of attribution implied, i.e. whether PNA or QNA.

In modern language, the use of effective UNA as a rule comprises instances in which the distinction between PNA and QNA may be considered irrelevant. For example:

kaki kursi ini dibuat dari kaki méja
 foot chair Dct be-made from foot table
 'This chair's leg is made from a table leg'

Frequently, qualitative attribution is implied by circumstantial wisdom in instances in which the nature of attribution would theoretically seem to be unspecific, for example in:

kamar guru
'teachers' room' (not 'a teacher's room')

kantor polisi
'police office' (not 'a policeman's office')

In such cases, the explicit means of expression already referred to above will usually be expected when the alternative possessive attribution is implied (see below). Often, however, transformation to PNA would lead to such semantically exotic expressions that circumstantial knowledge quite unambiguously identifies the attribution as QNA. This is particularly true when the attribute is a noun denoting some material or substance serving as characterisation of the target:

rumah batu
'stone house' (not 'house belonging to a stone')

mesin uap
'steam engine' (not 'machine belonging to steam')

tenaga listrik
'electric energy' (not 'the energy of electricity')

Qualitative attribution is also implicit in a large number of fixed expressions:

wakil présidén
deputy president
'vice-president' (not 'the president's deputy')

lemari és
cupboard ice
'refrigerator' (not 'the ice's cupboard')

burung unta
bird camel
'ostrich' (not 'the bird belonging to the camel')

Here too, explicit means would be needed in the unlikely occasion that one should wish to express the alternative possessive attribution.

Finally, there is a subclass of nouns in Indonesian which can only be used as QNA or circumstantial complement (the latter with verbs and adjectives as target), which I have called 'anominal' (Mahdi 1993:191). When they are to be used in positions other than that of QNA, an 'empty' target of qualitative attribution has to be placed before them, the meaning of which is redundant (being already expressed by the anominal noun itself). These are names of countries, rivers, mountains, islands, dates, weekdays, months, years, fish, snakes, birds, and trees. The respective 'empty' targets are words meaning 'country', 'river', etc. In absence of such an empty target, the attribute is always a QNA:

kuda Nil
horse Nile
'hippopotamus'

pasar *Senin*
 market Monday
 'Monday market'

minyak kayuputih
 oil cajeput
 'cajeput oil'

In possessive attribution, with or without PC, the corresponding 'empty' target of qualitative attribution then serves as the actual PNA:

arus sungai Nil
 current river Nile
 'current of the Nile'

pagi -nya hari Senin
 morning PC day Monday
 'the morning of Monday'

daun pohon kayuputih
 leaf tree cajeput
 'leaf of the cajeput tree'

The former and latter of the three last glosses at the same time serve as illustrations of the instance when the relationship between the denotata of the target and the attribute would be readily perceived by circumstantial wisdom as corresponding to that expressed in possessive attribution even in absence of a PC. Compare also:

potlot guru
 pencil teacher
 'the teacher's pencil'

anggota organisasi
 member organisation
 'member of the organisation'

isteri direktur
 wife director
 'wife of the director'

5 Disambiguating to PNA

The role of the language as vehicle of cultural renovation in the process of gaining and consolidating national independence called for greater precision of formulation. This led to increased recourse to various means for overcoming the ambiguity in nominal attribution. The matter of course was of particular urgency in the use of the language in education, where one obviously had to be able to differentiate, for example, between 'scientific definition' and 'definition of science'. However, the problem was more acute in the officially prescribed language taught in the schools, which was being developed on the base of School Malay, than in the spoken language which grew out of Bazaar Malay, the latter already featuring a ready means to specify possessiveness explicitly, the PC *nya*. The introduction of the same means into the written language, as already indicated above, of course suggested itself:

kamar-nya guru 'the teacher's room'
kantor-nya polisi 'office of the police, policeman's office'

Alternatively, as already discussed above, one has the constructions with *punya* and the prepositions at one's disposal.

A more subtle means of specifying possessive attribution derives from a particularity in the syntagmatics of the Indonesian noun, on the base of which I have proposed to distinguish between a 'nominal' form of the noun and a homonymic 'participial' form, the latter only occurring in the functions of QNA and circumstantial complement (Mahdi 1993:183, 187). Rigid constraints exist in the realisation of syntactic valencies characteristic of the noun, most of which being actually valencies not of the noun in general, but of its 'nominal' form. The realisation of one of these valencies in the case of a noun in the 'participial' form immediately transforms it into the 'nominal' form. As a noun serving as QNA is in the first-mentioned form, and that serving as PNA is in the latter, realisation of any of these valencies immediately identifies the attribution as a possessive one.

One of the critical valencies is the combination with a preceding numeral group consisting of a numeral and, optionally, a classifier or a unit of measure. When the nominal attribute is a count noun, inserting a group consisting of the clitic *se-* 'one' and a classifier suffices to immediately establish it as PNA. For inanimates, the word *suatu* 'a, one', historically deriving from such a group (< *se-watu* < **sa-* 'one' + **Batu* 'stone')³⁰ also does the trick:

pintu suatu rumah
 door a house
 'door of a house'

kamar se- orang guru
 room one Cl teacher
 'room of a teacher'

kantor se- orang polisi
 office one Cl police
 'office of a policeman'

cinta se- orang ibu
 love one Cl mother
 'love of a mother'

Another critical valency was actually already discussed above in conjunction with the use of *dari* and *daripada*, and that is the capability of combining with a preceding preposition, which is likewise impossible for a noun in the 'participial' form.

A noun in the 'participial' form can also not have a possessive attribute. Therefore, if a QNA is immediately followed by such an attribute, the latter cannot refer to the noun serving as QNA, but must aim at the latter's target. The opposite interpretation would immediately transform the QNA into a PNA. Compare:

³⁰ See Gerth van Wijk (1909:198–199). The original compound apparently dates back to the time when the sound law **aBa* > *awa* was still operative in (pre-)Malay (see Adelaar 1985:85–86). *Suatu* has the doublet *satu* 'one' exhibiting loss of the antepenultimate vowel that sometimes occurred in often-used words (compare *dulu* 'earlier, before, previously', beside *dahulu* < **Di* 'at' + **qulu* 'head'; see Adelaar 1985:61, 63).

rumah batu kami
 house stone we
 'our stone house'

Here, *rumah* is the target of the QNA *batu* as well as of the possessive attribute *kami*. If one assumes *kami* to be aimed at *batu*, this latter would automatically be transformed into the 'nominal' form which cannot be a QNA, but must in this context be a PNA of *rumah*. The phrase would then translate as 'our stone's house' which, being unrealistic, is eliminated by circumstantial wisdom. When, however, the latter grammatical interpretation is contextually or circumstantially the preferred or more realistic one, then we have a disambiguation of the (first) attribute to PNA:

pintu rumah saya
 door house me
 'the door of my house'

cinta ibu kami
 love mother we
 'our mother's love'

Although a noun in the 'participial' form cannot be the target of a possessive attribute, it can be that of a qualitative attribute which may be expressed by a noun, an adjective, or some other word forms:

arca batu pualam
 statue stone marble
 'a marble statue'

pangkat letnan muda
 rank lieutenant young
 'the rank of junior lieutenant'

It was already noted above that Indonesian personal pronouns do not share the same morphological paradigm with nouns. Instead, they form a distinct hyperclass of words together with proper names, and a class of words I have called 'relational pro-names', being 'pronominalised' kinship and titular terms. As a result of this pronominalisation, they display properties similar to those of personal pronouns and proper names (Mahdi 1993:199). It is common to all three word classes that they do not have a 'participial' form and thus cannot serve as QNA. An attribute solely consisting of any one word of these three classes is thus necessarily possessive:

rumah kami
 house we
 'our house'

rumus Einstein
 formula Einstein
 'Einstein's formula'

kantor Tuan
 office <Mister>
 'your office'

This means that any context leading to the identification of an attribute as a member of one of these three classes automatically disambiguates the attribution to a possessive one. The 'relational pro-names' have a full and an abbreviated article form in their paradigm. These forms function like the two personal articles *si* (neutral or familiar) and *sang* (honorific) in that they identify a following word as a proper name or its equivalent. Whenever an attribute is preceded by either an article form or a personal article (both terms will be abbreviated to 'Art'), it can only be a possessive attribute:

pendapat si penulis
 opinion Art writer
 'opinion of the writer'

penaikan Sang Dwiwarna
 the-raising Art Bicolour
 'the hoisting of the Bicolour'³¹

kantor Pak Polisi
 office Art police
 'the policeman's office'

For 'substantive' nouns, i.e. not proper names or related word classes, there seems to be a more general rule, and that is that the 'participial' form of a noun must immediately follow the noun it is the attribute of, or the verb or adjective which it serves as circumstantial complement. Thus, any other word inserted between a nominal attribute and the target would have a similar effect of disambiguating to possessive attribution.

6 Disambiguating to QNA

It is much more difficult to specify explicitly the nature of a nominal attribute as being qualitative, than to establish its being possessive. The 'participial' form of the noun does not have any syntactic valencies, not shared by the 'nominal' form. Some rather 'artificial' steps therefore have to be taken, when one wishes to make the qualitative nature of the attribution explicit. When an abstract noun serves as attribute, it is by circumstantial wisdom less likely to be a PNA, and thus more likely to be a QNA, than in the instance of a concrete noun. In Indonesian, abstract nouns can be formed by circumfixation of *ke-...-an* to verbs, adjectives, and nouns, for example:

<i>datang</i> 'come'	—	<i>kedatangan</i> 'arrival'
<i>kaya</i> 'rich'	—	<i>kekayaan</i> 'wealth'
<i>ibu</i> 'mother'	—	<i>keibuan</i> 'motherliness, motherhood'
<i>negara</i> 'state'	—	<i>kenegaraan</i> 'statehood, stateliness'
<i>raja</i> 'king'	—	<i>kerajaan</i> 'kingdom, kingship'

Replacement of the basic noun by the respective derived noun tends to have the effect of implying or suggesting that the attribute is a QNA. The parallel existence of the two competing expressions has the additional effect of mutually excluding the respective less

³¹ The Indonesian red-and-white national flag.

likely nature of attribution implied. One always has in the back of one's mind that if the speaker or writer meant the other nature of attribution, he/she would have used the corresponding other expression. In this way the tendency arises to perceive the basic noun as PNA, and the corresponding derived abstract noun as QNA:

<i>cinta ibu</i> 'a mother's love'	—	<i>cinta keibuan</i> 'motherly love'
<i>tamu negara</i> 'guest of the state'	—	<i>tamu kenegaraan</i> 'state guest'
<i>tanda raja</i> 'sign of a king'	—	<i>tanda kerajaan</i> 'royal insignia', but also 'sign of royalty'

As the latter example demonstrates, however, the apposition is not absolute, and the respective 'less likely' nature of attribution is actually never totally excluded.

Alternatively one is left to take recourse to a circumscribing relative clause, typically introduced by *yang* and having a verb like *bersifat* 'have the quality of' as predicate. This would, however, no longer be a qualitative attribute. A qualitative attribute as a means to qualify a noun can be retained, in that an adjective is used in place of a QNA. Of course, this solution too no longer belongs strictly within the scope delineated by the title of this paper. However, besides offering an alternative means for that which one intended to express by the QNA, it also involves some interesting points in language reform and maintenance policy. Moreover, it serves to underline the difference between an adjective and a noun acting as qualitative attribute.

Malay does not have an original means of deriving adjectives from nouns. And although several such means borrowed from other languages have been taken up, there had been prolonged official resistance against their 'legalisation'. Among language policy officials and the Commission editors in charge of guarding the purity of School Malay there seems to have been a tendency to regard these derivational means as a feature foreign to the very nature of Malay and as being superfluous for the development of this literary language tradition. The question of the significance of distinguishing qualitative from possessive attribution was already touched upon above. The notion that the derivational feature was foreign to the nature of Malay, furthermore, took no account of the development of Malay in the last centuries prior to colonial rule.

As a result of conversion to Islam, Malay experienced profound influences from Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani.³² Already since the beginnings of Classical Malay, a number of lexical items were borrowed twice, as noun in the nominative, and either as noun in the genitive or as derived adjective. These latter retained their attributive or adjectival grammatical meanings in Malay.³³ These are firstly some geographical names (which, unlike personal proper names, are included among the nouns in Malay):

³² I use the term Hindustani to refer to both Hindi and Urdu, or to their former common precursor.

³³ Adjectival derivations borrowed later, during the colonial period via Bazaar Malay, on the other hand, often obtained a nominal grammatical meaning, so that, for example, the Portuguese adjectives *inglês* and *francês* are reflected as (*negeri*) *Inggeris* 'England, English' (via a substandard or Creole Portuguese cognate) and (*negeri*) *Perancis* 'France, French' respectively (the latter still attested as *Peransis* in mid-nineteenth century usage). For the former, the corresponding noun *Inglitir* 'England' (also from the Portuguese) is attested for seventeenth century High Malay. In nineteenth century Bazaar Malay, meanwhile, we even find (*negeri*) *Prasman* (from Dutch *fransman* 'Frenchman') for 'France, French' (Mahdi in preparation).

<i>Kabul</i> 'Kabul'	→	<i>nasi kebuli</i> 'pilaff (Kabul rice)'
<i>Korasan</i> 'Khorasan'	→	<i>besi karsani</i> 'good quality iron (Khorasan iron)'
<i>Rum</i> 'Rome'	→	<i>surat rumi</i> 'Latin script'
<i>Surat</i> 'Surat (town in India)'	→	<i>itik surati</i> 'Manila duck (Surat duck)'

Similar noun/adjective pairs for non-geographical words were also acquired from Arabic:

<i>asas</i> 'basis'	→	<i>asasi</i> 'basic' ³⁴
<i>insan</i> 'man'	→	<i>insani</i> 'human, pertaining to mankind'
<i>jisim</i> 'body'	→	<i>jasmani</i> 'physical'
<i>roh</i> 'soul'	→	<i>rohani</i> 'spiritual'
<i>unsur</i> 'element'	→	<i>unsuri</i> 'elementary'
<i>hakékat</i> 'essence'	→	<i>hakiki</i> 'essential'
<i>dunia</i> 'world'	→	<i>duniawi</i> 'worldly'
<i>alam</i> 'nature'	→	<i>alamiah</i> 'natural'
<i>ilmu</i> 'science, art'	→	<i>ilmiah</i> 'scientific'

Forms ending in *-i* or *-wi* (the latter applies when the root morph ends in an *a*) reflect the Arabic masculine form of the adjective, those in *-iah* the feminine. I have also included some examples, in which the historical morphophonology is somewhat less transparent (Arabic is a vowel-intercalating language), to illustrate the complexity of the feature when seen from the Malay end.³⁵

Since the implementation of Indonesian as official language and thus also as language of education and of technical literature, the use of derived adjectives has increased tremendously, and the paradigm has become quite productive. It has thus also been applied to nouns of non-Arabic origin.³⁶

<i>manusia</i> 'human being'	→	<i>manusiawi</i> 'human, humane'
<i>Roma</i> 'Rome'	→	<i>Romawi</i> 'Roman'

The former is from Sanskrit, the latter from Latin.

The persistent tradition inherited from School Malay language policy, to regard these derivations as 'non-orthodox', initially had the effect that the speaking public coined derived adjectives spontaneously, without scholarly guidance. Predictably this sometimes led to redundant and somewhat irregular forms, such as:

<i>ilmu</i> 'science'	→	<i>ilmiawi</i> 'scientific'
-----------------------	---	-----------------------------

This had led Badudu (1983:73–79) to provide some guidelines in a textbook which was subsequently endorsed for use in school instruction since October 1984.

An important undertaking in the accommodation of Indonesian to its new role as official language was the coining of technical terms. But apparently under the influence of patriotic

³⁴ These are now often replaced by the hyper-Arabisms *azas/azasi*.

³⁵ As a consequence of this circumstance, derivations are often not recognised as such, e.g. *anasir* '(political) elements', and *arwah* 'spirits (of ancestors)', representing in the donor language the plural forms of the etyma of *unsur* 'element' and *roh* 'soul' respectively.

³⁶ An isolated instance of this application is attested at the beginning of this century. Thus, *Hindiawi* seems to have appeared in the name of a newspaper as a Malay match to Dutch *Indisch(e)*. It is derived from Malay *Hindia*, which corresponds to Dutch *Indië* 'the Indies' and is of Indic origin.

sentiments in combination with puristic traditions of School Malay, many names of scientific disciplines, previously borrowed into the spoken language from Dutch, were replaced by terms felt to be more congruent with an oriental tradition of the language. In practice, this meant replacing Graeco-Latin morphemes by Sanskrit, Arabic, Persian, Javanese, and original Malay ones, or creating calques of the Dutch terms with means provided from these Asian source languages.

In view of the initial reservations of the officials towards adjective derivation, reflecting the same School Malay influence, the replacement of the terms took no account of the need for such derivation. Consequently, most of the original Graeco-Latin nominal terms were replaced by etymologically oriental counterparts, but the corresponding adjectives featuring the Dutch derivational suffix, for which a more and more informed speaking and writing public found steadily increasing use, remained unreplaced. In the following examples, the dash separates semantic doublets, the original Indonesian-Malay Graeco-Latin term to the left, its 'oriental' replacement to the right, whereas the arrow points at the adjectival form derived from the former:³⁷

<i>astronomi</i>	—	<i>ilmu falak</i> 'astronomy'	→	<i>astronomis</i> 'astronomical'
<i>biologi</i>	—	<i>ilmu hayat</i> 'biology'	→	<i>biologis</i> 'biological'
<i>géografi</i>	—	<i>ilmu bumi</i> 'geography'	→	<i>géografis</i> 'geographical'
<i>géométri</i>	—	<i>ilmu ukur</i> 'geometry'	→	<i>géométris</i> 'geometrical'

The productive use of the 'oriental' term as qualitative attribute is only possible in some exceptional instances, for example:

<i>dérétan</i>	<i>ukur</i>	'geometrical progression (mathematical term)'
row	<measure>	

Strictly speaking, it is not an example of a QNA, because *ukur* is not a noun but an attributive basic form of the verb *mengukur* 'measure'.

It might be worthwhile to consider either retaining the nominal Graeco-Latin term as well as the adjectival one, or to contract the 'oriental' phrase replacing the former by a compound word, which would permit creating adjectives by means of the suffix *-i* or *-iah*. One could then have for example **ilmuhayati* 'biological', **ilmubumiah* 'geographical', etc.

The superseding of Dutch by English as the chief source of 'European' linguistic influence during the last decades under initial reservations of language officials towards adjective derivation led to the spontaneous formation of two parallel series of derived adjectives, differing from each other in that one series displays adjectival suffixes taken from Dutch, whereas the other features such suffixes from English.³⁸ In the following examples, the

³⁷ Only where a European term was recognised as reflex of an originally Arabic form, i.e. in the case of 'algebra', did Indonesian apparently retain the direct loan from Arabic (*aljabar*) from the very start, rather than first borrowing the European term and subsequently replacing it by a direct loan from Arabic. Consequently, a corresponding adjective of European provenance is not readily available in the language. In the analogical example, in which, however, the Arabic etymon was a loan from Greek, *filisafat* 'philosophy' (compare *filisuf* 'philosopher'), we do find the expected European loan for the corresponding adjective: *filosofis* 'philosophical'.

³⁸ This process has not, however, stopped another tendency already existing for some time, which is to replace the English suffix in a word borrowed from that language by its Dutch cognate, thereby coining terms not always having a cognate in Dutch. One very recent example, demonstrating that this 're-derivational borrowing' still is productive, is *solusi* 'solution (of a problem)' (as against *larutan* 'solution [dispersed in a solvent]'). The suffix *-si* reflects Dutch *-tie*, being the Dutch cognate of English *-tion*, both borrowed from Latin *-tio(n)*.

Dutch-style derivation is in the second column from the left, the English-inspired one in the third:

<i>individu</i>	→	<i>individuil</i>	—	<i>individual</i>	‘individual (adj.)’
<i>rasio</i>	→	<i>rasionil</i>	—	<i>rasional</i>	‘rational’
<i>tradisi</i>	→	<i>tradisionil</i>	—	<i>tradisional</i>	‘traditional’
<i>gramatika</i>	→	<i>gramatis</i>	—	<i>gramatikal</i>	‘grammatic(al)’
<i>tipe</i>	→	<i>tipis</i>	—	<i>tipikal</i>	‘typical’
<i>mékanika</i>	→	<i>mékanis</i>	—	<i>mékanik</i>	‘mechanic(al)’
<i>période</i>	→	<i>périodis</i>	—	<i>périodik</i>	‘periodic’

Since the 1980s, the official recommendation is generally to use forms with *-al* exclusively (see, for example, Moeliono et al. 1989:1051), mainly because this led to more morphophonological transparency in the context of the already existing means of deriving the corresponding abstract noun, as can be seen from the following example:³⁹

formil — *formal* ‘formal’ → *formalitas* ‘formality’

The adjectival derivation with *-il* is now only retained when the doublets differ in meaning, as in the following examples taken from Badudu (1983:78), where *-il* marks adjectives and *-al* marks nouns:

moril ‘moral (ethical)’ — *moral* ‘morale (esprit)’
idiil ‘ideal (conceptual, imaginary)’ — *idéal* ‘ideal (model, perfect)’

For the forms in the left column, the recommended spelling given in Moeliono et al. (1989:1051) is even *morél* and *idiél* respectively (which better reflects the underlying phonemics).

With regard to doublets with *-is* from Dutch *-isch* and *-ik(al)* from English *-ic(al)*, the recommended treatment is to prefer *-is* to *-ikal*, but *-ik* to *-is*, except in some cases in which the opposite has become ingrained in the language (see Badudu 1986:122–123).⁴⁰

Meanwhile, official handling of the problem has in general become more flexible, and the use of indigenous or oriental replacements is no longer always regarded preferable to that of the originally borrowed European term. In the following examples, the tolerated synonym is on the left, and the corresponding recommended term is on the right:⁴¹

<i>absorb</i>	<i>serap</i>	‘absorb’
<i>aksélerasi</i>	<i>percepatan</i>	‘acceleration’
<i>diaméter</i>	<i>garis tengah</i>	‘diameter’
<i>kekerapan</i>	<i>frékuénsi</i>	‘frequency’
<i>nisbi</i>	<i>relatif</i>	‘relative’
<i>téperatur</i>	<i>suhu</i>	‘temperature’

Note that in two of the examples, the European loan is the recommended term.

³⁹ The for Indonesian-Malay euphony somewhat ungainly suffix *-itét*, reflecting Dutch *-iteit* (corresponding to English *-ity*), was replaced in the mid 1950s by *-itas*, which was taken directly from the Latin (apparently at the initiative of Mohammad Yamin).

⁴⁰ The suffix *-is* is also retained when it reflects Dutch or English *-ist*, as in *idéalis* ‘idealist’.

⁴¹ The examples are taken from the recommendation of the Minister of Education and Culture appended to the standard dictionary of Moeliono et al. (1989:1045).

7 Conclusions

With regard to the expression of possession and of qualitative attribution, Indonesian presents a somewhat unsystematic picture, reflecting the complex historical developments which led up to the present language situation. Instead of having some standard morphological or syntactic procedure for distinguishing possessive and qualitative nominal attribution, the language provides a number of borrowed, in part stylistically non-neutral means for specifying the nature of such attribution, and otherwise maintains ambiguity of the latter as the stylistically neutral normal state.

To specifically indicate that a nominal attribute expresses possession, one has the choice of the use of the Bazaar Malay copula *-nya* of Javanese origin, the Moluccan Malay construction using *punya* as copula, or the preposition *dari* or *dari pada* by analogy to the use of *van* in Dutch. To stress that qualitative attribution is implied, on the other hand, one has either to take recourse to using the corresponding abstract derivation of the noun as attribute, in which case the disambiguation is not absolute, or to replacing the noun with an adjective which may be formed from it, using means of derivation originating ultimately either from Arabic or from Latin. In the latter instance, the borrowing of the involved affixes were usually mediated either by Dutch or by English.

Besides going into the pragmatics of the use of these various means, the foregoing discussion repeatedly touched upon aspects of interaction between official language policy and spontaneous usage by the language community. The language situation as regards the use of Malay before World War II was characterised on one side by stringent enforcement of an obsolete late-medieval literary language tradition in publications of the Commission for Indigenous Popular Literature and in school language classes. On the other side, versions of Bazaar Malay were used in actual daily conversation as well as in political and publicist discourse. Furthermore, the indigenous elite was schooled in Dutch rather than in Malay, and therefore in the main only literate in the former (except teachers that had been trained to teach in Malay schools). Although there has been a deliberate tendency towards convergence, in that the Bazaar Malay of educated speakers began incorporating features of the standard language since the 1880s (Mahdi in preparation), and a renovated language standard incorporating features of the actually spoken language began to be developed since the early 1930s, there still remains a considerable gap between the standard language and that which is actually spoken.

The main problem seems to have been that language politicians were initially unwilling, and subsequently too slow in adapting the language standard to the actual needs of contemporary conditions. Under these circumstances, the language community spontaneously developed the means of expression which the economic, social, and cultural development made necessary. In this, it made full use of resources that had been made available through the multiplicity of cultural contacts the country had experienced in the past. Acquisitions from languages of both oriental and western foreign cultures have been indiscriminately utilised, as also appropriations from a variety of domestic sources. Language policy has apparently learned from this experience, and a newer trend which strives to introduce a certain guidance and order in the spontaneous development, rather than resisting it, seems indeed to represent a more productive attitude.

References

- Adelaar, K.A., 1985, Proto-Malay, the reconstruction of its phonology and parts of its lexicon and morphology. Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.
- Alisjahbana, Soetan Takdir, 1935, 'Kekatajauan' yang ni'mat, *Poedjangga Baroe* 2:363–366.
- Amir, Muhammad, 1939, Sampai dimana 'kemadjoean' kita?, *Poedjangga Baroe* 6:125–131, 149–155.
- Anwar, Chairil, 1949, *Kerikil tadjam dan jang terampas dan jang putus*. Djakarta: Pustaka Rakjat.
- Badudu, J.S., 1983, *Inilah Bahasa Indonesia yang benar*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- 1986, *Inilah Bahasa Indonesia yang benar II*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- 1989, *Inilah Bahasa Indonesia yang benar III*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable, 1978 [1982], *A history of the English language*. Third edition. London/Boston/Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- [BGD — Burgerlijke Geneeskundige Dienst], 1915, *Pertolongan jang pertama pada waktou ketjelakaän, dipindahkan dari Bahasa Belanda olèh M.Pw. Soeardja*, Serie uitgaven door bemiddeling der Commissie voor de Volkslectuur No.167. Betawi: Ruygrok.
- Boetzelaer, Asperen van and C.W. Th. van Dubbeldam, 1941, De geschiedenis van de Maleische bijbelvertaling in Nederlandsch-Indië, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* 100:27–48.
- Bradshaw, Joel, 1982, Genitives and relatives in Numbami: a New Guinea Austronesian language. In Rainer Carle, Martina Heinschke, Peter W. Pink, Christel Rost and Karen Stadlander, eds *Gava', Studies in Austronesian Languages and Cultures*, Veröffentlichungen des Seminars für Indonesische und Südseesprachen der Universität Hamburg 17, 123–139. Berlin: Dieter Reimer.
- Brandes, Jan Lourens Andries, 1884, *Bijdrage tot de vergelijkende klankleer der Westersche Afdeeling van de Maleisch-Polynesische Taalfamilie*. Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. Utrecht: P.W. van de Weijer.
- Brouwerius, Daniel, 1668, *Testamento Barou, Attau Segalla Kitab derri Tuan cami Jesu Christo pounja Cauwoul Barou*. Amsterdam: Paulus Matthéus [Matthyszoon].
- Clercq, F.S.A. de, 1894, Proeve eener briefwisseling met inlandsche hoofden ten tijde der Oostindische Compagnie. In anon., ed., *Feestbundel van taal-, letter-, geschied- en aardrijkskundige bijdragen ter gelegenheid van zijn tachtigsten geboortedag aan Dr. P.J. Veth oud-hoogleraar door eenige vrienden en oud-leerlingen aangeboden*, 51–54. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Collins, James T., 1980, *Ambonese Malay and creolization theory*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia.
- 1983, Syntactic change in Ambonese Malay: the possessive construction. In James T. Collins, ed. *Studies in Malay dialects*, Part II, NUSA 17, 28–41. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Atma Jaya.
- Dempwolff, Otto, 1941, *Einführung in die malaiische Sprache*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen, Heft 22. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer/Hamburg: Friedrichsen, de Gruyter.

- Dix Grimes, Barbara, 1991, The development and use of Ambonese Malay. In H. Steinhauer, ed. *Papers in Austronesian linguistics No. 1*, 83–123. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Francillon, Gérard, 1988, Sloup/Selup: Le mot et la chose, *Travaux du LAPMO* (Laboratoire d'Anthropologie et de Préhistoire de la Méditerranée Occidentale) 1988:243–247.
- Francis, G., 1892, *Atoeran Soerat-soerat, terisi bebrapa tjonto soerat-soerat kiriman dan perdjandjian dan permoehoenan dan laen-laen sebageinja, jang bergoena pada sekalian orang jang bitjara bahasa Melajoe di Hindia-Olanda*. Batavia: Albrecht and Rusche.
- Gerth van Wijk, D., 1909, *Spraakleer der Maleische taal*. 3e druk. Batavia: G. Kolff (1e druk 1889).
- Gibson-Hill, C.A., 1949, Cargo boats of the east coast of Malaya, *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 22(3):106–125.
- 1950, The Indonesian trading boats reaching Singapore. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 23(1):108–138.
- Groeneveldt, W.P., 1877 [1880], Notes on the Malay Archipelago and Malacca. Compiled from Chinese Sources. *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 33/1.1. Batavia: W. Bruining/The Hague: M. Nijhoff.
- Honey, P.J., 1956, Word classes in Vietnamese. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 18(3):534–544.
- Hoerip, Satyagraha, 1985, Kata pengantar. In Satyagraha Hoerip, ed. *Cerita pendek Indonesia I*, vii–xxi. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Hoerip, Satyagraha, ed., 1986, *Cerita pendek Indonesia II*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Kanski, P. and P. Kaspruch, 1931, Die indonesisch-melanesischen Übergangssprachen auf den Kleinen Molukken, *Anthropos* 26:883–890.
- Kridalaksana, Harimurti, 1991, Kongres Bahasa Indonesia I (1938) dan Kongres Bahasa Indonesia II (1954). In Harimurti Kridalaksana, ed. *Masa Lampau Bahasa Indonesia: Sebuah Bunga Rampai*, Seri ILDEP, 235–269. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Mahdi, Waruno, 1993, Distinguishing homonymic word forms in Indonesian. In Ger P. Reesink, ed. *Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics*, Semaian 11, 181–216. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië.
- in preparation, High and Low Malay in the formation of Indonesian.
- Moeliono, Anton M. et al., 1989, *Kamus besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Balai Pustaka No. 3658, cet. ke-2. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Mookerji, Radhakumud, 1912, *Indian shipping. A history of the sea-borne trade and maritime activity of the Indians from the earliest times*. Bombay/Calcutta/London/New York: Longmans/Green.
- Ophuijsen, Ch. A. van, 1910, *Maleische spraakkunst*. Leiden: S.C. van Doesburgh.
- [Peratoeran], 1913, *Peratoeran dari segala hal hakim dan hoekoeman jang terpakai di dalam tanah 'Atjeh dan Taäloek Djadjahannja'* (Staatsblad 1909 No. 207, 1909 No. 381 and 1910 No.352). Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Perhimpoean Indonesia, 1928, Motie daripada Perhimpoean Indonesia tentang keadaän-keadaän di Digoel-Oedik, *Soeloeh Indonesia Moeda* 1:327–328.
- Rassat, S.M., 1918, *Serba djenis peroesahaan di-Europa*, Serie uitgaven door bemiddeling der Commissie voor de Volkslectuur No.204. Betawi: Pertjetakan Gouvernement.
- Rendra, W.S., 1971, *Ballada Orang-orang tertjinta*. Djakarta: Pustaka Jaya.

- Rosidi, Ajip, ed., 1970, *Dua orang dukun dan tjerpen2 Sunda lainnja*. Djakarta: Budaja Djaja
- Simon, H.F., 1953, Two substantival complexes in Standard Chinese. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 15(2):327–355.
- Valentyn, Francois, 1698, *Deure der Waarhyd, voor 't ooge der Christen-wereld geopend*, [.....]. Dordregt: Cornelis Willegaarts.
- Wernedly, George Henrik, 1736, *Maleische spraakkunst, uit de eige schriften der Maleiers opgemaakt*: [.....]. Amsterdam.
- Wiltens, Caspar and Sebastianus Danckaerts, 1623, *Vocabularium, ofte Woort-Boeck, naer ordre van den Alphabet int 't Duytsch-Maleysch, ende Maleysch-Duytsch*. 's-Gravenhaghe: Hillebrant Jacobsszoon van Wouw.

