Grammatical Properties of the Indonesian Language as a Case Marker

| Correspondence: | Beslina Afriani Siagian <beslinasiagian@uhn.ac.id> | University of HKBP Nommensen, Indonesia. |
| | Mulyadi <mulyadi@usu.ac.id> | University of Sumatra Utara, Indonesia. |

Abstract

The case marker in Indonesian is frequently discussed in typological linguistic scope. This study discussed the grammatical properties that mark cases in Indonesian. The data of this study was obtained from oral and written sources. The oral data was acquired based on the intuition of the researcher as an active speaker, so that the data was displayed without reference and the analysis was carried out using the introspective-intuitive technique. Meanwhile, the written data was obtained from various printed media. The study results showed that grammatical properties, such as affixes, prepositions, pronouns, correspondence, and word order, were marked in the case of the Indonesian language.

Keywords: Indonesian Language, the Case Markers, the Grammatical Properties, Typology

1. Introduction

"To what language X is allied?" This starts the question of discussing typology studies as well as being the essence of the birth of the scope. The typology studies are based on two important presuppositions, and they are: a) it is assumed that languages can be compared with each other according to their structure; and b) language typology presupposes that there are differences between languages (Comrie in Artawa and Ketut WP, 2020). That's why the experts are trying to analyze and map languages with a natural descriptive way of working. Based on the previous studies, it is stated that language can be typed based on the existing cases. The type is classified into three parts, namely: the accusative type, the ergative type, and the mixed type.

A language that is classified as an accusative type is named an accusative typology. The parameter placed S (Subject) in the intransitive clause is treated grammatically the same as the argument A (as Agent) in the transitive clause, and differently to P (as patient) in the transitive clause. Language is an accusative type and has two types of passive diathesis: passive di- and passive pronominal (Chung 1976; Verhaar 1977; Verhaar, 1992). Furthermore, a language with an ergative alliance system is classified to be an ergative typological language. The parameter is inversely correlated to the accusative, as S is treated the same as P, and a different treatment is given to A. Finally, a language is said to be an active language if its grammatical alliance system shows that a group of S is behaving the same as A (Sa) and a group of S behaving the same as P (Sp) in the same language is said to be an active language. The three types simultaneously show similarities in these languages grammatically (see Comrie, 1978; Dixon, 1994; Artawa, 2000).

The typology of languages is based on the aspects of grammatical behavior that are, by some experts, referred to as grammatical typology. This mention is made to distinguish it from the term of functional typology, which bases the typology of languages on the basis of pragmatic functions or the functions of language as a tool of communication. Thus, in its development, linguistic typology and the typology of languages can be divided into grammatical and functional typologies (Givon, 1984, 1990; Jufrizal, 2008; Artawa, 2005). The typology of languages, the level of syntax, is related to the grammatical alliance system.

The Indonesian language is derived from the Austronesian language. The Austronesian language family is the 5th largest language family based on the number of native speakers and 2nd in terms of the number of languages of a language family (Sukardi, Budiarsa & Made, 2017). According to Soeparno (2002, p. 33), Indonesian is a language in which word structure is formed by combining the main elements and additional elements, main elements and main elements, or repetition of main elements. In other words, the formation of words in this type of language is through the process of affixing the roots of words. Indonesian is also a language that does not have a verb tense system.

Indonesian language generally uses the accusative type (e.g., Fokker, 1980; Keraf, 1984, 1989; Parera, 1991; Alwi et al., 2000). On the other hand, Verhaar (1989) states that the Indonesian language is typologically divided into two types, named the accusative type for the official Indonesian language and the ergative type for the informal Indonesian. Aligned with Verhaar, Artawa (1997) claims that Indonesian has a syntactically ergative property. Furthermore, Mulyadi (2006) reiterated that Indonesian can be classified as a syntactically ergative language because it treats P the same as S and treats A differently and also has syntactic accusative properties. Then, both types are owned by the Indonesian language.

There are several previous studies related to the case marker in Indonesian, but none have focused on examining the grammatical properties of the study. For example, Sawardi (2005), who still doubts the ergativity (accusative-ergative typology) in Indonesian, This is due to the lack of parameters used in this study. Furthermore, Arifin (2006) offers initial ideas about the new ergative construction of the Indonesian language in his writings. It can also be expanded if the case marker parameters have been mapped well.

Indeed, there has been no research that has mapped the grammatical properties in the case of Indonesian. The following example sentences:

(1) The child throws away the doll.
(2) The doll is thrown away by the child.
(3) The child is crying.

Data (1) is a transitive clause that consists of the argument of the child (A) and the doll (P). The grammatical property of A is indicated by the indicating pronoun and its enclitic, and the verb is marked with the affix mem-as a classic marker in the active clause. The

determination of A and P in the Indonesian syntactic typological system refers to the verb prototype in the clause structure being studied. The verb "throw" has a behavior that requires both an agent and a patient. In this case, it is not clear which agent can control the verb activity and which one cannot control it. Furthermore, data (2) is a passive form of data (1), which is marked by changes in the affix of verbs and shifts in A and P positions. However, do these changes and moves behave the same in other clauses?

Case marking (case markers) is implemented in various languages in various ways (Hardegree, 2009, p. 2), namely, 1) word order, 2) inflection, and 3) ad position (postposition and preposition). However, so far, these markers have not been determined in the research on the Indonesian language. In addition to that, grammatical markers such as clitics have not been mapped in the case of Indonesian. Therefore, it is necessary to have a mapping of grammatical properties for case markers to ensure the Indonesian case, such as: 1) verb transitivity; 2) affixes; 3) prepositions; 4) clitics; and 5) pronouns. Thus, a study will be conducted on Indonesian grammatical properties as Case Markers by utilizing data, both oral and written.

In English for example, the most prominent cases include the following whose names are borrowed from Latin grammar. This will be realized in Indonesian as in this study.

Table 1. Case Marker in English

Latin Code	Name	Marker	Role / Example
1	nominative	before verb	usually the *subject* of a verb phrase
{ Jay | he | she } respects everyone			
2	accusative	after verb	usually the *direct object* of a transitive verb
everyone respects { Jay | him | her }			
3	dative	to	usually the *indirect object* of a di-transitive verb
Jay wrote a letter **to** { Kay | him | her }			
4	ablative	from	usually the *indirect object* of a di-transitive verb
Kay received a letter **from** { Jay | him | her }			
5	Perlative	by	usually the agent in a passive construction
Jay is respected **by** { Kay | him | her }			
6	Genitive	of 's	associated with certain *relational* nouns
mother, brother, friend, capital, premise			

2. Research Method

This research utilized qualitative research. The data used in this research are Indonesian clauses, which are conducted from oral data and written data. Oral data was obtained based on the intuition of the researcher using Indonesian as an active speaker so that the data was displayed without reference and the analysis was carried out using an introspective-intuitive technique (Millroy in Artawa & Ketut, 2020). The written data was obtained from various printed media so that the data included reference sources. In addition, the data was analyzed using the apportion method (metode agih). The agih method is a method that uses a tool to determine the part of the language concerned which is the target object in the research itself, which included the following steps: 1) formulating basic Indonesian clauses; 2) dividing the direct elements of the clause by dividing each word based on the predicate and its arguments; and 3) analyzing the word based on the argument and the agent to form the word and formulate the typology.

3. Results and Discussion

In terms of case marking, Indonesian recognizes valence reduction operations such as passive, anti-passive, and incorporation. In this case, Indonesian uses syntactic marking, not semantic marking. This case is indicated by: 1) the verb is determined by its ability to describe activities, 2) the participants are marked based on the prototype of the verb in binding the argument; and 3) the existence of syntactic derivation to prove the ability of the verb to bind the argument (Sawardi, 2005:6).

Furthermore, referring to the opinion of (Comrie, 1989:30), which states that in addition to the differences between languages that exist in the world, there must be similar properties that may be observed to see the interrelationships and similarities between these languages (Song 2001; Artawa 2011; Jufrizal, 2007). Therefore, this study will examine the case markers of the Indonesian language by referring to grammatical properties such as order, correspondence, affixes, pronouns, and clitics.

Greenberg (1986) proposed a typology which he called a basic order typology, which is determined by three criteria, namely: 1) the relative order of SVO in a declarative sentence, 2) the presence of adpositions, and 3) the position of attributive adjuncts to nouns. In this regard, Surdayanto (1983, p. 27-28) describes the basic order of Indonesian with several points, namely: 1) the order of VO is more dominant than OV because of the unconditional position of V followed by O; 2) the nature of prepositions and the order of SV is more dominant; 3) there is an alignment of prepositions in NA, VS, VO, Npos. In addition, the opinion of Lehman (1978, p. 96), which states that the modifier (modifier) V placed on the left is one of the characteristics of the VO language as an indicator for determining the order of Indonesian words, Furthermore, linguists agree to classify Indonesian by the SVO pattern or sequence. This sequence is a strict order (Surdayanto, 1983), as well as a marker of the grammatical constituents of the language.

So far, Indonesian is indeed categorized as an accusative case, although there have been several findings that point to its ergativity (Arifin, 2006). However, the markers in marking these cases have not been so clearly conveyed in previous studies. Pay attention to the following data.

(1a) Rhea runs.
(1b) Rhea runs.
(2a) Rapha calls Rhea.
(2b) Rhea Rapha was called.
(3a) Rhea is called by Rapha.
(3b) Rhea is called Rapha.
(4a) Rhea gives Rapha some food.
(4b) Rhea gives some food to Rapha.
(4c) Rapha Rhea gives food.
(4d) Rapha Rhea gives food.

In the data (1) to (4), there is no boundary between S, A, and P, which significantly indicates the type of case that the Indonesian language has. The only starting point that can help is word order. Judging from the type of clause, the four clauses are in different categories. Data (1a) and (1b) are intransitive clauses because there is only one argument that functions as a subject and an agent at the same time. The subject is present in the preverbal position. Data (1a) and (1b) show that BI has SV ordering in a canonical pattern. Furthermore, data (2) is an intransitive clause consisting of two arguments, namely SUBJ and OBJ, which act as agents and patients. Subjectively, SUBJ is present in a preverbal position, while OBJ is in a postverbal position. One important note is that in the SVO order, extra transitive verbs tend to be

marked with prefixes. (Iskandar, 2021). If the order is changed to OSV, then the construction is not acceptable like in (2b). This is what describes BI's position in the transitive clause with an SVO pattern. The same applies to data (3a) and (3b), but with passive diathesis, where the prefix as a grammatical property of the clause is passivized so that the position of the argument changes. OBJ in data (2a) is increased grammatically to become SUBJ. So, formally, the passivation feature is indicated by the presence of the preposition 'by' as in data (3a). Finally, data (4a) is a bitransitive clause which must have three arguments. The argument in the preverbal position is occupied by SUBJ, then the second argument in the postverbal position functions as OBJ1, and the third argument to the right of the verb functions as OBJ2. This position arises because of the existence of beneficial markers, which are marked with a prefix on the verb, which is actually in the form of data (4b). If the sequence is changed to a pattern in the data (4c) and (4d), then the construction is not acceptable. So, the stronger BI's position as a language with an SVO pattern is, the At least this syntactic category is enough to help us understand the next positions of S, A, and P in BI.

Furthermore, case marking can be mapped based on agreement. BI's compatibility can be seen from its effectiveness. Fokker (in Oktavianti, 2013) states that the role of agents and patients is the realization of conformity in Indonesia. If a subject acts as an agent, then the verb is attached to the affix meN-, but if it acts as a patient, the verb is attached to the affix di-.

(5a) Women also have the same opportunities as men in various fields. (Kompas, March 8, 2022)
(5b) Equal opportunities for men and women in various fields are also owned bywoman.

It can be seen that the verb 'have' attached to sentence (5a) forms an active diathesis so that the position of the subject acts as an agent, while in sentence (5b), the subject acts as a patient because of the presence of the verb 'to have'. The correspondence of the agentive argument verb shows the semantic aspect of the argument and realizes it in the morphology of the verb.

(6a) The robber shot the policeman. (Mulyadi, 2007).
(6b) the policeman shot the robber.

The congruence of agent and patient roles in (6a) and (6b) is characterized by the placement of arguments. The argument as a preverbal subject is interpreted as' the person who carried out the shooting action', while the argument as the postverbal subject is' the person who is the victim of the shooting action'. The role of the subject is interpreted that way because BI has a grammatical mechanism that involves morphological forms to express the semantic role or grammatical relation of the subject in a clause. These morphological forms are usually realized in the form of affixes and markers on verbs, which are the central elements in a clause.

Furthermore, the correspondence of argument verbs in BI is more semantic. This is realized through affixes related to semantic information, such as benefactive, applicative, and causative (Oktavianti, 2013). Of course, this is different from English, which has categorical information, such as persona and number.

In addition, BI morphemic marking does not contain gap time. The gap time is expressed periphrastically in peripheral constructs. Therefore, time is not an external condition of verb-argument correspondence, as is the case in English. Based on the description, if you look at the morphology of the verb, which is full of semantic information, BI is a language that is quite sensitive to the semantic aspect. Therefore, it is not surprising that there is a verb-argument agreement based on the semantic aspect of the argument, namely, the role of the argument.

Active and passive diathesis in Indonesian has become the most important discussion to mark the property of affixes as case markers. Although this affix can be discussed in the matching property, it seems necessary to create a separate property to discuss this considering BI is an agglutinative type.

In BI, affixes ter-, ber-, and men- (data 7a) are classified as markers in active diathesis, while affixes are classified as markers in passive diathesis (data 7b). However, on the other hand, regarding the prototype of verbs, the ter-affix and some men-and ber-affixes usually form intransitive clauses so that they only present S, while di-affixes tend to form transitive clauses so that they are able to present A and P. That's not so.

(7a) WHO itself has set a standard for the percentage of positive cases of not more than five percent (Kompas, 05 March 2022).
(7) This event is filled with ethnic and cultural parades. (Kompas, 05 March 2022).

Furthermore, the addition of affixes to subordinate clauses will cause morphological changes in the form of omissions that have an impact on marking. This change will also have an impact on the meaning of the verb.

(8a) Indra (S) is crying ∅ (S) for being happy.
(8b) Indra (A) weeps for his sister (P) ∅ (S) for being happy.

Data (8a) shows correlative behavior where the subject of the first intransitive clause is the same as or correlative with the subject of the second clause, while in Data (8b), the correlativity does not appear again because of the addition of the-i suffix to the verb. Thus, it can be said that the semantic load of Indonesian affects the grammatical syntactic load of the language. Based on this explanation, the correlative behavior of the sentence argument is likely to be eliminated due to this change. Furthermore, it can be said that the correlative system or the same argument from clauses forming subordinate sentences can clearly be analyzed (Netra, dkk, 2008).

Furthermore, BI case marking can also be marked based on pronoun clitics. In several previous studies (Prayogi, 2012), it was said that clitic pronouns in BI consisted of three, namely -ku, -mu, and -nya. The pronouns -ku are mapped as proclitic, while -ku, -mu, and -nya are mapped as enclitic. Proclitics are usually attached to verbs or other categories that are derived from verbs, while enclitics are attached to transitive verbs and nouns.

The morphological case labels attached to the four clitic patterns link the clitic with the syntactic function and the thematic role of the predicate argument (Sukerti, 2016). S in intransitive clauses with nonverbal predicates is marked by pronoun clitics with nominative, accusative, and dative cases. The genitive-dative cluster clitic appears in the nominal predicate intransitive clause, which means ownership. S in intransitive clauses with verbal predicates is marked by pronominal clitics with nominative, genitive, and dative cases.

Possibly because of the high intensity of use, clitic pronouns have various functions and meanings. The change from pronouns to affixes can be seen by looking at the evidence that-nya has many variations of usage, both as clitics, affixes, and topic particles, and di- which is then completely used as a passive prefix.

Furthermore, prepositions become part of the grammatical property of case markers because their position is quite influential in limiting the core argument (core/term (and not adjunct) at the syntactic level. Arguments are grouped into core arguments (subject and object) and other elements (oblique), and adjunct), although by Kroeger (2005, p. 62), oblique is included as an argument. (Sawardi, 2017).

In Indonesian, grammatically, the subject and object should not be preceded by a preposition. If this is done, a sentence like the following will appear.

(9) From that incident, it is necessary to get attention from various parts, so in the future, no one will demand compensation. (Sawardi, 2017).

(10) Today, we are not talking about the price, but about the quality of the goods. (Sawardi, 2017).

The prepositions "from" in data (9) and "about" in data (10) are prepositions that are located in front of the subject and object, which causes the sentence to be grammatically ineffective. On the other hand, an oblique is usually preceded by a preposition, as in the sentence below.

(11) He also started writing descriptions of computer software (Kompass, 08 March 2022).

(12) Carol Shaw was born in 1955 and raised in California (Kompas, 08 March 2022).

From the two data above, it appears that the presence of the prepositions "about" and "in" in the functions under the oblique and adjunct is not a problem and is even required to be present. However, it should also be noted that the use of prepositions is optional. That is, there are prepositions that can be removed and there are those that must be present (Sawardi, 2017). The presence of nouns is indeed implied by the verb, but the presence of prepositions can be omitted. The proximity of the location to the verb is one of the determining factors for the elimination of prepositions. With regard to case markers, it is clear that the presence of a preposition can be a grammatical property that distinguishes a subject from an object, but not both. This means that, in Indonesian, prepositions are marked as non-subject and non-object markers so that arguments that are not marked with prepositions can be markers for subjects and objects who act as agents and patients.

Once a property (or a number of properties) has been selected for typological analysis, the structural types according to that property (or properties) will be identified or formulated so that the languages of the world can ultimately be classified into these types.

4. Conclusion

Based on the research conducted, it can be concluded that Indonesian case markers appear in several grammatical properties, such as word order, correspondence, affixes, prepositions, and pronouns. The order of the Indonesian language with the SVO pattern becomes a marker for the position of S, A, and P in the case. Furthermore, the compatibility of the roles of agents and patients is also a determinant of the argument in marking Indonesian cases. Then, adding affixes to subordinate clauses will cause morphological changes in the form of omissions that have an impact on marking. Then, BI case marking can also be marked based on pronoun clitics. Finally, the presence of a preposition can be a grammatical property that distinguishes between subject and object, but not both. Thus, this grammatical property becomes a case marker in Indonesian.

Bio-note:

Beslina Afriani Siagian is a linguistics and education lecturer at HKBP Nomensen University. She is currently taking her linguistic doctorate school at University of Sumatra Utara in Medan. Her research interests are Indonesian language, linguistics and education and have won several research grants from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia.

Mulyadi is a lecturer in linguistics at the University of Sumatra Utara and he is a doctorate in semantics that has done a lot of research in linguistics.

References

Arifin, Z. (2006). Konstruksi Ergatif Baru dalam Bahasa Nusantara. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*, *18*(34).

Artawa, I. . (2000). *"Alternasi Diatesis pada Beberapa Bahasa Nusantara" dalam Purwo, B.K.(ed.) 2000. Kajian Serba Linguistik*. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya.

Artawa, I. K. (1997). *"Keergativan Sintaksis dalam Bahasa: Bahasa Bali, Sasak, dan Indonesia" dalam Purwo, B.K. (ed.).* (PELLBA10 ed.). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Artawa, I. K. (1998). *Ergativity And Balinese Syntax Part I, II, III*. Jakarta: Nusa.

Artawa, K. dan K. W. P. (2020). Pemarkahan Diatesis Bahasa Indonesia: Kajian Tipologi. *Linguistik, Mozaik Humaniora*, *20*(1), 26–38.

Comrie, B. (1978). *Ergativity. In Lehman, W.D. (ed). Syntactic Typology: studies in the phenomenology of language*. Austin: The University of Texas.

Comrie, B. (1981). *Language Universals and Lin-guistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Black-well.

Comrie, B. (1988a). *Coreference and conjuc-tion reduction in grammar and discourse. In Hawkins, J. (ed).* (Explaining Lan-guage Universals. (ed.)). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Comrie, B. (1988b). Linguistic typology. In Newmeyer, F. J. (ed). *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey*, *I*, 447–467.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardegree, G. (2009). *Compositional Semantics*. UMass Amherst.

Jinoe, Aneuk. (2004). Persesuaian dalam Bahasa Aceh. *Bahasa Dan Seni*, *32*(2).

Jufrizal. (2008). Fenomena Tipologi Gramatikal Bahasa Minangkabau: Akusatif, Ergatif, atau Campur?. *Linguistika*, *15*(28).

Netra, dkk. (2008). Sistem Koreferensial Klausa Subordinatif Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistika*, *15*(29).

Oktavianti, I. N. (2013). *Persesuaian Verba dengan Argumen dalam Bahasa Inggris dan Bahasa Indonesia: Tinjauan Tipologi Bahasa. In: Seminar Tahunan Linguistik UPI 2013, 23-24 Januari 2013*. UPI Press: Bandung.

Prihadi. (1999). Inkorporasi Kasus Pasientif dalam Kalimat Tunggal Bahasa Indonesia. *Jurnal Diksi, 16*(6).

Sari, M.K., Fauzan, M. R. dan S. (2020). The Function Of Nouns In The Accusative Case In Russian. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Linguistik Dan Sastra (SEMANTIKS)*. https://jurnal.uns.ac.id/prosidingsemantik.

Sawardi. (2005). Aktif, Pasif, Dan Ergatif Dalam Bahasa Indonesia. *Seminar Antarbangsa Linguistik Melayu (Salim) '05 International Seminar On Malay Linguistics (Salim),* 05, 29–30.

Sawardi, (2017). Pelesapan Preposisi dalam Gramatika Bahasa Indonesia. *Semiotika*, *18*(2), 94–102.

Soffya Ranti. (2022). *"Hari Perempuan Sedunia 2022, Ini 5 Wanita yang Berpengaruh di Bidang Teknologi."* https://tekno.kompas.com/read/2022/03/08/13450027/hari-perempuan-sedunia-2022-ini-5-wanita-yang-berpengaruh-di-bidang-

teknologi.

Sukerti. (2016). Pola pemarkah keaspekan bahasa kodi : pendekatan teori role and reference grammar, soshum. *Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *6*(2).

Surdayanto. (1983). *Predikat Objek dalam bahasa Indonesia: Keselarasan Pola- urutan*. Jakarta: Djambatan.

Umiyati, M. (2015). Prioritas Aspek-Aspek Tipologi Linguistik Pada Pemetaan Masalah-Masalah Kebahasaan. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, *1*(2), 279–297.

Verhaar, J. W. M. (1992). *"Keergatifan Sintaksis Bahasa Indonesia Modern". Serpih-Serpih Telaah Pasif Bahasa Indonesia* (dalam Purwo). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Yusri, Maulia, dan A. R. (2016). Partikel Penanda Lokatif Dalam Kalimat Bahasa Jepang. *Jurnal Kotoba*, *3*.