# The morphosyntax of Sundanese benefactive constructions

Christina L. Truong
University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa
cltruong@hawaii.edu

May 2019

## 1   Introduction

The Sundanese verbal system includes a substitutive benefactive construction which indicates that the agent performs the action on behalf of, and instead of, a beneficiary. This construction is formed with the prefix *pang-* and the causative/applicative suffix *-keun.* In this paper I will describe the morphosyntax of this construction, including the morphological components found on the verb, the morphophonemic processes involved, and the syntactic properties of various types of clauses with substitutive benefactive meanings. Finally, I will briefly compare Sundanese substitutive benefactives with other Western Austronesian benefactive constructions and discuss its historical origin. This paper is based on data from Dewi Setiani, a 30-year-old speaker from Bandung, West Java. The data were collected for a field methods class at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa over a period of nine months in Honolulu, HI in 2018 and 2019. Examples given are from recorded wordlists, elicited sentences and short natural texts.

## 2   The Sundanese language and community

Sundanese is the language of the Sundanese ethnic group, and it is spoken over roughly the west third of the island of Java in Indonesia. The Sundanese ethnic community today is made up of more than 30 million people, and almost all these speak the Sundanese language (Simons & Fennig 2017).

Java is the world's most populous island, owing to its fertile volcanic soil, and wet rice cultivation has long been practiced there, giving rise to sophisticated social organization and the formation of early Sunda kingdoms. Before the arrival of Islam, the kingdoms of Java are known to have had significant trade relations and cultural ties to India. Old Sundanese writing from this period is preserved in palm-leaf manuscripts in a local script related to Pallava (Moriyama 1996). Arabic script has been used for writing Sundanese since the 12th or 13th century. The language was also influenced heavily by Javanese during the time of the Majahpit and Mataram empires from roughly 1400-1600 A.D. during which time Javanese was the language of the courts. In this period, Sundanese manuscripts written in both Javanese and Arabic script are found, while in the Dutch colonial period which followed, Sundanese began to be written in the Latin alphabet, as it is today. Most Sundanese people today are bilingual in Indonesian, the national language, and there are some indications that Sundanese is at risk of marginalization in favor of Indonesian, especially in urban centers (Indrayani 2011). Despite this, Sundanese is used in all domains, including local print and broadcast media (Simons & Fennig 2017, Indrayani 2011).

Sundanese has had extensive contact with Javanese and Malay, and while all three belong to the Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian family, Sundanese does not subgroup closely with either one. Like Javanese, Sundanese is known for a system of speech levels, the use of which is governed by social rank and etiquette.

Sundanese examples given in italics in this paper are transcribed with the following orthographic conventions: <c> is a voiceless alveopalatal affricate, <j> is a voiced alveopalatal affricate, <'> is a glottal stop, <ng> is a velar nasal, <ny> is a palatal nasal, <e> is schwa /ə/, <é> is an unrounded front mid vowel /e/, <eu> is an unrounded mid back vowel /ɤ/ (this vowel is often described as central and transcribed as /ɨ/ in the literature on Sundanese). Other symbols used are consistent with their expected phonetic values. These orthographic choices are fairly standard in written Sundanese, though the acute accent on the mid front vowel is not consistently used by all community members and outside authors.

## 3    Overview of Sundanese benefactives

Sundanese has a benefactive construction which indicates that the agent performs the action of the verb on behalf of, and instead of, a beneficiary. Some examples of basic transitive sentences and corresponding benefactive constructions are given below. Example (23), shows a benefactive construction in active voice, where the translation shows that the buying action is performed on behalf of the beneficiary *indung=na* 'his mother.' Example (24) shows a benefactive construction in passive voice where the translation shows that the taking action is performed on behalf of another person. This type of benefactive construction is always formed by adding the prefix *pang-* and the suffix *-keun* to the root.

(1)   a.   *Asep meuli baju.*
          "Asep buys clothing."
      b.   *Asep mangmeulikeun baju keur indungna.*
          "Asep buys clothing for his mother."

(2)   a.   *Duit dicokot ku Icih.*
          "The money was taken by Icih."
      b.   *Duit dipangnyokotkeun ku Icih.*
          "The money was taken by Icih (for someone else)."

Benefactive constructions formed with *pang-* and *-keun* are quite productive in Sundanese, though it is unsurprisingly restricted in typical use to roots expressing actions that are semantically compatible with the meanings "on behalf of another" and "instead of another." Thus this type of benefactive construction is not used when the action is considered to be the responsibility of the agent or for the agent's own benefit. The following examples show benefactive verbs that our consultant supplied as the type of requests for assistance that a child might hear from her parent in everyday usage.

(3)   a.   *Pangmasakkeun sanggu.*
          "Cook the rice (for me)."
      b.   *Panghurankeun lampu.*
          "Turn on the light (for me)."
      c.   *Pangmawakeun beas.*
          "Bring the (uncooked) rice(for me)."
      d.   *Panggarokeun tonggong.*
          "Scratch (my) back (for me)."
      e.   *Pangnimbakeun cai.*
          "Draw water from the well (for me)."

f. *Pangnyeuseukeun baju.*

"Wash the clothes (for me)."

These imperative forms are formed with the root plus *pang-* and *-keun* only. On the other hand, the examples above in declarative sentences show additional voice morphology, which in Sundanese take the form of the prefix *ng-* for active voice and *di-* for passive voice. The voice prefixes and the suffix *-keun* are all three found on non-benefactive verbal constructions without *pang-* so it will be helpful to understand their more basic usage first. Accordingly, these will be described in the following sections.

## 4   Voice in Sundanese

In this section, I will describe basic voice morphology on verbs in Sundanese. An unaffixed verb root[1] denotes an imperative, as exemplified in (4a) and (5a). In declarative transitive clauses, most verb roots are obligatorily marked for voice, taking either the active voice prefix as shown in (4b) and (5b) or the passive voice prefix as shown in (4c) and (5c). The passive voice prefix in Sundanese is *di-*. The active voice prefix, which I will represent as *ng-*, has a number of allomorphs and triggers morphophonemic changes on the root which will be described in greater detail below. Throughout this paper morphophonemic changes in examples are marked with a backslash in the gloss line following Leipzig glossing conventions.

(4)   a. *Cokot   duit.*
       take.IMP money

       "Take the money."

      b. *Icih ny\okot   duit.*
       Icih ACT\take money

       "Icih took the money."

      c. *Duit   di-cokot   ku Icih.*
       money PASS-take by Icih

       "The money was taken by Icih."

(5)   a. *Beuli    baju.*
       buy.IMP clothes

       "Buy clothes."

      b. *Asep m\euli   baju.*
       Asep ACT\buy clothes

       "Asep buys clothes."

      c. *Baju    di-beuli   ku Asep.*
       clothes PASS-buy by Asep

       "The clothes were bought by Asep."

Sundanese shows SVO word order. In active voice clauses, the agent is the subject and it precedes the verb. In transitive active clauses, the patient is the object and it follows the verb. In passive clauses, the converse is true. The patient is the subject and precedes the verb. The agent, if expressed, follows the verb, and is demoted to an oblique "by-phrase" marked by the preposition *ku*. Intransitive active voice clauses

---

[1]In many Western Austronesian languages, it is unclear whether roots inherently belong to a grammatical category, such as noun or verb, or acquire a category on the basis of position in the clause or through affixation. A definitive discussion of grammatical category in Sundanese is outside of the scope of this paper. I will use the term "verb root" to refer to bare content morphemes, typically disyllabic, the primary semantic content of which denotes an action.

contain a single nominal argument preceding the verb, as shown in Example (6). Note that the verb root may be prefixed with the active voice marker or bare. This appears to be determined by a property of the root.

(6)  a.  *Icih diuk.*
        I.    sit
        "Icih sits."

     b.  *Asep ny\umput.*
        A.    ACT\hide
        "Asep hides."

     c.  *Budak nga-liwat.*
        child    ACT-pass.by
        "A child passes by."

The active voice prefix *ng-* takes different forms depending on the shape of the root to which it attaches. Table 1 shows examples of the active voice prefix on roots with various initial segments. If the root begins with a vowel, the active voice prefix appears as its base form, a velar nasal /ng-/. If the roots begins with a nasal consonant, the prefix coalesces with the initial segment. (This also can be thought of as a vacuous application of nasal substitution.) If the root begins with a voiceless obstruent (other than /h/), the active voice prefix is realized as nasal substitution (abbreviated as NS in the table). This means that the initial consonant of the stem is replaced with a nasal at the same place of articulation. In the case of /s/-initial roots, the nasal is palatal. If the root begins with any other other consonant, the active voice prefix is realized as /nga-/. Interestingly, in Sundanese, /b/-initial forms in the active voice can be formed either with the /nga-/ allomorph or with nasal substitution. This may indicate that a phonological change is in progress.

To summarize, voice in Sundanese is marked with the active prefix *ng-* or the passive prefix *di-*. Some roots also take no voice morphology in active voice. Constructions marked with *di-* appear to be true passives as the agent is optional and appears in an oblique argument marked by the preposition *ku*. Thus, *di-* has a valency-reducing effect on the verb. The active voice prefix is characterized by morphophonemic changes on the stem known as nasal substitution when the stem begins with a voiceless obstruent (excluding glottal /h/) or /b/.

## 5   Applicative constructions with *-keun*

Sundanese has two verbal suffixes, *-an* and *-keun*, which change the argument structure of a verbal clause. Both can be used to form a variety of causative and applicative constructions, but whether a verb takes *-an* or *-keun* appears to be lexically determined and the precise change to the argument structure of the resulting verb is idiosyncratic. As the substitutive benefactive constructions are formed with *-keun*, the following discussion will focus on its uses, rather than those of *-an*.

First, *-keun* may be used to add a causer argument to an intransitive or stative verb. In examples (7-9), *-keun* has this type of causative function. Note that the stative or intransitive verb may appear without any voice morphology in basic declarative sentences, as is the case in (8a) where the verb *potong* 'break' is bare. However, in declarative causative clauses, voice marking is obligatory. Thus, a verb formed from an intransitive verb + *-keun* such as *potong-keun* only functions as an imperative 'break it!', and not a declarative verb. Accordingly the declarative verb is formed with voice marker /nga-/ in example (8b). Likewise, a verb formed from a stative verb root + *-keun* only functions as an imperative and not a declarative verb. One such example is *lempeng-keun* 'Straighten it!',

Table 1: Examples of the active voice prefix in Sundanese

| Initial | Bare root | Active form | Gloss | Allomorph |
|---------|-----------|-------------|-------|-----------|
| /a/ | aku | ng-aku | 'admit' | ng- |
| /i/ | impi | ng-impi | 'to dream' | ng- |
| /o/ | omong | ng-omong | 'to say' | ng- |
| /u/ | udag | ng-udag | 'to chase' | ng- |
| /m/ | melak | melak | 'to plant' | ∅ |
| /n/ | nikah | nikah | 'to get married' | ∅ |
| /ny/ | nyaho | nyaho | 'to know' | ∅ |
| /ng/ | ngojay | ngojay | 'to swim' | ∅ |
| /p/ | paké | m\aké | 'to wear' | NS |
| /t/ | tinggali | n\inggali | 'to see' | NS |
| /c/ | carios | ny\arios | 'to speak' | NS |
| /k/ | kebut | ng\ebut | 'to speed' | NS |
| /s/ | sapu | ny\apu | 'to sweep' | NS |
| /b/ | beuli | m\euli | 'to buy' | NS |
| /b/ | bantos | nga-bantos | 'to help' | nga- |
| /d/ | dangu | nga-dangu | 'to hear' | nga- |
| /j/ | jungkel | nga-junkel | 'to flip over' | nga- |
| /g/ | gantung | nga-gantung | 'to hang' | nga- |
| /l/ | liwat | nga-liwat | 'to pass by' | nga- |
| /r/ | rénghap | nga-rénghap | 'to breathe' | nga- |
| /w/ | wawuh | nga-wawuh | 'to know (a person)' | nga- |
| /h/ | hakan | nga-hakan | 'eat (rude)' | nga- |

(7)  a.  *Tali  lempeng.*
    rope straight

    'The rope is straight.'

    b.  *Pagawe nga-lempeng-keun tali.*
    worker ACT-straight-CAUS rope

    'The worker straightens the rope.'

(8)  a.  *Patlat  potong.*
    pencil break

    'The pencil breaks.'

    b.  *Asep m\otong-keun    patlot.*
    A.    ACT\break-CAUS pencil

    'Asep breaks the pencil'

(9)  a.  *Cai    nga-golak.*
    water ACT-boil

    'The water boils.'

    b.  *Icih nga-golak-keun cai.*
    I.    ACT-boil-CAUS   water

    'Icih boils the water'

The suffix *-keun* is can also be used to form non-causative applicative constructions. In one such usage, *-keun* adds a P argument to an intransitive verb. This is shown in the following examples, where the addition of *-keun* results in a transitive verb form that takes a direct object. Again, the applicative construction has obligatory voice marking. In the case of Example (13b), this is the non-volitional prefix *ka-* (but the active voice marker could be substituted here instead with the meaning that the action was intentional).

(10)  a.  *Dewi ng-ajar.*
    D.    ACT-teach

    'Dewi teaches (as a profession).'

    b.  *Dewi ng-ajar-keun    basa     Inggris.*
    D.    ACT-teach-APPL language English

    'Dewi teaches English.'

(11)  a.  *Icih sok    tumbang-tembong.*
    I.    always RED-show.off

    'Icih always shows off.'

    b.  *Asep n\embong-keun    mobil=na   ka Dewi.*
    A.    ACT\show.off-APPL car=3.POSS to  D.

    'Asep shows off his car to Dewi.'

(12)  a.  *Cai    ng\ucur  tina  para.*
    water ACT\pour from ceiling.

    'Water pours from the ceiling.'

    b.  *Icih ng\ucur-keun   cai     sa-gelas.*
    I.    ACT\pour-APPL water one-glass

    'Icih pours a glass of water.'

(13) a. *Icih utah.*
   I.  vomit.
   'Icih vomited.'

   b. *'Icih ka-utah-keun     udang.'*
   I.  NVOL-vomit-APPL shrimp
   'Icih vomited up the shrimp.'

Another use of the suffix *-keun* is to promote a non-core argument to a core argument of the verb. In the following example, *-keun* promotes an instrument, which becomes the P argument of a clause. When the verb is used without the suffix, the instrument is an oblique argument, expressed in a phrase headed by *maké* 'use.' When the verb is used with *-keun*, the instrument is a core argument.

(14) a. *Asep meuli   baju   maké duit.*
   A.  ACT\buy clothes use    money.
   'Asep bought clothes using money.'

   b. *Duit    di-beuli-keun  baju.*
   money PASS-buy-APPL clothes
   'Money is used to buy clothes.'

The instrumental applicative is notable for two reasons. First, it appears to only be available in the passive voice, and second, even though the verb is marked with *di-*, which reduces valency in basic transitive clauses, the verb here has two primary arguments.

*di-beuli-keun* here still takes a direct object, the patient *baju* 'clothing'. Together, these two facts indicate that (1) passive voice verbs marked with *di-* in Sundanese may not be syntactically derived from active voice verbs, and (2) the argument structure of some Sundanese applicative constructions allows for two object-like arguments e.g. may be ditransitive. Regarding the first point, note that there is also no morphological evidence that Sundanese passive verbs are derived from active verbs, as they both forms are equally marked by a distinctive prefix. As Sundanese is descended from a Austronesian ancestor that had a four-way voice distinction (Chen 2017), I suspect that the association of such instrumental applicatives with passivce voice is a historical relic from an "instrumental voice" construction.

In all the above cases, the suffix *-keun* increases or changes the valency of verb. It either adds an argument to an intransitive verb, or promotes a non-core argument to a core argument position. In the case of the instrumental applicative, the resulting argument structure may be ditransitive.

# 6   The prefix *pang-*

The prefix *pang-* has several functions in Sundanese where it appears without the suffix *-keun*.

First, when affixed to stative verbs (roots denoting properties), *pang-* can be used to form superlative constructions. In such constructions, *pang-* appears with the post-clitic *=na* which appears to mark definiteness.[2] Some examples of this are shown in Example (15). It is not possible to use the superlative meaning of *pang-* without *=na*, as shown by the ungrammatical examples in (16).

(15) a. *hade* 'good', *pang-hade=na* 'the best'
   b. *gelis* 'beautiful', *pang-gelis=na* 'the most beautiful'
   c. *bageur* 'kind', *pang-bageur=na* 'the kindest'

---

[2] The morpheme *=na* also marks third person possession or a third person agent in passive constructions.

    d. *mirah* 'cheap,' *pang-mirah=na* 'the cheapest'

(16)  a. \* *pang-hade* 'best'

     b. \* *pang-gelis* 'most beautiful'

     c. \* *pang-goreng* 'ugliest'

Second, *pang-* is used in nominalizing constructions. This usage is somewhat archaic and not very productive for younger speakers like our consultant. She found the nominals forms with *pang-* in (17) acceptable, but noted they sound formal or archaic. On the other hand, she did not recognize the forms in (18) as acceptable; these are taken from Jonathan Rigg's (1862) Sundanese-English dictionary.

(17)  a. *rasa* 'feel', *pang-rasa* 'feelings, s.t. which can be felt'

     b. *asuh* 'nurture', *pang-asuh* 'nanny'

     c. *arti* 'understand', *pang-arti* 'knowledge, understanding'

     d. *laku* 'do', *pang-laku* 'behavior'

(18)  a. \* *pang-gali* 'a tool for digging' from *gali* 'dig'

     b. \* *pang-gawé* 'worker' from *gawé* 'work'

     c. \* *pang-asih* 'commiseration, pity' from *kasih* 'affection, love*

A few cases of nominalization with the circumfix *pang- -an* were also offered by our consultant.

(19)  *Asa di  pang-impi-an.*
      Feel LOC NMLZ-dream-NMLZ

      "(It) feels like being in a dream-like place."

(20)  *Pang-rasa-an=na manéhna téh  bener.*
      NMLZ-feel-NMLZ  3s       PRT right

      "His feeling is that he is right."

Rigg's dictionary entry for the morpheme *pang* reads: "Pang, a preposition; a modification of Pa, when occurring before a word beginning with a vowel." From this it appears that *pang-* was an allomorph of *pa-* at the time that Rigg's wrote (though in his dictionary it does not appear to be restricted entirely to vowel-initial roots, counter to his statement). While *pang-* persists in non-productive usage in Sundanese today, in the speech of our consultant, nominalizing *pa-* and *pa- -an* are much more productive. It does not appear to be the case that *pang-* is an allomorph of *pa-* any longer. With vowel-initial stems, *pa-* is pronounced as [paʔ-] in our data, not [paŋ-]. For example, the word *pa-anggang* 'separation' from /pa-/ + /angang/ 'apart' is pronounced [paʔaŋgaŋ].

## 7  Simple benefactive applicatives

In the previous three sections, the usage of the affixes *ng-*, *di-*, *-keun*, and *pang-* in Sundanese were described and exemplified. These form the component morphemes found on verb stems in substitutive benefactive constructions. Having reviewed the basic functions of these affixes, I now return to Sundanese benefactives.

In addition to substitutive benefactive constructions described in Section 3 above, it worth mentioning two other Sundanese constructions that have been described in literature as benefactive applicatives. These occur without *pang-* and I will refer to them as a simple benefactive applicatives.

Hanafi (2001: 135) reports that intransitive verbs suffixed with *-an* can take take a beneficiary as a P argument, citing the pair of sentences in Example (21). Example (21a) shows an intransitive clause, with

the nominal *kaluarga=na* 'his family' expressed as an oblique with the preposition *keur* 'for'. Example (21b) shows a transitive clause, in which the nominal *kaluarga=na* appears as a core argument in object position. Our consultant Dewi, preferred the translation "He lives for his family" for the sentence in (21a), whereas Hanadi gives "He earns a living for his family." If the former is accepted, and *hirup* has the basic meaning 'live' rather than 'earn a living', the sentence in (22b) can be interpreted as a causative construction rather than a benefactive applicative. That is, the meaning of the second sentence is roughly, "He enables his family to live." If Hanadi's translation is understood, and *hirup* means 'earn a living' then I agree that this is a benefactive applicative in which *-an* increases the valency of an intransitive verb by adding a beneficiary as a core argument.

(21)  a. *Manéhna hirup keur kaluarga=na.*
      3s      live   for   family=3

      "He earns a living for his family." OR "He lives for his family."

   b. *Manéhna nga-hirup-an   kaluarga=na.*
      3s       ACT-live-APPL  family=3

      "He earns a living for his family."

Another benefactive construction reported by Hanafi (2001: 136) is formed by adding *-keun* to a transitive verb. The sentences that he uses to exemplifying this construction are shown below, marked with grammaticality judgments given by Dewi. Example (22a) shows a basic transitive clause in the active voice. The beneficiary is expressed in an oblique phrase headed by *keur* 'for'. Example (22b) shows that the beneficiary can be promoted to a core argument. Here, the beneficiary *kuring* '1s' is the subject of a verb marked for passive voice. Accordingly, this can be analyzed as another applicative function for *-keun* where the suffix changes the valency of the verb. Like the instrumental applicative shown above in (14a), this benefactive applicative appears to have two non-agent core arguments, *kuring* '1s' and *panto* 'door'. This suggests that simple benefactive applicatives formed with *-keun* are ditransitive. (The agent is a non-core argument and appears in a by-phrase, *ku Dédé*.

(22)  a. *Udi m\uka    panto keur kuring*
      U.  ACT\open door  for   1s

      "Udi opens the door for me."

   b. *Kuring di-buka-keun    panto ku Dédé.*
      1s     PASS-open-APPL door  by D.

      "I had the door opened for me by Dede."

   c. ?? *Udi m\uka-keun    kuring panto.*
      U.  ACT\open-APPL 1s     door

      "Udi opens the door for me."

   d.  * *Panto di-buka-keun    kuring ku Dédé*
      door PASS-open-APPL 1s     by D.

      "The door was opened for me by Dede."

Example (22c) shows another apparently ditransitive benefactive construction, this time in active voice. The subject is the agent, and the beneficiary and patient both appear to the right of the verb, in that order. Both beneficiary and patient appear to be core arguments; neither are obliques in prepositional phrases. Dewi said that she often uses and hears this type of construction, but she considers it to be not correct grammatically. This intuition that active voice ditransitive applicatives are less grammatical suggests that passive voice applicatives are not necessarily derived syntactically from active voice applicatives.

Example (22d) is reported as not grammatical by Hanadi and Dewi both. This shows that the patient cannot be the subject of a simple passive benefactive verb formed with *-keun*. This means that though both the beneficiary and the patient are core arguments in such a construction, the beneficiary is more privileged syntactically. This is consistent with its position closer to the verb in (22c).

In summary, in simple benefactive applicatives the suffixes *-an* and *-keun* can promote a benficiary to a core argument. It appears that *-an* operates in this manner on intransitive verbs, and *-keun* on transitive verbs. There is some evidence that simple benefactive applicatives formed with *-keun* are ditransitive, but in the active voice, there are not considered completely grammatical by all speakers. As with instrumental applicatives formed with *-keun*, this suggests that simple passive benefactive applicative verbs are not necessarily derived from active voice counterparts.

## 8   Substitutive benefactives with *pang-*

As discussed in Section 3, Sundanese has a special construction used to indicate that the action of the verb is performed on the behalf of the beneficiary. These are formed with the prefix *pang-* and the suffix *-keun* and are distinguished from simple benefactive applicatives in that they are used only in situations where the beneficiary is responsible to perform an action, but instead an agent does it on the beneficiary's behalf. I call these "substitutive benefactive" following terminology used by Kittilä (2005: 273), who defines substitution benefaction as events in which the benefit conferred "consists in not having to carry out the profiled event oneself." In the remainder of this section, I will discuss the morphosyntax of Sundanese benefactive constructions in detail.

### 8.1   The morphology and morphophonemics of substitutive benefactives

Sundanese substitutive benefactives can occur in both active and passive voice in declarative clauses. Examples (23) and (24) are repeated below with glossing to show their morphological components.

(23)  a.  *Asep m\euli   baju.*
          A.   ACT\buy clothing

          "Asep buys clothing."

      b.  *Asep m\ang\meuli-keun baju    keur indung=na.*
          A.   ACT\BEN\buy-APPL clothing for   mother=3

          "Asep buys clothing for his mother."

(24)  a.  *Duit    di-cokot   ku Icih.*
          money PASS-take by I.

          "The money was taken by Icih."

      b.  *Duit    di-pang\nyokot-keun ku Icih.*
          money PASS-BEN\take-APPL   by I.

          "The money was taken by Icih (for someone else)."

These constructions are distinguished from simple benefactive applicatives formed with *-keun* by the presence of the prefix *pang-*. Accordingly, I gloss *pang-* in these constructions as 'BEN' and ascribe to it the meaning "on behalf of, and instead of the beneficiary". I gloss *-keun* as 'APPL' because its function in these constructions is consistent with that in other applicative constructions discussed above, where *-keun* adds a P argument or promotes a non-core argument to a core position.

It is apparent that voice morphology is added to the left end of substitutive benefactive verbs. Passive forms take the prefix *di-* and active forms take *ng-*, which is realized as nasal substitution (just as in simple active verbs) because the verb stem begins with *pang-* and thus is voiceless stop-initial.

Closer to the verb root, another application of nasal substitution is apparent. The root *beuli* 'buy' is realized as the allomorph *meuli* after *pang-* and the root *cokot* 'take' is realized as the allomorph *nyokot* in the same position.

Sundanese substitutive benefactive verbs like *dipangnyokotkeun* 'was taken for s.o.' from the root *cokot* 'take' look similar to "undergoer-oriented" verbs in Salako, another Austronesian language spoken in southern Sarawak on the western part of the island of Borneo. Salako and Sundanese are both Western Austronesian languages, and in syntax they both contrast two voices. Adelaar (2005) calls the voices in Salako "agent-oriented," and "undergoer-oriented." Examples of undergoer-oriented clauses (Adelaar 2005: 53) are shown in Example (25).

(25)  *Ia [...] di=m\areʔ   makatn.*
      3  [...] UO=N\give food

      'He was given food."

(26)  *Sanaŋ-lah     ati    Si  Bunsuʔ aɲ=ɲian tai*
      pleased-EMP heart PA B.      this      ANAF

      *nanaŋ uma-e akaʔ     di=ŋa-rumput.*
      see      field-3 finished UO=N-weed

      "Si Bunsu was pleased to see that her field was all weeded."

In these examples, undergoer voice is marked with the clitic *di=* on the left edge of the verb. Closer to the verb stem, we find the morpheme that Adelaar glossed as *N*. This morpheme marks transitivity on (transitive) verb roots in the agent-oriented voice (completed and non-completed aspect) and undergoer-oriented voice (completed aspect only). *N-* triggers nasal substitution on roots beginning with a stop (voiced or voiceless), as in *dimareʔ* from *bareʔ* 'give' in (25), and appears as *ŋ-* or *ŋa-* elsewhere. Salako is unique for Western Austronesian languages because both *di=* and *N-* can occur simultaneously on the verb. In most Western Austronesian languages, the *di-* morpheme and the *(me)N-* morpheme are never found together on a verb stem, as in Indonesian, where the *meN-* active voice prefix is mutually exclusive with the *di-* passive voice prefix.

Despite a superficial similarity with Salako undergoer-oriented verbs, Sundanese substitutive benefactives do not appear to be a second case where *(me)N-* is becoming a marker of transitivity rather than voice. The Sundanese active voice prefix *ng-* may very well be cognate with the Salako *N-* transitive marker and they have very similar morphophonemic patterns. But unlike Salako *N-*, Sundanese active voice *ng-* appears on the left-edge of the verb rather than close to the root, and never occurs simultaneously with passive *di-*. The nasal substitution present on the initial segments of roots in substitutive benefactives appear to be a morphophonemic change triggered by the benefactive prefix *pang-*, not the voice marker.

Looking more closely at nasal substitution on substitutive benefactives, the morphophonemic changes triggered by *pang-* follow a different pattern from those triggered by the active voice prefix *ng-*. In the latter, the velar nasal segment of the prefix coalesces with (or triggers deletion of) the initial segment of the root. In the former, the final velar nasal of the prefix *pang-* remains present and the initial stop of the root is realized as a nasal; no coalescence can be said to have taken place.

Examples showing the benefactive *pang-* on roots of various initial segments are shown in Table 2. Though not every possible initial segment is exemplified in the data, some patterns emerge. The underlying form of the benefactive prefix appears to be /pang-/ and it is realized as this basic form [paŋ-] before vowels,

nasals, and the glottal fricative /h/. Before voiceless stops and /b/, the benefactive prefix is realized as [paŋ] + nasal substitution. Note that these are exactly the initial consonant that undergo nasal substituion triggered by the active voice prefix /ng-/. Before voiced stops, the benefactive prefix is variantly realized as [paŋ-] ~ [paŋa]. Our consultant indicated that the [paŋa-] variant might be associated with slow speech or non-standard pronunciation, but both variants are used productively.

Table 2: Allomorphs of the pang- benefactive prefix

| Initial | Bare root | Gloss | substitutive benefactive | Allomorph |
|---------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|-----------|
| /a/ | ala | 'take' | pang-ala-keun | pang- |
| /eu/ | eureun | 'stop' | pang-eureun-keun | pang- |
| /o/ | omong | 'say' | pang-omong-keun | pang- |
| /h/ | hurung | 'turn on' | pang-hurung-keun | pang- |
| /m/ | masak | 'cook' | pang-masak-keun | pang- |
| /p/ | pindah | 'move' | pang\mindah-keun | pang+NS |
| /t/ | timbang | 'draw water' | pang\nimba-keun | pang+NS |
| /c/ | cokot | 'take' | pang\nyokot-keun | pang+NS |
| /k/ | kumba | 'wash (as dishes)' | pang\ngumba-keun | pang+NS |
| /s/ | seuseu | 'wash (as clothes)' | pang\nyeuseu-keun | pang+NS |
| /b/ | bawa | 'bring' | pang\mawa-keun | pang+NS |
| /d/ | dayung | 'row' | panga-dayung-keun | panga- |
| /j/ | jieun | 'make' | pang-jieun-keun | pang- |
|     |       |        | panga-jieun-keun | panga- |
| /g/ | giring | 'chase' | pang-giring-keun | pang- |
|     |       |        | panga-giring-keun | panga- |

In comparing the morphophonemics of benefactive *pang-* to those of *ng-*, it can be seen that the two prefixes trigger similar changes to roots beginning with voiceless stops and /b/ which are realized as nasals. This behavior might have an origin in the morphophonological system of a language ancestral to Sundanese. Similar parallels are found in Indonesian for the active voice prefix *meN-* and the agentive nominalizer prefix *peN-*, as well as in Javanese for the active voice prefix *N-* and the general nominalizer *paN-/peN-* (Obglobin 2005), which all trigger nasal substitution.

Differences between the two patterns of nasal substitution in Sundanese might be explained by position in the word. For *pang-* prefixation, sequences of velar nasal + voiced stop are medial, and are allowed in Sundanese phonotactics (c.f. Sundanese *bungbu* 'spice', *dingduit* 'wail', *tinggali* 'see'). On the other hand, nasal+consonant sequences, as created by /ng-/ prefixation, are never allowed in word-initial position in Sundanese, regardless of voicing. So coalescence for initial /ng/ + /p, t, c, k, b/ and /a/-epenthesis to break up initial /ng/ + /d, j, g, h, r, l, w/ are two repair strategies used in Sundanese to avoid initial nasal+consonant sequences. Neither type of repair is necessary in word-medial position. I suggest that the optional, non-standard [panga-] pronunciation with voiced stops in substitutive benefactives have been introduced by analogy with the active voice forms.

While the benefactive *pang-* can trigger nasal substitution, there is no evidence that the superlative *pang- =na* circumfix behaves likewise. Note that *pangbageurna* 'the kindest' from *bageur* 'kind' does not show substitution e.g. is not realized as *[paŋmagɤrna]. Because of this, I will consider the benefactive *pang-* to be a distinct prefix from that used in the superlative construction.

## 8.2 The syntax of substitutive benefactives

Turning to syntax, substitutive benefactives can be formed in the active voice and passive voice, and they can be transitive or ditransitive.

First, let us consider active voice substitutive benefactives. Example (27) shows a transitive clause where the beneficiary is an oblique, expressed in a prepositional phrase headed by *keur* 'for'. Example (28) shows a corresponding substitutive benefactive clause where there is no change in valency; there are still two core arguments. The beneficiary remains an oblique argument, however the sentence differs in meaning with (27) because it indicates that the agent performed the action on behalf of the beneficiary. Example (29) shows a ditransitive substitutive benefactive clause. Here the beneficiary is promoted to a core P argument. The patient is a secondary object following the beneficiary. Neither beneficiary nor patient are in prepositional phrases.

(27) *Asep m\euli  baju      keur indung=na*
     A.   ACT\buy clothing for   mother.3

     "Asep buys clothing for his mother."

(28) *Asep m\ang\meuli-keun baju      keur indung=na*
     A.   ACT\BEN\buy-APPL clothing for   mother=3

     "Asep buys clothing for his mother (on her behalf)."

(29) *Asep m\ang\meuli-keun indung=na baju*
     A.   ACT\BEN\buy-APPL mother.3   clothing

     "Asep buys his mother clothes (on her behalf)."

Turning to passive voice substitutive benefactives, we see a similar pattern. Example (30) shows a simple passive clause, where the patient is the subject and the agent is an oblique in a by-phrase. Example (31) shows a corresponding passive substitutive benefactive clause, where valency is unaffected. The beneficiary does not appear as a core argument (though the consultant chose to mention her as a possessor). The meaning of the sentence is still consistent with substitutive benefaction, as the sentence indicates that the agent performed the buying action on behalf of a beneficiary. Example (32) shows a passive substitutive benefactive construction where valency has been increased. There are two core arguments, the beneficiary, which appears in subject position, and the patient, which appears in object position. Note that, as shown in example (33), it is not grammatical to switch the positions of the two core arguments such that the patient is the subject and the beneficiary is the object.

(30) *Baju    di-beuli  ku Asep.*
     clothing PASS-buy by A.

     "Clothes were bought by Asep."

(31) *Baju    indung Asep di-pang\meuli-keun ku Icih*
     clothing mother A.   PASS-BEN\buy-APPL by I.
     "Asep's mother's clothes were bought by Icih (on her behalf)."

(32) *Indung Asep di-pang\meuli-keun baju      ku Icih.*
     mother A.   PASS-BEN\buy-APPL clothing by I.

     "Asep's mother had clothes bought for her by Icih (on her behalf)."

(33)  * *Baju di-pang\meuli-keun indung Asep ku Icih.*

In discourse, the beneficiary argument is often implied. Thus, a sentence like that in example (34), which has no overt beneficiary argument, is grammatical, and it is implied that the taking action was done

by the agent on behalf of someone else. Likewise, in conversation, a person might express a request for action to be done for them with an imperative substitutive benefactive verb. The intended beneficiary (the speaker) does not need to be an overtly expressed. Some examples of this are shown in (35).

(34)  *Duit    di-pang\nyokot-keun ku Icih.*
      money PASS-BEN\take-APPL   by I.
      "The money was taken by Icih (for someone else)."

(35)  a.  *Pang\maca-keun surat.*
          BEN\read-APPL    letter
          "Read the letter (for me)."
      b.  *Pang\nulis-keun kuitansi.*
          BEN\write-APPL  receipt
          "Write the receipt (for me)."
      c.  *Pang\ngumba-keun piriing.*
          BEN\wash-APPL        dishes
          "Wash the dishes (for me)."

To summarize, substitutive benefactives formed with *pang-* and *-keun* are used to express that an action is done on behalf of, and instead of, a beneficiary. Sometimes, these constructions are used without any change in valency, with the beneficiary remaining an oblique argument. In other instances, a change in valency does take place. In such constructions, the beneficiary is promoted to a core argument, and the patient remains a secondary object. These substitutive benefactives appear to have ditransitive argument structure like that of passive instrumental applicatives and simple benefactive applicatives formed with *-keun*. However, there are some indications that those two types of constructions are not fully grammatical in active voice, while substitutive benefactives with two non-agent core arguments are perfectly grammatical in both active and passive voice. The patient in substitutive benefactives is usually expressed overtly, both in active and passive forms. Finally, the beneficiary, on the other hand, is commonly omitted in normal discourse contexts, though a beneficiary's existence and interest in the event are implied.

## 9    Discussion and conclusion

To conclude this study, I offer a look at the broader context in which Sundanese benefactive applicatives are found. In this section, I will compare Sundanese benefactives to other benefactive constructions in Western Austronesian languages, discuss the historical origin of the prefix pang- and offer some concluding remarks.

### 9.1    Survey of benefactive constructions

Among Western Austronesian languages,[3] two types of benefactive constructions are found.

First, in Philippine-type languages (found in the Philippines, Northern Borneo, and Madagascar), benefactive constructions are generally formed using benefactive voice (BV). In such constructions, the verb is marked with an affix for benefactive voice (BV) and the beneficiary is indicated by case marking or word order. An example is given from Tagalog in (36), where the beneficiary *bataʔ* 'child' is marked with the nominative case marker *aŋ* and the verb is marked for beneficiary voice with the prefix *i-*.

---

[3]In this section I use "Western Austronesian" to refer to the Austronesian languages outside of Taiwan which do not belong to the Central-Eastern-Malayo-Polynesian subgroup.

(36)  *i-b\<in\>ilí    naŋ lalake naŋ isdáʔ aŋ    bataʔ*
BV-PERF-buy GEN man   GEN fish   NOM child

"The man bought a fish for the child."

In some languages, benefactive constructions are marked in the same way as instrumental voice. Such is the case in Tagalog, where benefactive voice and instrumental voice utilize the same morphology. In other languages, benefactive constructions have been subsumed into another type of voice category (such as dative voice or conveyance voice). Table 3 shows a sample of Philippine-type Western Austronesian languages and the morphemes that mark benefactive constructions.[4]

Table 3: Voice affixes used with beneficiary "subjects"

| Language | Location | Form | Function |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tagalog | Philippines | i- | Benefactive/Instrumental voice |
| Ilokano | Philippiges | i- -an | Benefactive Voice |
| Kimaragang | N. Borneo | -an | Dative Voice |
| Buol | C. Sulawesi | -an | Dative Voice |
| Ratahan | N. Sulwawesi | \<in\> | Conveyance Voice |
| Chamorro | Guam | -iyi | Benfactive Voice |

A second type of benefactive construction is found in non-Philippine-type Western Austronesian languages. These are formed by used of an applicative suffix. Some examples of such applicative benefactives are given below.

(37)  Javanese

*Surti ng-gawek-ake    aku layangan*
S.    ACT-make-APPL 1s   kite

"Surti made me a kite." (Nurhayani 2014: 7)

(38)  Balantak

*Alia  paraa    manga-wawau-ii tama-ngku wala'on.*
don't as.far.as AV.IRR-make-BEN father-1s    boiled.water

"It really isn't necessary to make a hot drink for my father." (van den Berg & Busenitz 2012: 108)

(39)  Besemah

*beli-ka=nye        empat ijat.*
PV.buy-caus.appl=3 four    seed

"...he bought (my family) four pieces (of durian fruit)." (McDonnell 2016: 97)

Table 4 shows a sample of applicative suffixes in Western Austronesian languages that are used to form benefactive constructions.[5] The table shows the forms of applicative suffixes and functions that they serve including forming benefactive applicatives (BEN), forming causatives (CAUS), forming instrumental applicatives (INST), and increasing valency generally (V+).

---

[4]Information in Table 3 is from Blust (2013), Himmelmann & Wolff (1999), and Adelaar & Himmelmann (2005).

[5]Information in Table 4 is from van den Berg & Busenitz (2012), McDonnell (2016), Nurhayani (2014), and Adelaar & Himmelmann (2005).

Table 4: Benefactive applicative suffixes

| Language | Location | Form | Function |
|---|---|---|---|
| Balantak | E. Sulawesi | -ii | BEN |
| Balantak | E. Sulawesi | -kon | BEN, CAUS, V+ |
| Besemah | S. Sumatra | -ka | BEN, CAUS, INST, V+ |
| Indonesian | Indonesia | -kan | BEN, CAUS, V+ |
| Javanese | E. Java | -ake/-aken | BEN, CAUS, V+ |
| Makassar | S. Sulawesi | -ang | BEN, V+ |
| Mori Bawah | C. Sulawesi | -ako, <in> -ako | BEN, INST |
| Sundanese | W. Java | -an | BEN, CAUS, V+ |
| Sundanese | W. Java | -keun | BEN, CAUS, INST, V+ |

Of course, in addition to the two types of benefactive constructions discussed above, in most Western Austronesian languages speakers may also choose to use constructions in which the beneficiary is not a core argument at all, but is marked with a preposition in an oblique phrase. We have already seen example of this in Sundanese with *keur* 'for'.

## 9.2 Whence pang-?

In substitutive benefactives specifically, the meaning 'on behalf of, instead of' is attributed to the prefix *pang-*. I know of no other similar substitutive benefactives in Western Austronesian languages, which raises the question of how the *pang-* substitutive benefactives arise. A definitive answer is not possible at present, however the existence of other similarly shaped prefixes in related language suggests a possibility.

In Indonesian, the *peN-* prefix has a nominalizing agentive function. It forms agents as in *pembeli* 'buyer' from *beli* 'buy' and instruments as in *pembersih* 'cleaning solution' from *bersih* 'clean'. It is possible that the *pang-* prefix in Sundanese arose from a cognate source with Indonesian *peN-*. The Austronesian Comparative Dictionary (Blust & Trussel 2018) lists the reconstructed form *paŋ-, "nominal prefix marking instruments, or products of an action." According to the ACD, reflexes of *paŋ- have a nominalizing instrument function in Ilokano, Tagalog, Karo Batak, and Toba Batak and a nominalizing agentive function in Indonesian and Karo Batak.

On basis of this cognate set, and observed parallels between Indonesian *peN-* and Sundanese *pang-* prefixes, it seems likely that the Sundanese substitutive benefactive construction arose from a previous agentive nominalizing function of *pang-*. Thus the meaning of substitutive benefactive verbs can be paraphrased as 'to serve as the agent of an action for s.o.' Note that in present day Sundanese no such nominalizing function of *pang-* is productive. Agent nominals are instead expressed with headless relative clauses. A concept like 'buyer' (c.f. Indonesian *pembeli*) is expressed in Sundanese as *nu beuli* 'one who buys', and a concept like 'vendor' (c.f. Indonesian *pendagang*) is expressed in Sundanese as *nu dagang* 'one who sells'.

## 9.3 Concluding remarks

Sundanese benefactive constructions show similarities to other non-Philippine-type Western Austronesian languages in that they are a type of applicative construction, and are formed with a suffix, *-keun*, that has a variety of causative and applicative functions. The Sundanese *pang-* prefix may be derived from the agentive nominalizer *paŋ, which when used in applicatives came to have the meaning 'to serve as an agent of an action for s.o.' Sundanese substitutive benefactive verbs can be transitive or ditransitive, and ditransitive argument structure appears to be fully grammatical in both active and passive voices. Sundanese also has

ditransitive instrumental and simple benefactive applicatives, but there is some evidence that these are not fully grammatical in active voice. The association between passive voice and such three-place verbal constructions might be linked to the four-way voice system of Proto-Austronesian, with earlier undergoer, instrumental, and beneficiary voice functions being subsumed into modern passive voice. Going forward, directions for further research might include studies of correlation between voice and types of applicatives in Western Austronesian languages; studies of the typology, both morphosyntactic and semantic, of benefactives in Western Austronesian languages; and studies of the historical development of Sundanese morphology.

# 10   References

Adelaar, K. Alexander. 2005. *Salako or Badameá: sketch grammar, text and lexicon of a Kanayatn dialect in West Borneo* (Frankfurter Forschungen zu Südostasien 2). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Adelaar, K. Alexander & Nikolaus Himmelmann (eds.). 2005. *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar* (Routledge Language Family Series). London ; New York: Routledge.

van den Berg, René & Robert L. Busenitz. 2012. *A grammar of Balantak: a language of Eastern Sulawesi* (SIL e-Books 40). SIL International.

Blust, Robert. 2013. *The Austronesian languages*. Revised edition (Pacific Linguistics A-PL 008). Canberra: Australian National University.

Blust, Robert & Stephen Trussel. 2018. *Austronesian comparative dictionary*. Web edition.

Chen, Victoria. 2017. *A reexamination of the Philippine-type voice system and its implications for Austronesian primary-level subgrouping*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i at Mānoa dissertation.

Hanafi, Nurachman. 2001. A description of basic clause structure in Sundanese. *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 11(5).

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & John U. Wolff. 1999. *Toratán (Ratahan)* (Languages of the World: Materials 130). Muenchen: Lincom Europa.

Indrayani, Lia Maulia. 2011. Language Vitality: a case on Sundanese language as a surviving indigenous language. *Language Maintenance and Shift*. 5.

Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Recipient-prominence vs. beneficiary-prominence. *Linguistic Typology* 9(2). 269–297.

McDonnell, Bradley J. 2016. *Symmetrical voice constructions in Besemah : a usage-based approach*. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Santa Barbara dissertation.

Moriyama, Mikihiro. 1996. Discovering the language and the literature of West Java : an introduction to the formation of Sundanese writing in 19th century West Java (Special issue: The formation of the Indonesian nation : in memory of the late professor Kenji Tsuchiya). *Southest Asian Studies* 34(1). 151–183.

Nurhayani, Ika. 2014. *A unified account of the syntax of valence in Javanese*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University dissertation.

Rigg, Jonathan. 1862. *A dictionary of the Sunda language of Java*. Batavia: Lange.

Simons, Gary & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2017. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. 20th. Dallas, TX: SIL International.