

## Indonesian *ter-* as a stative passive

Based on novel fieldwork data with speakers from Java, I propose a unified analysis of (near-)Standard Indonesian verbal prefix *ter-* as a stative/adjectival passive (Alexiadou et al. 2014), whose further uses (“accidental passive”, “abilitative”, Sneddon 2010) are derived pragmatically and semantically.

**1/ Fieldwork data** shows that *ter-* does not contain any true agent as argument in its structure, as showed in (1) by the unavailability of goal-PPs (Bruening 2013). As a result, *ter-* rejects animate agents and accepts mostly inanimate causers, cf. (1). The only instance of animate agents with *ter-*marked verbs arises with KIND readings, cf. (2). *ter-* can also attach to unaccusative verbs, cf. (3). Furthermore, *ter-*prefixed verbs behave like statives, cf. their incompatibility with adverbial *perlahan-lahan* ‘slowly’ (Yusof 2005) in (4), and they can denote states without preceding event, cf. (5). To summarise it, *ter-* seems to attach to voiceless projections (no external argument) and generate a stative reading of verbs.

- (1) Rumah *ter-bakar* {#**untuk mendapatkan uang asuransi** / #**oleh penjahat** / ✓ **oleh api besar**}.  
House *ter-burn* for obtain money insurance / by criminal / by fire big  
‘The house was burnt {#**in order to get the insurance money** / #**by a criminal** / ✓ **by a fire**}.’
- (2) Siti Nurbaya *ter-baca* oleh anak (#itu).  
Siti Nurbaya *ter-read* by child DEM  
‘Siti Nurbaya is read {✓ **by children (in general)** / #**by the child (we were talking about)**}.’
- (3) Lamris (**ter-**)tidur. (4) #Buku itu *ter-baca perlahan-lahan*.  
Lamris *ter-fall.asleep* book DEM *ter-read slowly*  
‘Lamris is sleeping / has fallen asleep.’ Intended: ‘This book is read slowly.’
- (5) *Context: you are visiting a newly-built house. You are the first one to enter it. You come across a door which was built closed (it was never open and nobody ever closed it).* Pintu {✓ **ter-tutup** / #**di-tutup**}.  
door *ter-close* di-close  
‘The door is closed.’

**2/ A stative passive** analysis is tenable, as *ter-*marked verbs differ from *di-*marked verbs (Indonesian canonical passive, Sneddon 2010) the same way that English/German stative/adjectival passives differ from canonical passives (Gese et al. 2011, McIntyre 2013). Stative passives, like *ter-*verbs, are voiceless & compatible with unaccusative verbs (unlike e.g. anticausatives). They only denote resulting states, thus not compatible with verbs which do not have [*become(s)*] in their lexical conceptual structure (Levin & Rappaport-Hovav 1995), like ‘exist’ or verbs denoting [*act(e)*]. This prediction holds for *ter-*, cf. (6). Data like (5) is not incompatible with *ter-* denoting a result-state: it can be captured by means of a state-token instantiated from a result-state kind (from an event kind), cf. (7) (Gehrke & Marco 2014).

- (6) a. *ada* ‘exist’ [exist(x)] ⇒ \**ter-ada*      b. (*ber-*)*napas* ‘breathe’ [breathe(x)] ⇒ \**ter-napas*  
c. *lari* ‘run’ [run(x)] ⇒ \**ter-lari*      d. *ber-tari/men-[t]ari* ‘dance’ [dance(x)] ⇒ \**ter-tari*
- (7)  $\llbracket (5) \rrbracket = 1$  iff  $\exists s_{token}, s_k, e_k [close(e_k) \wedge BECOME(s_k)(e_k) \wedge R(s_{token}, s_k) \wedge closed(the-door, s_{token})]$

**3/ Further uses** of *ter-* can also be accounted for. The “accidental” reading, which can arise with e.g. (3) or (8), is derived from pragmatic competition with either the *di-*prefixed counterpart denoting an event with a true agent, cf. (8) [*di-*verbs take goal-PPs and true agents, unlike *ter-*verbs, cf. (1)], or with the bare root of the verb, cf. (3). Thus, voluntarily caused states should be expressed with *di-* for transitives (externally caused), and with bare root for intransitives (internally caused), cf. *Maximise Presupposition!*, Heim 1991. As a result, *ter-*verbs give rise to an “accident” implicature.

- (8) Tas-nya {**ter-tinggal** / **di-tinggalkan**} di perpustakaan.  
bag-3SG *ter-leave* / PASS-leave in library  
‘The bag **was left** in the library.’ [with *ter-*: accidentally, with *di-*: deliberately] (Sneddon 2010)

The “abilitative” use, cf. (9), arises with transitives, under negation, and is ambiguous with a stative reading ((9) = also ‘this car is not sold’). It is derived semantically via a modalisation effect akin to the one arising with accomplishments under progressive (Dowty 1977, Portner 1998). I summarise the idea in (10), where *ter-beli* denotes that there is a sold-state in all possible worlds where the circumstances allow for it: its negation thus results in no possible world containing this result state.

- (9) Mobil semahal itu **tidak ter-beli** oleh saya.  
car expensive that NEG TER-buy by 1SG  
‘I **can’t afford to buy** a car as expensive as that.’ (Sneddon 2010)

- (10)  $\llbracket (9) \rrbracket = 1$  is true at a world *w* iff there is no world *w'* in BEST(Circ,FS,e,P) in which there is a final state *s* deriving from *e* such that P(*w'*)(*s*) is true. with *Circ* = the set of circumstances relevant to reaching the final state *s*, and *FS* = the set of propositions which assert that the final state *s* is reached

Thus, all uses of *ter-* can be captured from its stative meaning, possibly including superlatives with *ter-* on adjectives where it denotes the greatest extent of a state (“the essence of the property”, Grangé 2013).

**Selected references.** \*Gehrke & Marco (2014). *Different by-phrases with adjectival and verbal passives*. \*Gese et al. (2011). *Adjectival conversation of unaccusatives in German*. \*Portner (1998). *The Progressive in Modal Semantics*. \*Sneddon (2010). *Indonesian: A comprehensive grammar*.