

---

## Prosodic domains and (re-)linearization in Indonesian nominalizing circumfixes

---

Sören E. Tebay<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universität Leipzig  
tebay@uni-leipzig.de

**Main Claim:** Indonesian adphrasal and extrametrical circumfixes challenge lexicalist theories of morphology. Postsyntactic linear displacement triggered by a prosodic subcategorization frame in Distributed Morphology (DM) explains both the extrametricality of the suffixal part and the domain of nominalization, providing a restrictive theory of circumfixation. **Data:** In Standard Indonesian (Austronesian, Indonesia), the abstract nominalization circumfix *ke-* *-an* shows two puzzling properties. First, it attaches to the left and right of a domain otherwise considered a syntactic phrase (Sneddon 1996), which includes negation *tidak* (in other contexts syntactically independent (Kroeger 2014)), a middle voice prefix *ber-* and a complex verbal base, or the adverb *salah* ‘wrongly’, but not high voice prefixes. Second, the circumfix is extrametrical (Conners 2002, 2003), where the usual penultimate phrasal stress (Halim 1981, Cohn 1989) is not applied and instead stress is on the antepenultimate, ignoring the *-an* of the circumfix.

**Analysis:** The analysis extends the idea of linear displacement triggered by prosodic subcategorization frames (used for infixes in Kalin 2022, Kalin & Rolle 2022) in the framework of Distributed Morphology to higher prosodic units. The nominalization head *n* attaches to a vP, the lowest part of a three-head verb phrase (Jeoung 2018). The interface between syntax and phonology proceeds cyclically, starting with the vP, which is prosodified into a prosodic phrase ( $\phi$ ) and undergoes regular stress assignment. In the next cyclic domain, *ke-* and *-an* are inserted, but only the suffixal part *-an* is equipped with a subcategorization frame [ $\phi$  \_], which demands that it follows a right prosodic phrase boundary. *-an* is displaced to follow the prosodic phrase and therefore is not integrated into it. Stress is not reassigned.

**Discussion:** The present account explains both the extrametricality and the domain of nominalization as a result of relinearization. The empirical generalization provided by Sneddon (1996) hints at a lexicalist approach, where phrases are compounded if they serve as a base for affixation, which mispredicts the stress facts and leads to a look-ahead problem. Relinearization, however, extends to e.g. modal circumfixes in Meskwaki (Algonquian, USA, Dahlstrom 2000). **References:** •Cohn, A.C. 1989. Stress in Indonesian and bracketing paradoxes. *NLLT* 7(2). 167–216. •Conners, T.J. 2002. Circumfixation: An unnoticed complication for Indonesian stress. Ms. Yale University. •Conners, T.J. 2003. Circumfixation: An unnoticed problem for Indonesian stress. In proceedings of AFLA X •Halim, A. 1981. Intonation in relation to syntax in Indonesian. •Jeoung, Helen. 2018. Optional elements in Indonesian morphosyntax. •Kalin, L. 2022. Infixes really are (underlyingly) prefixes/suffixes. *Language* 98(4). •Kalin, L. & N. Rolle. 2022. Deconstructing subcategorization: LI early access. •Kroeger, P. 2014. External negation in Malay/Indonesian. *Language* 90(1). •Sneddon, J.N. 1996. Indonesian.