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Abstract
This study investigates the derivation of words through the process of infixation. Specifically, Prince & McCarthy’s (1993a) morphologically-driven Phonological Readjustment theory and Yu’s (2007) phonologically-driven Phonological Subcategorization theory are compared to determine which of the two is better fit to explain -um-infixation in Javanese. I show here that Javanese infixation data is crucial in providing insight into this debate, because unlike other previously studied infixation cases, the Javanese -um-always triggers some phonological readjustment(s). This provides overwhelming evidence for the morphologically-driven Phonological Readjustment theory, as this theory is the one that can offer (i) a unified target for infixation in Javanese, and (ii) a phonologically-driven motivation for the derived words.
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INTRODUCTION
Affixation is a well-known morphological process that is productive in most languages like English and Indonesian, among many others. Generally, affixation involves attaching a suffix or morpheme to a root and/or a base, to derive (i) new words, or (ii) new grammatical relations. Most commonly, such affixes are attached in front of stems (prefix), or at the end of stems (suffix). Indonesian uses both morphological processes, also in combination, to derive mainly new words. The process summarized in (1) shows a typical prefixation, where the prefix pe- is attached before the root kerja to form the new word pekerja. The process summarized in (2), on the other hand, shows a typical suffixation, where the suffix -an is attached after the root kerja to form the new word kerjaan.
1. pe- + kerja ➔ pekerja
   prefix to work worker

2. kerja + -an ➔ kerjaan
   to work suffix work

Often, a new word or new grammatical relations can be built by doing a series of
prefixation and suffixation. An example of this is given in (3) below, where the root beri is first
prefixed with meN to get memberi ‘to give. The newly formed memberi is in turn suffixed with
-kan to get the final word memberikan, which adds a beneficiary argument.

3. a. me- + beri ➔ memberi
   prefix to give to give (active)
b. memberi + -kan ➔ memberikan
   to give (active) suffix to give (sth) to (someone)

It is equally possible, to arrive at the complex verb memberikan by first doing
suffixation followed by the prefixation – which is probably more plausible if we consider the
syntactic bottom-up derivation, but this ordering is not important for the discussion in this
paper. We will instead focus on Javanese -um-, that is not easily categorized as either a prefix or
a suffix.

Most importantly, we have established that prefixation is a process of attaching an affix
in front of a root, while suffixation is a process of attaching an affix after a root. In both cases,
the affix targets the word boundary, and as such, can be clearly defined. Much less clear is
another type of affixation known as infixation. Infixation typically involves inserting an affix in
the middle of a word. This phenomenon is not attested in English, with the exception of
something familiar that sometimes occur in colloquial speech by “inserting” an expletive or
profanity into a word, as seen in (4) below. Usually, the expletive is inserted just before the
stressed syllable of the word that it is embedded in.

4. a. abso-fucking-lutely
   b. un-fucking-believable

Another famous set of examples for infixation comes from the Tagalog -um. As seen in
(5) below, the affix -um appears to be inserted after the first consonant in (5a), but the same
affix appears to be prefixed in front of the root inom in (5b). Similar infixation patterns are
widely attested in other languages of the world, and many have attempted to “explain” the rule,
derivation and reasons for this pattern we see in (5) (Jiang, 2019; Chan, Lee, & Yip, 2021;
Pelagio, et.al., 2022).

5. a. s-um-ulat [Tagalog]
   ‘to write’
b. um-inom
   ‘to drink’

Just from comparison of (4) and (5), we can see that infixation rules are language-
specific; the pattern in (5) shows furthermore, that within one language, the derivation of the
infix and root to form a new word is a complicated process. Poedjosoedarmo (1979) describes Javanese as having 4 infixes: (i) -er-; (ii) -el-; (iii) -in-; and (iv) -um-. The -in-, -el-, and -er-infixes are somewhat similar to the Tagalog -um- data above, where it is inserted after the first consonant, but appear as a prefix with vowel-initial base.

6. a. geget + -er- ➔ g-er-geget [Javanese]
   ‘to bite’ ‘passion’

   b. titi + -er- ➔ t-el-iti
   ‘to check’ ‘to be careful’

The -um- infix, however, differ slightly from the Tagalog data, and more details are specifically elaborated below; this deviation from the Tagalog data above is the reason why this article will discuss this specific infix in-depth. In the following sections, I will discuss the two most prominent, but opposing theories of Infixation: McCarthy & Prince’s (1993a) Phonological Readjustment, and Alan Yu’s (2007) Phonological Subcategorization. Based on these opposing views, I will also present data on Javanese -um- infixation and will show that McCarthy & Prince’s (1993) Phonological Readjustment is more well-suited to explain -um-infixation in Javanese.

THEORIES OF INFIXATION

Phonological Readjustment is a principle set forth in McCarthy and Prince’s (1993a) Generalized Alignment, and Halle’s (2001) Onset Metathesis, among others. The basic idea behind this principle is that the target of infixation is still a morphological boundary – like the beginning of a word in prefixation, or the end of a word in suffixation. However, to satisfy an “ideal” phonological form such as syllables with onsets, or syllables without codas, these prefixes or suffixes must be re-aligned or readjusted. This realignment means that a prefix that is normally aligned to the left boundary of a word, for example, might have to be aligned after the first consonant of the word; creating what appears to be a phenomenon of infixation. To illustrate this derivation process, I will reuse the Tagalog verbs we had in example (5).

7. 1 2 3
   um-+ sulat ➔ um-sulat ➔ s-um-ulat [Tagalog]
   ‘to write’

   We see in example (7) above that um- is first prefixed to the root sulat to give us umsulat (Step 1 ➔ 2). Then, um- has to get realigned, by way of Onset Metathesis (Halle, 2001), i.e., by moving the /s/ - the onset of the second syllable in um.su.lat - to the front of the word (first syllable), so that the resulting word su.mu.lat consists only of syllables with onsets. Without the readjustment in Step 3, we would have umsulat (um.su.lat), whereby the first syllable of the word is without an onset, but with a coda. This is generally dispreferred as a syllable structure in languages of the world, and all languages that allow syllable codas also allow syllable onsets (de Almeida, Ferré, & dos Santos, 2019; Rubach, 2022; Lee & Seo, 2019). Thus, under the principle of Phonological Readjustment, the phonology seems to override the morphology, because the morphological alignment is “sacrificed” to satisfy a “better” phonological form.
When we consider the other half of our earlier Tagalog data, another possible outcome of the um- infixation in Tagalog is shown in (8) below. Here, the root, inom, starts with a vowel, unlike the earlier example of sulat. So, when um- is prefixed to the root in Step 1, we get uminom in Step 2. Here, the resulting syllable structure is not maximized as the first syllable is without an onset (uminom), but there is no way to readjust the sounds by way of Onset Metathesis to get only syllables with onsets. For example, applying onset metathesis and moving the onset of the second syllable to the front would give us *mi.u.nom, which would still give us a syllable without an onset. As such, the less-than-ideal final derivation of uminom is what we get.

8. 1 2  
   um+ inom \rightarrow um-inom
   ‘to drink’

Phonological Readjustment, as we have seen so far, is thus an affixation process that first targets the morphology, followed by some form of phonological readjustment to maximize ideal phonological conditions. Alan Yu (2007) criticized this emphasis on the morphology; instead, he proposed the Phonological Subcategorization theory to explain the derivation of infixation. In this theory he claims that infixes like -um- does not have a morphological subcategorization like to the left or the right of the word boundary, contrary to prefixes and suffixes. Instead, infixes sub-categorizes for phonological constituents. The infix -um-, in Tagalog, would for example, have an attachment property that sub-categorizes for the left of the nucleus (vowel) of the first syllable in the word; this is a derivation rule that targets the phonology, without making any reference to morphology. If this phonological subcategorization happens to coincide with the morphological boundary of the word, then we do not get infixation (uminom (9)). However, if there is a mismatch between the morphological boundary and the phonological sub-categorization, then we would get infixation (sumulat (10)).

9. 1 2  
   um- + inom \rightarrow um-inom
   ‘to drink’

10. 1 2  
    um- + sulat \rightarrow s-um-sulat
    ‘to write’

In example (9) above, because inom does not have an onset in its first syllable, the phonological sub-categorization of the infix - vowel of the first syllable - and the morphological boundary of the word happens to coincide, resulting in a prefixation process. The word sulat, however, has an onset in its first syllable and there is a mismatch between the morphological boundary of the word and the phonological sub-categorization of the infix. Thus, we get infixation in (10), even though -um- undergoes the same phonological sub-categorization targeting the left of the vowel in the first syllable of the root. Similar detailed study of the Javanese -um- derivation from these perspectives has never been done before.

The advantage that Phonological Subcategorization offers over the Phonological Readjustment is that the former involves a much simpler process, whereas the latter necessitates more steps in the derivation. Moreover, with Phonological Subcategorization, we can posit one generalized rule as the attachment property of the affix. Phonological Readjustment, on the
other hand, gives us a better explanation of why we have infixation, i.e., to maximize the syllable structure in the Tagalog data we have discussed above. *Phonological Subcategorization* does not offer any explanation to why some affixes like prefixes and suffixes sub-categorizes for the morphology (word boundary), while some others like infixes sub-categorizes for phonological entities. However, despite these advantages and disadvantages, both theories are still adequate in explaining the Tagalog data in relation to -um-. With the -um- data from Javanese, though, I will show that *Phonological Readjustment* is more suitable to explain the data.

**METHODS**

Poedjosoedarmo’s (1979) *Morfologi Bahasa Jawa* was used as the main source for the Javanese infixation data discussed here, because it includes data on the different -um- infixation patterns seen in Javanese, including cases where the -um- appears as a prefix in vowel-initial base, as well as the variations seen in different base with different initial consonants (see below for more details). Additionally, close friends who are native speakers of Javanese were consulted to confirm the validity of the data taken from Poedjosoedarmo (1979).

**JAVANESE DATA**

Javanese is an Austronesian language closely related to Tagalog. As such, it is not surprising that the -um- affix is also attested in the language. However, the behavior pattern of the -um- affix in Javanese is quite different from what we have seen so far from Tagalog. Below, I present this data, that I will use to argue for the *Phonological Readjustment* theory. The Javanese infixation data can be generally divided into two patterns: (i) Pattern A where we see prefixation like our example with the Tagalog uminom; and (ii) Pattern B where we see true infixation like our example with the Tagalog sumulat.

11. **Pattern A:**
   
   (Prefixation + initial vowel /u/ deletion)
   
   [Javanese]

   **a. Word starting with vowels**

   1  2  3 (/u/ deletion)
   ili + um- ➔ um-ili ➔ m-ili
   ‘to flow’
   aju + um- ➔ um-aju ➔ m-aju
   ‘to go forward’
   undur + um- ➔ um-undur ➔ m-undur
   ‘to go backward’

   **b. Words starting with /l/**

   1  2  3 (/u/ deletion)
   laku + um- ➔ um-laku ➔ m-laku
   ‘to walk’
   layu + um- ➔ um-layu ➔ m-layu
   ‘to run’
lebu + um- ➔ um-lebu ➔ m-lebu
‘to go in’
lumah + um- ➔ um-lumah ➔ m-lumah
‘to lie down’

12. **Pattern B**
(infixation)

a. **Words starting with stops**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (Onset Methatesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tibo + um-</td>
<td>um-tibo</td>
<td>t-um-ibo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘to fall’
| tandaŋ + um- | um-tandaŋ | t-um-tandaŋ         |
‘to do something’
| gantuŋ + um- | um-gantuŋ | g-um-antuŋ          |
‘to hang’

b. **Words starting with sibilants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (Onset Methatesis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sanak + um-</td>
<td>um-sanak</td>
<td>s-um-anak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘to be friendly’
| sebar + um- | um-sebar  | s-um-ebar           |
‘to spread’

**DISCUSSION**

Compared to the data on Tagalog infixation, the Javanese infixation data provides us with two very interesting facts in Pattern A:

**A1.** The *um-* “prefixation” pattern applies not only to roots that start with a vowel like uminom, but also to roots starting with the consonant /l/ sound.

**A2.** While Tagalog accepts the less-than-ideal uminom (*u.mi.nom*), with the first syllable having no onset, Javanese is stricter in applying the ideal of always having an onset in every syllable. Thus, we get the /u/ deletion pattern observed in (11) above.

The fact observed in (A1) makes it difficult to posit a phonological sub-categorization rule, because unlike in the case for the Tagalog uminom and sumulat, we cannot define a specific phonological target for the -um- in Javanese; the affix seems to target both the first vowel and the first consonant (if it is /l/). Thus, it is more likely that the word boundary is the target for the Javanese -um-, giving credit to the theory of Phonological Readjustment that prioritizes morphological alignment, before words get readjusted for phonological reason(s). The strict adherence to syllables with onsets seen in (A2), further supports the theory of Phonological Readjustment, as we see an obvious phonological motivation for readjustment, specifically to get the ideal phonological structure by way of the /u/ deletion (Step 3); this is an alternative strategy to the Onset Metathesis we see happening in Tagalog.
The pattern observed in Pattern B above is similar to the *sumulat* pattern in Tagalog that we have discussed:

**B1. When the root begins with consonants other than /l/, the affix -um- surfaces as an infix between the first consonant and the first vowel.**

The contrast between roots starting with /l/ and roots starting with other consonants crucially shows that the phonology cannot be easily subcategorized as the target for the -um-affix in Javanese. If we look at words starting with the consonant /l/, we see that the winning output candidate is *mlaku* and not *lumaku* (11b). This means that even though an infixation strategy, similar to the one we see with other roots starting with other consonants is available (Pattern B), it is dispreferred compared to the prefixation. To do this under the Phonological Subcategorization theory, we would have to posit a rather complicated and arbitrary phonological sub-categorization, where the target of derivation for the Javanese -um- would have to be either the first vowel or /l/. Even with this arbitrary phonological sub-categorization, we are unable to explain the /u/ deletion observed in Pattern A (11).

In contrast, McCarthy & Prince’s (1993a) Phonological Readjustment theory offers us a more unified and natural explanation of the data we see in Javanese:

- We can posit the word boundary as a unified target for derivation;
- We can explain both the /u/ deletion in Pattern A, as well as the onset metathesis in Pattern B as phonological readjustment;
- We can also explain the contrast between /l/ and other consonants (discussed further below) as the result of priority ranking for different phonological readjustment strategies.

13. a. **Pattern A**
   
   1. um- + ili ➔ um-ili ➔ m-ili (mi.li)  
   ‘to flow’  
   
   2. 3 (/u/ deletion)

   [Javanese]

   b. **Pattern B**

   1. um- + tibo ➔ um-tibo ➔ t-um-ibo (tu.mi.bo)  
   ‘to fall’  
   
   2. 3 (Onset Metathesis)

   [Javanese]

In (13), I show how Phonological Readjustment works for the data, whereby the infix -um- targets the left of the root boundary in Step 1 for both patterns, giving us umili in (13a) and umtibo in (13b) [Step 2]. Then, a phonological readjustment to get only syllables with onsets happen in Step 3, whereby the first vowel is deleted in (13a), while Onset Metathesis happens in (13b). The difference in Step 3 strategies is simply due to the availability of onsets in the root.

Now, I will address the difference seen in the phonological readjustment for /l/ and other consonants. If, as illustrated in (13) above, the -um- in Javanese targets the left root word boundary; and the different outcomes between vowel-initial root (13a), and consonant-initial root (13b) is simply a matter of Onset Metathesis availability, then why would roots that start with an /l/ behave differently from other consonants (11 b)? To answer this, I have to make some reference to the Sonority Sequencing Generalization (SSG) (Zec, 2007; Bhatta, 2021; Kord, 2018; Wulfert, & Hanulíková, 2022). According to the SSG principle, the vowel nucleus
in a syllable is always the most sonorous – the loudest sound – in the syllable, and the sonority of other co-occurring sounds decrease towards both the left and right tail of the syllable. In other words, if a language allows consonant clusters in the onset position, the first consonant in this cluster would be the least sonorous (least loud), and all subsequent consonants in the cluster would increase in sonority. The opposite is true for codas, with the consonant closest to the vowel being the most sonorous, and the last consonant in the coda cluster being the least sonorous. Figure 1 below shows this sonority hierarchy, i.e., the degree of loudness for different sounds.

**VOWELS >> GLIDES >> LIQUIDS >> NASALS >> OBSTRUENTS**

High Sonority ----------------------------------- Low Sonority

---

**Figure 1. Sonority Hierarchy**

In (14) and (15), I have laid out all the possible outputs for the -um- derivation involving /l/-initial and other consonant-initial roots. Simple prefixation of -um- as in (14a) and (15a) are both not accepted because of the strict adherence to syllables with onsets; this is a pattern we see with the vowel-initial roots too (11a). In the case of *laku*, however, a simple deletion of the initial /u/ is enough to solve this, as seen in (14b). A simple deletion of the initial /l/, as attempted in (15b), though, is not acceptable as the onset consonant cluster *mt* goes against the SSG principle. The /ml/ sound is a nasal, and the /l/ sound is an obstruent, so the onset cluster *mt* has a falling sonority, something that is not allowed in the onset position, according to the SSG principle. As such, the grammar is “forced” to apply *Onset Metathesis* as a last resort, so that the output we get still satisfies the requirement for syllables with onset. In the case of *mlaku*, the onset *ml* consists of a nasal and a liquid, so the SSG is satisfied; there is no need to apply *Onset Metathesis*. From this, we can also see that the /l/ deletion as a strategy is preferred, because when both this and the *Onset Metathesis* are available in /l/-initial roots, the /l/ deletion wins over the *Onset Metathesis* in giving us the ideal output in (14b).

14. a. um+laku ➔ *umlaku [um.la.ku] Syllable without onset ✗
   b. um+laku ➔ umlaku ➔ mlaku [mla.ku] SSG satisfied ✔
   ‘to walk’

15. a. um+tibo ➔ *utib [um.ti.bo] Syllable without onset ✗
   b. um+tibo ➔ *utibo ➔ mtibo [mti.bo] SSG NOT satisfied ✗
   c. um+tibo ➔ utibo ➔ tumibo [tu.mi.bo] Lastresort-Onset Metathesis ✔
   ‘to fall’

In the following subsection, I provide more evidence for the necessity of phonological readjustment(s) connected to the -um- affix.

**Bilabial consonant repair**

In Javanese, there is further restriction imposed by the grammar of the language with regards to -um- attachment. A sequence of bilabial consonants seems to be disallowed in the language, when -um- is attached to a base; specifically, there needs to be some repair mechanism if this affix is attached to roots that start with the bilabial consonant /p/ or /b/. The following examples
in (16) show the repair mechanism that is employed by the grammar of the language. Please note that *gemagus* and *keminter* are alternatives to the forms in (16 a &b) in informal speech (Poedjosoedarmo, 1979).

16. **Pattern B**

   ![Pattern B](image)

   a. /b/ → /g/ bilabial → velar
   
   1 2 3 4
   
   um + bagus → um-bagus → b-um-agus → g-um-agus
   ‘good’ → ‘pretending to be good’

   b. /p/ → /k/ bilabial → velar
   
   1 2 3 4
   
   um + pinter → um-pinter → p-um-inter → k-um-inter
   ‘smart’ → ‘pretending to be smart’

We see from this data that there is bilabial consonant dissimilation, with the first bilabial consonant in the sequence (/b/ /p/) changing into its velar counterparts, after -*um-* , which has the bilabial consonant /m/, is infixed. This is one of the strategies also listed in Zuraw & Yu’s (2009) diverse repairs for multiple bilabial consonants, that may be done to provide contrast between the first consonant and the subsequent bilabial consonant. Consequently, this shows that the process of word derivation involving the -*um-* affix involves several steps and phonological readjustments, after the -*um-* is attached to the root. A simple process of phonological sub-categorization for a specific phonological unit is simply not adequate to explain the Javanese data.

To summarize, the Javanese infixation data that I have presented so far supports McCarthy and Prince’s (1993a) theory of **Phonological Readjustment**, contra Yu’s (2007) **Phonological Subcategorization**, because (i) it is not possible to posit a simple phonological target for the -*um-* affix, and (ii) the patterns we observe necessitates phonological readjustments – to get the ideal syllable structure, as well as satisfy the SSG. The number of syllables in the base does not seem to have any effect on the pattern observed and my analysis.

**CONCLUSION**

While I have provided an explanation for the different behavior of Javanese -*um-* vis-à-vis consonant-initial roots, /t/ initial roots present a potential problem for the account I have provided here. Since /t/ is a categorized as a liquid, just like /l/, SSG predicts that /t/ initial roots should behave like /l/ initial roots (11 – Pattern A). However, the data is messy with some roots surfacing as *r-um-aket* (12 - Pattern B), while some others appear as *m-ringis* or *m-ripat* (11 – Pattern A). The derivations for these words are given in (17) below.
At this point in time, I am unable to collect enough information on these examples. But there is also some evidence that the Javanese mlaku was lumaku in Old Javanese. The name of the popular museum located in Yogyakarta, Ullen Sentalu, for example, is short for the phrase ulating blencong sejatining tataraning lumaku or “light is the guide for the walk of life,” with the lumaku form. This shows that there might be some variation involved in the -um- derivation of liquid-initial roots. Nevertheless, I have provided some evidence here that the Javanese -um- favors McCarthy & Prince’s (1993a) Phonological Readjustment theory. Consequently, the affix -um- in Javanese cannot really be categorized as a “true” infix; instead, it is a subset of prefix that targets the left word boundary (Kalin, 2022). What sets it apart from other prefixes is the fact that its attachment to the left of the word boundary triggers other phonological readjustment(s).
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