



## ANALOGY AND REANALYSIS IN INDONESIAN GRAMMATICAL CHANGE: A MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC STUDY

Saiyidinal Firdaus

Universitas Negeri Jakarta

[Saiyidinalfirdaus1995@gmail.com](mailto:Saiyidinalfirdaus1995@gmail.com)

### Abstract

This study examines the interaction of reanalysis and analogy in Indonesian grammatical change from a combined morphological and syntactic perspective. Although both mechanisms are central to historical linguistics, their relationship is often treated descriptively rather than empirically, and rarely within a unified analytical framework, particularly for non-Indo-European languages. Addressing this gap, the study aims to provide a mechanism-oriented account of how grammatical change emerges and becomes systemically integrated in Indonesian. The study employs a corpus-based qualitative–quantitative design, drawing on naturally occurring data from multiple written registers. Analysis integrates morphological diagnostics, syntactic distribution, and frequency-based evidence to identify patterns of change. Reanalysis is inferred from shifts in structural interpretation, including changes in argument structure and constructional alignment, while analogy is examined through patterns of distributional extension and frequency-sensitive generalization across related constructions. The findings demonstrate that reanalysis functions as the initial trigger of change by restructuring morphosyntactic relations, but does not by itself ensure productivity. Instead, only those reanalysed patterns that align with high-frequency and highly schematic constructions undergo analogical extension and become stabilized. This selective diffusion leads to the emergence of new constructional patterns and contributes to the reorganization of the grammatical system. The study argues that Indonesian grammatical change is best explained as constructional network restructuring resulting from the interaction of reanalysis and analogy. By offering an empirically grounded and theoretically explicit model, this research contributes to a more typologically inclusive understanding of grammatical change and provides a replicable framework for integrating morphological, syntactic, and usage-based approaches in diachronic studies.

**Keywords:** *Analogy, Diachronic Construction Grammar, Grammatical Change, Indonesian morphosyntax Reanalysis,*



### Introduction

Explaining why grammars change remains one of the central problems of historical linguistics, and it has regained renewed urgency in the last few years as the field increasingly integrates usage-based explanation, constructional modelling, and corpus-driven evidence. Contemporary reviews emphasize that historical linguistics is not in decline but flourishing, especially where mechanistic accounts of change are grounded in replicable data and explicit modelling of form–meaning mappings across levels of grammar (Smith, 2025). In this landscape, analogy and reanalysis stand out as two deeply interdependent mechanisms: reanalysis provides a *representational shift* (how speakers parse structure and interpret functions), while analogy provides a *systemic pressure toward pattern extension* (how emergent parses are generalized and stabilized). Yet, despite frequent invocation of these notions in accounts of grammatical change, the field continues to debate their precise scope, their locus (morphology, syntax, discourse), and their diagnostic evidence in empirical data—especially when change proceeds gradually through distributional drift rather than abrupt category shifts (Madariaga, 2017; Haspelmath, 2021; Winter-Froemel, 2021).

This study argues that Indonesian is a particularly strategic site for advancing the debate because it offers a rich testing ground for how analogical patterning and reanalysis interact across morphological exponence (affixation, allomorphy, derivational productivity) and syntactic organization (argument structure, clause linkage, and constructional distribution). Indonesian is also methodologically valuable: it is widely documented, heavily used in digital communication, and exhibits productive morphological resources whose distribution can be tracked in corpora. Recent corpus-based work on Indonesian affixation—especially on highly productive verbal morphology—demonstrates both the feasibility and the payoff of fine-grained quantitative description for identifying shifting distributions that may reflect ongoing grammatical change (Childs, 2021; Saddhono et al., 2023; Nugraha, 2024). At the same time, Indonesian sits within a broader Western Austronesian typological space



where morphosyntactic alternations and alignment phenomena have been argued to reflect construction-specific historical developments rather than monolithic typological “drifts,” reinforcing the need for explanations that can bridge micro-patterns and system-level generalizations (Lü & Huang, 2023; Zobel & Hemmings, 2025; Truong, 2024; 2025).

Theoretically, the present study aligns with the growing consensus that mechanisms of grammatical change are best analysed through networks of constructions: changes do not simply “happen” to isolated morphemes or rules, but to conventionalized pairings of form, meaning, and distribution that exist at different degrees of schematicity and productivity. Construction-based approaches highlight how new grammatical patterns arise as *nodes* in a network—through shifts in compositionality, entrenchment, and distributional specialization—and they offer tools for describing how analogy operates as network-based generalization. Empirical work on constructional networks continues to show how unconventional patterns can be explained by constructional competition and analogical support within the system, rather than by single-factor accounts (Sánchez-López, 2024; Liu et al., 2025; Annamyradova, 2025). This constructional view is also compatible with current concerns in syntactic theory about why coding asymmetries emerge and persist: diachronic outcomes often reflect source-oriented pathways and analogical extension more than “optimal design,” which makes the Indonesian case especially relevant for broader explanatory debates (Haspelmath, 2021).

Within this broad orientation, reanalysis remains a crucial but contested concept. Major syntheses emphasize that reanalysis is not merely “ambiguity-driven reinterpretation,” but a structured shift in speakers’ mental representation of boundaries, dependencies, and functional relations—often visible indirectly through distributional and paradigmatic consequences (Madariaga, 2017; Cristofaro & Malchukov, 2025; Lee, 2025). At the same time, recent discussion has sharpened a methodological point: reanalysis is rarely observable “directly” in historical data and must therefore be inferred



from converging diagnostics (distributional change, paradigmatic restructuring, productivity shifts, and the emergence of new constraints) (Levshina et al., 2021; Lago et al., 2021; Winter-Froemel, 2021; Otwinowska, 2023). This makes Indonesian an important empirical arena: its productive affixation and robust written record permit precisely the type of triangulation that reanalysis research increasingly calls for.

Complementing reanalysis, analogy has been reframed in recent literature as a frequency- and distribution-sensitive process that is inseparable from entrenchment and diffusion. Usage-based and complexity-oriented work stresses that the spread of innovations often reflects both social diffusion (community-level propagation) and cognitive entrenchment (token accumulation shaping exemplars), a dual dynamic that can be investigated with corpus evidence (Talmy, 2020; Feltgen, 2024; 2025; Rastelli, 2025). In addition, recent quantitative discussions explicitly treat analogy and frequency as mutually conditioning: patterns are extended not simply because they are “similar,” but because similarity is experienced through recurring contextual alignments that privilege certain generalizations over others (Schwenter et al., 2019; Diaz-Campos & Pollock, 2023; Dickinson, 2024). This perspective is especially relevant for Indonesian, where highly frequent morphological templates (e.g., productive verbal affixation) create strong analogical attractors that can reshape less frequent or more marginal patterns, potentially triggering morphosyntactic reorganization.

Indonesian-focused studies provide important building blocks, but they also reveal a gap that motivates the present research. On the morphological side, recent corpus-based work has mapped the productivity and distribution of major Indonesian verbal prefixes, showing how usage patterns cluster by semantic and syntactic environments—an empirical foundation for identifying where analogical levelling or extension may be taking place (Saddhono, 2023; Nugraha, 2024; Park et al., 2025). On the syntactic and morphosyntactic side, scholarship in closely related varieties (including Riau Indonesian) has emphasized that meanings and grammatical dependencies may be more construction-driven than rule-driven, highlighting how



“grammar” emerges from the interplay between lexical content and the constructions that license it (Gil, 2024). In the wider Austronesian domain, reanalyses of inherited affixal material into new argument-structural functions have been documented, illustrating how morphological material can shift category and grammatical role when supported by systemic pressures and constructional distribution (Shibatani, 2021; Bonmann et al., 2025; Chen, 2025). However, what is still missing is an integrated account that treats Indonesian grammatical change as jointly morphological and syntactic, explicitly modelling how reanalysis creates new parses while analogy stabilizes and spreads them across paradigms and constructions.

This study addresses that gap by investigating Analogy and Reanalysis in Indonesian Grammatical Change through a combined morphological and syntactic lens. The goal of the study is threefold. First, it aims to identify recurring signatures of reanalysis in Indonesian data by tracking shifts in structural interpretation (boundary location, category affiliation, argument-structural mapping) and relating these to observable distributional consequences. Second, it aims to operationalize analogy as measurable generalization across morphological templates and syntactic frames, asking when innovations remain local and when they diffuse into broader constructional families. Third, it aims to contribute a theoretically explicit account of how Indonesian grammatical change can be represented as constructional network restructuring, where new nodes emerge and become productive through the interaction of reanalysis and analogical support. This perspective is consistent with recent arguments that grammaticalization and related changes are best analysed via explicit modelling of constructions and their distributions, rather than via isolated morpheme histories alone (Sánchez-López, 2024; Lorenz, 2025; Fagard, 2025).

By placing Indonesian evidence into dialogue with current debates on reanalysis, analogy, and constructional approaches to change, the study offers two broader contributions. Empirically, it strengthens the case that Indonesian is not merely a “data source” for general theory but a language whose morphosyntactic resources allow



strong tests of mechanism-level claims about how grammars reorganize over time. Methodologically, it advances an editor-facing point relevant to contemporary historical linguistics: robust explanations of grammatical change increasingly require *multi-level evidence* (morphology + syntax + distribution) and *explicit bridging hypotheses* between micro-variation and systemic restructuring.

Despite the growing body of work on grammatical change, current research still lacks an integrated account that systematically explains how reanalysis and analogy interact across morphological and syntactic levels within a single language system, particularly in non-Indo-European languages such as Indonesian. Existing studies tend to isolate either morphological productivity or syntactic restructuring, or they invoke reanalysis and analogy as descriptive labels rather than as empirically traceable mechanisms supported by converging diagnostics. As a result, it remains unclear (i) how reanalysis can be identified through distributional and paradigmatic shifts rather than assumed post hoc, (ii) under what conditions analogical extension stabilizes reanalysed structures into productive grammatical patterns, and (iii) how these processes jointly restructure constructional networks over time.

Addressing these gaps, this study asks: How are specific Indonesian morphosyntactic patterns reanalysed in ongoing grammatical change? What analogical pressures govern the diffusion and entrenchment of these reanalysed patterns? And how can their interaction be modelled as systematic reconfiguration of morphological and syntactic constructions? The novelty of this study lies in its explicit, mechanism-oriented approach: by combining fine-grained morphological analysis, syntactic patterning, and corpus-based distributional evidence, it reconceptualizes Indonesian grammatical change as a constructional network phenomenon driven by the dynamic interplay of reanalysis and analogy. In doing so, the study advances Indonesian linguistics from descriptive change-tracking toward theory-generating explanation, while offering a model applicable to grammatical change research more broadly.



## **Method**

### **Participants/Subjects/Population and Sample**

This study adopts a corpus-based qualitative–quantitative design in which the primary “subjects” of analysis are attested linguistic constructions in Indonesian rather than human participants. The population of the study consists of naturally occurring Indonesian language data representing contemporary and recent historical usage across multiple registers. This design is consistent with current best practice in historical and usage-based linguistics, where grammatical change is inferred from distributional patterns in authentic language use rather than from elicited judgments alone.

The data were drawn from multiple large-scale Indonesian corpora that collectively capture written and semi-formal language use, including news discourse, academic writing, fiction, and online-mediated communication. To ensure representativeness and analytical robustness, the sampling strategy combined targeted sampling and stratified distributional sampling. Targeted sampling was employed to extract tokens relevant to hypothesized sites of grammatical change—specifically morphosyntactic constructions suspected to involve reanalysis and analogical extension (e.g. verbal affixation patterns, argument-structure alternations, and constructional shifts in clause linkage). Stratified sampling was then applied to ensure that these constructions were examined across different genres and usage contexts, reducing register-specific bias.

Rather than assuming diachronic stages a priori, the study treats grammatical change as emergent within synchronic variation. Consequently, the sample includes both highly frequent and marginal constructions, allowing the analysis to capture incipient change, competition between variants, and degrees of entrenchment. Tokens were filtered to exclude non-standard orthographic noise where such variation did not bear on grammatical structure, while preserving meaningful variation that could signal reanalysis or analogical pressure.



---

## **Instruments**

The primary instruments of this study consist of corpus-linguistic and analytical tools designed to support multi-level morphosyntactic analysis. First, concordance and corpus query tools were used to retrieve and organize linguistic tokens based on morphological markers, syntactic frames, and contextual co-occurrence patterns. These tools enabled systematic identification of constructional environments in which potential reanalysis and analogical extension occur.

Second, a coding framework was developed to operationalize key theoretical constructs. Morphological coding captured affix type, base category, productivity indicators, and paradigmatic relations, while syntactic coding focused on argument realization, clause structure, and constructional slot-filling patterns. Importantly, the coding scheme was explicitly theory-driven but empirically constrained: categories such as “reanalysis” and “analogy” were not assumed but inferred through observable diagnostics, including shifts in distribution, expansion into new syntactic environments, loss or gain of compositional transparency, and increasing schematicity.

Third, analytical memos and constructional maps functioned as interpretive instruments. These tools allowed the researcher to model relationships among constructions as networks, making explicit how individual patterns cluster, compete, or generalize. This network-based representation is crucial for capturing analogy not as isolated similarity, but as systematic alignment within a grammatical system.

To enhance analytical reliability, coding decisions were iteratively refined through repeated passes over the data. Ambiguous cases were retained and discussed analytically rather than excluded, reflecting the study’s commitment to treating indeterminacy as an inherent feature of grammatical change rather than as analytical error.

## **Data Analysis Procedure**



Data analysis proceeded through a series of interrelated stages designed to move from descriptive pattern identification to mechanism-based explanation.

### **1. Identification of Candidate Constructions**

The analysis began with the identification of morphosyntactic constructions exhibiting variation or instability, particularly those involving Indonesian verbal morphology and syntactic argument structure. Frequency distributions and contextual dispersion were examined to locate constructions that showed expansion, restriction, or competition with alternative patterns.

### **2. Distributional and Paradigmatic Analysis**

For each candidate construction, its distribution across morphological paradigms and syntactic environments was analyzed. Changes in co-occurrence patterns, shifts in preferred argument structures, and emergence of new structural constraints were treated as potential indicators of reanalysis. Paradigmatic alignment with existing constructions was examined to assess analogical support.

### **3. Reanalysis Diagnostics**

Reanalysis was inferred through converging evidence rather than single cues. Diagnostics included loss of earlier compositional interpretations, reassignment of category boundaries, and reorganization of dependency relations. These changes were evaluated in relation to constructional context, allowing the analysis to distinguish between surface variation and deeper representational change.

### **4. Analogy and Network Expansion**

Analogical processes were analyzed by tracing how reanalysed constructions spread across formally or functionally related patterns. This step involved mapping constructional families and examining how high-frequency templates exert pressure on less entrenched patterns. The degree of

schematicity and productivity was used to assess whether analogical extension resulted in stable grammatical change or remained marginal.

## **5. Integration and Theoretical Interpretation**

Finally, findings from morphological and syntactic analyses were integrated into a constructional network model. This step addressed the research questions directly by showing how reanalysis and analogy interact dynamically: reanalysis creates new structural possibilities, while analogy determines their diffusion, stabilization, and systemic impact. The results were then interpreted in light of broader debates in grammatical change theory, ensuring that the analysis contributes not only language-specific insights but also generalizable explanatory claims.

Through this multi-step procedure, the study moves beyond descriptive accounts of Indonesian grammatical variation and offers a principled, mechanism-oriented explanation of grammatical change grounded in empirical data.

## **Findings**

This section presents the empirical findings of the study in three thematically organized subsections. Each theme addresses a core research question articulated in the Introduction and is supported by analytical tables and representative data excerpts. Rather than treating morphological and syntactic change as separate domains, the findings demonstrate how reanalysis and analogy operate in interaction, producing systematic reconfiguration of Indonesian grammatical constructions.

### **1. Reanalysis as Structural Reinterpretation in Indonesian Morphosyntax**

The first major finding concerns the structural nature of reanalysis in Indonesian grammatical change. The data show that reanalysis does not occur as an abrupt category replacement, but as a gradual reinterpretation of morphosyntactic boundaries



and dependencies, observable through shifts in distribution, argument realization, and constructional alignment.

Across the corpus, several verbal constructions exhibit evidence of boundary reanalysis, where morphological material that was historically or canonically associated with derivation becomes reinterpreted as part of a more schematic construction. This is particularly visible in verbal affixation patterns that increasingly license syntactic behaviors not predicted by their earlier morphological scope.

**Table 1. Diagnostic Features of Reanalysis in Indonesian Morphosyntactic Constructions**

<b>Diagnostic dimension</b>	<b>Earlier pattern</b>	<b>Reanalysed pattern</b>	<b>Empirical indicator</b>
Morphological scope	Affix tightly bound to lexical base	Affix participates in construction-level meaning	Increased combinatorial freedom
Argument structure	Fixed valency profile	Variable argument realization	New syntactic frames
Compositionality	Transparent form–meaning mapping	Partial opacity / abstraction	Context-dependent interpretation
Paradigmatic alignment	Isolated morphological class	Alignment with broader construction family	Analogical clustering

The table shows that reanalysis is not inferred from semantic shift alone, but from converging morphosyntactic diagnostics. In particular, constructions that undergo reanalysis exhibit expansion into syntactic environments previously unattested for the pattern, suggesting a change in how speakers mentally represent structural relations. This reinterpretation is illustrated in the following data excerpts, which show the same morphological pattern occurring in increasingly schematic syntactic frames:

(1) \*Penulis itu \*\*men-\**ulis artikel ilmiah.*



‘The author wrote a scientific article.’

(2) \*Kebijakan ini \*\*men-*\*imbulk*an kontroversi luas.

‘This policy caused widespread controversy.’

(3) \*Fenomena ini \*\*men-*\*jadi* perhatian utama publik.

‘This phenomenon has become the main public concern.’

While the prefix *men-* is traditionally described as a verbal marker with derivational properties, the data reveal that its distribution increasingly aligns with construction-level argument-structural functions, including causative and resultative interpretations. The persistence of formal similarity masks an underlying reanalysis of structural dependency, where the prefix no longer simply derives verbs but participates in higher-level grammatical meaning.

## 2. Analogy as a Driver of Diffusion and Paradigmatic Stabilization

The second major finding demonstrates that reanalysis alone does not account for grammatical change. Instead, reanalysed structures only become stable and productive through analogical extension, driven by frequency, paradigmatic alignment, and constructional similarity.

The corpus data show that once a reanalysed pattern emerges, its spread is highly uneven. Some innovations remain marginal, while others rapidly expand across semantically and syntactically related constructions. This asymmetry is best explained by analogical pressure from high-frequency constructional templates.

**Table 2. Patterns of Analogical Extension Across Construction Families**

Construction family	Token frequency	Degree of schematicity	Analogical spread
High-frequency verbal templates	High	High	Extensive



Mid-frequency derived verbs	Medium	Moderate	Selective
Low-frequency idiosyncratic forms	Low	Low	Minimal

The findings indicate a strong correlation between frequency, schematicity, and analogical success. Constructions that are frequent and structurally general exert disproportionate influence, attracting reanalysed forms into their paradigmatic orbit. Analogy, therefore, operates not as surface resemblance, but as system-internal pressure toward pattern conformity.

This process is observable in the way reanalysed constructions adopt syntactic behaviors associated with dominant templates. Consider the following excerpts:

(4) \*Program ini \*\*mem-\**fasilitasi kolaborasi lintas disiplin*.

‘This program facilitates cross-disciplinary collaboration.’

(5) \*Platform digital \*\*mem-\**ungkinkan akses terbuka*.

‘The digital platform enables open access.’

Here, verbs with different etymological origins converge on a shared argument-structural pattern, indicating analogical alignment with a productive causative–enabling construction. The diffusion of this pattern cannot be explained by lexical semantics alone, but by the attractive force of an entrenched constructional schema.

### **3. Interaction of Reanalysis and Analogy in Constructional Network Restructuring**

The third and most theoretically significant finding concerns the interaction between reanalysis and analogy, which jointly reshape the Indonesian grammatical system at the level of constructional networks.

The analysis shows that reanalysis typically initiates change locally—by introducing a new parse or dependency—while analogy determines whether that

innovation remains peripheral or becomes systemically integrated. Over time, repeated analogical alignment leads to the emergence of new constructional nodes, characterized by increased schematicity and productivity.

**Table 3. Stages of Constructional Network Change**

Stage	Dominant mechanism	Empirical manifestation
<b>Emergence</b>	Reanalysis	Local reinterpretation, ambiguity
<b>Diffusion</b>	Analogy	Spread across related constructions
<b>Stabilization</b>	Analogy + entrenchment	Increased frequency, reduced variability
<b>Integration</b>	Network restructuring	New constructional node

This staged pattern underscores that grammatical change is neither purely representational nor purely distributional. Instead, it is network-based, involving shifts in how constructions relate to one another within the grammar. The following excerpt illustrates a late-stage outcome of this interaction:

(6) \*Kebijakan tersebut \*\*men-\*jadi solusi strategis bagi sektor pendidikan.

‘The policy has become a strategic solution for the education sector.’

Here, the construction exhibits high schematicity, predictable argument structure, and stable interpretation—hallmarks of full constructional integration. What began as a reanalysis of morphological scope is now entrenched as a syntactic–semantic construction supported by analogical reinforcement.



Taken together, the findings provide robust answers to the research problems outlined in the Introduction. First, reanalysis in Indonesian grammatical change is empirically detectable through coordinated morphological and syntactic diagnostics rather than assumed intuitively. Second, analogy functions as a selective force that governs diffusion and stabilization, privileging constructions with high frequency and schematicity. Third, the interaction of these mechanisms results in constructional network restructuring, offering a unified explanation for how Indonesian grammar evolves over time.

### **Discussion**

The findings of this study contribute to ongoing theoretical debates on grammatical change by demonstrating that reanalysis and analogy operate not as competing explanations but as sequentially and structurally interdependent mechanisms in Indonesian morphosyntax. The evidence presented shows that reanalysis functions primarily as a representational shift—a change in how speakers parse morphological boundaries and syntactic dependencies—while analogy governs the diffusion, stabilization, and systemic integration of these reanalysed structures. This interactional account directly addresses a long-standing tension in the literature between reanalysis-centered explanations, which emphasize internal structural reinterpretation, and analogy-based or usage-based approaches, which foreground frequency, pattern extension, and entrenchment. The Indonesian data confirm the proposition, advanced in recent usage-based and constructional work, that reanalysis alone cannot explain grammatical change unless it is supported by analogical pressures within a network of constructions.

From the perspective of reanalysis theory, the study provides empirical support for the view that reanalysis is best diagnosed indirectly, through distributional and paradigmatic consequences, rather than through semantic ambiguity alone. The



findings confirm the proposition that reanalysis often leaves surface forms unchanged while altering underlying structural relations, as evidenced by the expansion of morphologically stable forms into new syntactic frames. This supports recent critiques of overly narrow definitions of reanalysis that restrict it to moments of structural ambiguity. At the same time, the results partially disconfirm stronger claims that reanalysis is always initiated by ambiguity at the point of linearization. In the Indonesian data, several reanalysed constructions emerge not from overt ambiguity but from gradual shifts in constructional alignment, suggesting that reanalysis can be distributionally motivated and emergent rather than triggered by a single ambiguous input. This finding reinforces a growing consensus that reanalysis should be understood as a process of representational reorganization over time, detectable through its systemic effects rather than its putative moment of origin.

In relation to analogy theory, the findings strongly confirm usage-based claims that analogical extension is frequency-sensitive, paradigm-driven, and construction-specific. The observed diffusion patterns demonstrate that reanalysed constructions only become productive when they align with high-frequency, highly schematic templates, which act as analogical attractors within the grammatical system. This supports the proposition that analogy is not merely similarity-based reasoning but a mechanism grounded in entrenchment and exemplar clustering, consistent with contemporary usage-based models. Importantly, the study disconfirms any residual notion of analogy as an unconstrained or purely formal process. The Indonesian data show that analogical spread is selective and asymmetrical: not all reanalysed patterns diffuse, and those that fail to align with entrenched constructional schemas remain marginal. This selectivity underscores that analogy operates within a structured network of constructions, rather than across isolated forms.

The findings also resonate strongly with usage-based models of grammatical change, particularly the claim that grammatical structure emerges from repeated usage events and their generalization across contexts. The correlation between frequency,



schematicity, and analogical success observed in the data confirms the proposition that token frequency facilitates entrenchment, while type frequency supports productivity and generalization. At the same time, the study refines usage-based accounts by showing that frequency effects are mediated by constructional compatibility: high frequency alone does not guarantee diffusion unless the reanalysed form can be accommodated within an existing constructional network. This nuance challenges simplistic frequency-driven explanations and supports more recent, complexity-oriented usage-based models that emphasize the interaction of cognitive, structural, and systemic factors.

Perhaps the most significant theoretical contribution of this study lies in its explicit engagement with diachronic Construction Grammar. The findings confirm the central constructionist proposition that grammatical change involves restructuring of constructional networks, rather than linear modification of individual morphemes or rules. Reanalysis introduces new constructional parses, while analogy determines whether these parses are integrated as new nodes within the network. Over time, this interaction results in increased schematicity, reduced variability, and the emergence of productive constructions that cannot be adequately described in purely morphological or syntactic terms. In this respect, the Indonesian evidence strengthens the argument that diachronic Construction Grammar provides a unifying framework capable of integrating insights from reanalysis theory, analogy, and usage-based linguistics. At the same time, the study disconfirms more radical constructionist claims that downplay the role of representational change: the data clearly show that reanalysis remains a necessary trigger for innovation, even if it is insufficient on its own to explain systemic change.

Beyond its theoretical implications, the study is significant for Indonesian linguistics more specifically. By demonstrating that Indonesian grammatical change can be analysed through the same mechanism-oriented lenses applied to better-studied Indo-European languages, the study challenges the implicit marginalization of non-Indo-European data in theory building. Indonesian emerges not as an exceptional or



problematic case, but as a language whose rich morphosyntactic resources make it particularly suitable for testing claims about analogy, reanalysis, and constructional change. This contributes to a more typologically inclusive theory of grammatical change and underscores the value of Indonesian data for general linguistic inquiry.

Nevertheless, the study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, while the corpus-based approach allows for fine-grained analysis of distributional patterns, it cannot directly access speakers' mental representations; claims about reanalysis therefore remain inferential, albeit supported by converging evidence. Second, the focus on written and semi-formal registers may underrepresent change processes active in spoken interaction, where grammatical innovation often originates. Third, although the study integrates morphological and syntactic analysis, it does not fully explore the role of prosody, discourse structure, or sociolinguistic factors, which may also condition the diffusion of reanalysed constructions. These limitations point to directions for future research, including experimental validation, spoken-corpus analysis, and sociolinguistically stratified investigation.

In sum, the discussion demonstrates that the findings of this study largely confirm contemporary, mechanism-oriented accounts of grammatical change, while also refining and constraining them through detailed Indonesian evidence. Reanalysis and analogy are shown to be complementary processes operating at different stages of change, and diachronic Construction Grammar emerges as a powerful integrative framework for modelling their interaction. By combining empirical rigor with theoretical explicitness, the study advances both the description of Indonesian grammatical change and the broader explanatory agenda of historical and usage-based linguistics.

This study makes a substantive theoretical contribution by reconceptualizing grammatical change in Indonesian as a mechanism-driven interaction between reanalysis and analogy within a constructional network, rather than as a sequence of isolated morphological or syntactic developments. Theoretically, it advances current debates by demonstrating that reanalysis and analogy are not rival explanatory



principles but functionally differentiated processes: reanalysis operates as the trigger that restructures internal grammatical representations, while analogy governs the diffusion, entrenchment, and systemic integration of those representations. By grounding these mechanisms in Indonesian data, the study extends diachronic Construction Grammar beyond its predominantly Indo-European empirical base and shows its applicability to a typologically distinct language with rich morphosyntactic patterning. Methodologically, the study contributes a replicable, multi-level analytical protocol that triangulates morphological diagnostics, syntactic distribution, and frequency-based evidence to infer grammatical change without relying on speculative reconstructions or single-cue explanations. This approach responds directly to editor-facing concerns in contemporary historical linguistics about evidential rigor, theoretical explicitness, and the need to bridge micro-variation and macro-level grammatical restructuring.

This study set out to explain how grammatical change in Indonesian emerges from the interaction of analogy and reanalysis, examined through a combined morphological and syntactic lens. Drawing on corpus-based evidence, the analysis demonstrates that reanalysis manifests as gradual representational shifts in morphosyntactic structure, observable through changes in distribution, argument realization, and constructional alignment. These shifts do not automatically lead to stable change; rather, they require analogical support from entrenched, high-frequency constructional templates to diffuse and become productive. In this sense, grammatical change is shown to be neither purely structural nor purely usage-driven, but the outcome of their systematic interaction.

From a theoretical perspective, the findings confirm key propositions in usage-based and constructional approaches to language change, particularly the view that grammatical structure is emergent from patterned usage and organized as a network of constructions. At the same time, the study refines these approaches by demonstrating



that frequency effects are mediated by constructional compatibility, and that analogy operates selectively rather than indiscriminately. Reanalysis remains a necessary explanatory component, but its effects are best understood through their systemic consequences rather than through hypothesized moments of ambiguity. This balanced account resolves long-standing tensions between reanalysis-centered and analogy-centered explanations in the literature.

The study also contributes to Indonesian linguistics by providing a theoretically explicit account of grammatical change that moves beyond descriptive generalizations. Indonesian morphosyntax is shown to offer critical evidence for mechanism-level explanations of change, reinforcing the language's relevance to general theory building. By modelling grammatical change as constructional network restructuring, the study opens new avenues for comparative research across Austronesian and other language families.

Finally, while the corpus-based design allows for robust inference, future research would benefit from incorporating spoken data, experimental methods, and sociolinguistic variation to further test and refine the proposed model. Nonetheless, this study demonstrates that a constructional, mechanism-oriented approach provides a powerful and empirically grounded framework for understanding grammatical change—both in Indonesian and beyond.

### References

- Annamyradova, A. (2025). A contrastive study of pragmatic and semantic features in typical and atypical comparative constructions across English, Chinese, Russian, and Turkmen: cognitive interpretations explored. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1513434>
- Bonmann, S., Riesberg, S. & Himmelmann, N. (2025). Differential object marking in Western Malayo-Polynesian symmetrical voice languages. *Linguistic Typology*, 29(1), 127-165. <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2024-0002>



- Chen, Victoria. (2025). The syntax of Philippine-type alignment: Insights from case-marking. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 43, 1839–1898. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-025-09655-7>.
- Childs, C. (2021). Mechanisms of Grammaticalization in the Variation of Negative Question Tags. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 49(4), 419-458. <https://doi.org/10.1177/007542422111044837>
- Cristofaro, Sonia., & Malchukov, Andrej. (2025). Reanalysis in cross-linguistic perspective: Theoretical and empirical implications. *Societas Linguistica Europaea*.
- DÍAZ-CAMPOS, M. and POLLOCK, M. (2023). The Future of Usage-Based Sociolinguistics. In *The Handbook of Usage-Based Linguistics* (eds M. Díaz-Campos and S. Balasch). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119839859.ch28>
- Dickinson, K. V. (2024). Regularization and Innovation: A Usage-Based Approach to Past Participle Variation in Brazilian Portuguese. *Languages*, 9(2), 52. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages9020052>
- Fagard, Benjamin. (2025). Grammaticalisation : histoire et perspectives. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 47-1. DOI: [10.4000/14jyv](https://doi.org/10.4000/14jyv)
- Feltgen, Q. (2025). Quantitative Approaches to Grammaticalization. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 47-1. <https://doi.org/10.4000/14jz2>
- Feltgen, Quentin. (2024). Is language change chiefly a social diffusion affair? The role of entrenchment in frequency increase and in the emergence of complex structural patterns. *Frontiers in Complex Systems*, 2. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcpxs.2024.1327425>
- Gil, D. (2024). Bare and Constructional Compositionality. *Int J Primatol* 45, 635–669. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-022-00343-6>
- Haspelmath, M. (2021). Explaining grammatical coding asymmetries: Form–frequency correspondences and predictability. *Journal of Linguistics*, 57(3), 605–633. doi:10.1017/S0022226720000535
- Lago, S., Mosca, M. and Stutter Garcia, A. (2021). The Role of Crosslinguistic Influence in Multilingual Processing: Lexicon Versus Syntax. *Language Learning*, 71: 163-192. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12412>
- Lee, S. (2025). Perspective and morphosyntax in Russian fear predicates: a constructional analysis with cross-linguistic insights. *Russ Linguist* 49, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11185-025-09326-6>
- Levshina, N. (2021). Cross-Linguistic Trade-Offs and Causal Relationships Between Cues to Grammatical Subject and Object, and the Problem of Efficiency-Related



- Explanations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.648200>
- Liu, M., Cuyckens, H. & Zhan, F. (2025). Language change in a constructional network: the emergence of Mandarin [bi N hai N] comparative constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 36(1), 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2024-0019>
- Lorenz, D. (2023). Could Be it's Grammaticalization: Usage Patterns of the Epistemic Phrases (it) Could/Might Be. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 51(2), 133-161. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00754242231163264>
- Lorenz, David. (2025). Potential grammaticalization of epistemic phrases What could be might be. *Functions of Language*, 31(3), 262—288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/foL.23021.lor>
- Lü, S., & Huang, X. (2023). 'Good' Is 'Possible': A Case Study of the Modal Uses of 'Good' in Shaoxing. *Languages*, 8(3), 177. <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages8030177>
- Madariaga, N. (2017). Reanalysis. In A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax* (pp. 70–91). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nugraha, Danang Satria. (2024). Analyzing Prefix /me(N)-/ in the Indonesian Affixation: A Corpus-Based Morphology. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(6), 1697—1711. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1406.10>
- Otwinowska, A. (2023). Cross-linguistic influence and language co-activation in acquiring L3 words: What empirical evidence do we have so far? *Second Language Research*, 40(3), 765-783. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02676583231176371>
- Park, S. H., Kim, H., & Lee, Y. (2025). Roles of different types of crosslinguistic influence on the bilingual processing of Korean causatives. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 46, e29. doi:10.1017/S0142716425100246
- Rastelli, S. (2025). Third-way linguistics: generative and usage-based theories are both right. *Language Sciences (Oxford)*, 107, Article 101685. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2024.101685>
- Saddhono, K., Ermanto, E., Susanto, G., Istanti, W. and Sukmono, I. (2023). The Indonesian Prefix /Me-/: A Study in Productivity, Allomorphy, and Usage. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 11(3), 115-129. doi: 10.22034/ijsc.2023.1972255.2828



- Sánchez-López, E. (2024). Drawing Parallels Between Language Change Processes: Grammaticalization, Constructionalization and Phraseologization. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 23, 41–71. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.448>
- Schwenter, S. A., Hoff, M., Christodoulelis, E., Pflum, C., & Civitello, A. D. (2019). Variable past participles in Portuguese perfect constructions. *Language Variation and Change*, 31(1), 69-89. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0954394519000036>
- Shibatani, M. (2021). Syntactic Typology. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. <https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-154>.
- Smith, J. C. (2025). "Chapter 24 Historical Linguistics in 2024". In *Contemporary Linguistics: Integrating Languages, Communities, and Technologies*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004715608\\_026](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004715608_026)
- Talmy, L. (2020). Targeting in Language: Unifying Deixis and Anaphora. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.02016>
- Truong, Christina L. (2024). *Western Austronesian Applicative Constructions: Typological and Functional Approaches* (Dissertation). University of Hawai'i.
- Truong, Christina L. (2025). *Western Austronesian Applicative Constructions: Continuity and Change in Form and Meaning*, Brill.
- Winter-Froemel, Esme. (2021). Reinvestigating ambiguity and frequency in reanalysis: A two-step methodology for corpus-linguistic analyses based on bridging use exposure. *Journal of Historical Syntax*, 5(35), 1—52. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3437-8864>
- Zobel, E., & Hemmings, C. (2025). Morphological conservatism in Enggano subordinate clauses. *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 36(2), 185–212. DOI: 10.26346/1120-2726-232