

Tense, aspect and mood in some West Indonesian languages

Alexander ADELAAR

Asia Institute
University of Melbourne

In this paper, I follow the development of tense, aspect and mood markers in some West Indonesian languages. I try to find out what happened to the aspectual and modal affixes reconstructed for Proto Austronesian, and I look for tense, aspect and mood affixes that cannot be traced to Proto Austronesian and must be innovative.

The languages in question have definitely reduced the original Proto Austronesian aspect and mood affixes, and there is usually no new morphology to compensate for this reduction. The Proto Austronesian modal suffix *-a has retained its original form and function more successfully than the aspect affixes. Malagasy is the only language with clear tense distinctions: they are due to contact with Bantu languages.

Remarkably, the perfect marker *ni-/*<in> has gone almost full circle from a perfect marker in Proto Austronesian to an undergoer marker in Maanyan and other South East Barito languages in Borneo, and then from an undergoer marker in South East Barito to a past tense marker in Malagasy. While the change from undergoer voice to past tense is common, that from perfect aspect to undergoer voice is less obvious.

1. Introduction

In this paper, I follow the development of tense, aspect and mood markers in four West Indonesian languages (or language groups), to wit the Batak, Javanese, Malayic and South East Barito languages. I will do so by (1) trying to find out what happened to the aspectual and modal affixes reconstructed for Proto Austronesian (henceforth PAn), and (2) looking for tense, aspect and mood affixes that cannot be traced to PAn and must be innovative.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 gives a schematic overview of PAn verbal morphology. Section 3 deals with Batak and is largely based on data from Toba Batak, although it also includes some comments on Karo Batak. Section 4 discusses Old and modern standard Javanese. Section 5 describes aspect and mood in Kanayatn, a branch of Malayic. The members of this branch are spoken in West Kalimantan (Indonesian Borneo) and western Sarawak (Malaysian Borneo). Section 6 deals with South East Barito languages, which include Maanyan (spoken in Central and South Kalimantan) and Malagasy (spoken in Madagascar). Finally, in section 7 I present some conclusions. I give a list of abbreviations at the end of the present section.

Space limitations forced me to make a selection of languages to be included in this paper. I decided on the above ones as they are reasonably representative of the typological diversity and geographical spread of West Indonesian languages. They are also among the languages I have become most familiar with in the course of my Austronesian investigations. This paper may be seen as a modest initial step towards a more comprehensive study of tense, aspect and mood developments in the West Indonesian language area.

2. A schematic overview of PAn verbal morphology

Table one is a schematic overview of Ross' (2001) reconstruction of PAn verbal morphology. In this system aspect and mood are expressed, but not tense. In the West Indonesian languages discussed below we see a reduction of the original PAn aspect and mood affixes, along with the development of new markers of grammatical aspect and mood. Tense is generally absent in these languages, except in Malagasy.

	Actor	Patient	Location	Circumstantial
INDICATIVE				
Neutral	<um>root	root-ən	root-an	Si-root
Perfective	<umin>root	<in>root	<in>V-an	Si-<in>root
Durative	<um>-R-root	R-root-ən	R-V-an	Si-R-root
NON-INDICATIVE				
Atemporal	root	root-u	root-i	án-i + root (root-áni)
Projective	<um>root-a	root-aw	root-ay	án-ay + root (root-ánay)

Table 1: PAn verbal morphology (Ross 2001)

3. TAM affixes in Batak

There are several varieties of Batak. The Batak language group has two main subgroups, Southern Batak (including Toba -, Mandailing - and Angkola Batak) and Northern Batak (including Karo -, Dairi - and Alas Batak), whereas Simalungun Batak takes an uncertain position between the two.¹ My present observations are mainly based on Toba Batak, although I also use some data from Karo Batak for comparison.

3.1 Toba Batak

Toba Batak does not have tense or mood affixes. (The imperative is marked by absence of voice marking). It is not clear whether UO marking (undergoer orientation) involves aspect. The language has four sets of UO markers:

- Set 1. *hu-* is prefixed to a verb if the agent is 1s or 1p exclusive
 ta- is prefixed to a verb if the agent is 1p inclusive
 di- is prefixed to a verb if the agent is a second or third person
- Set 2. *hu-* is prefixed to a verb if the agent is 1s
 ta- is prefixed to a verb if the agent is 1p inclusive
 ni- or <in> are affixed if the agent is second person, third person or 1p.inc.
- Set 3. *-on*
- Set 4. *tar-*

¹ Based on phonological evidence, Simalungun Batak seems to be an early off-shoot of Southern Batak (Adelaar 1981), but this is a preliminary conclusion at best.

The affixes *ni-* and *<in>* are allomorphs of the same morpheme: while *ni-* is prefixed to monosyllabic roots and roots with initial vowel, *<in>* is infix after the first consonant of other roots.

Tables two and three below illustrate examples of sets one and two above with the root *búat* ‘make’.

1s	<i>hu-búat</i>	1p.inc.	<i>ta-búat</i>
		1p.exc.	<i>hu-bùat hámi</i>
2s	<i>di-buàt hó</i>	2p	<i>di-buàt hámu</i>
3s	<i>di-buàt (ibána)</i>	3p	<i>di-buàt nasída</i>

Table 2. Examples of *di-/hu-/ta-* prefixation (based on *búat* ‘to take’)

1s	<i>(na) hu-búat</i>	1p.inc.	<i>(na) ta-búat</i>
		1p.exc.	<i>(na) binuàknámi</i>
2s	<i>(na) binuákmu</i>	2p	<i>(na) binuákmu?²</i>
3s	<i>(na) binuákna</i>	3p	<i>(na) binuàknasída</i>

Table 3. Examples of *ni-/<in>/hu-/ta-* affixation (based on *búat*)

Tuuk, Nababan and Wouk have very different – and partly contradictory – interpretations concerning the meanings of *di-/hu-/ta-* and *ni-/<in>-(/hu-/ta-)*.

Tuuk does not attribute any tense or aspectual meaning to these voice markers. In his description, *di-/hu-/ta-* and *ni-/<in>-(/hu-/ta-)* are the undergoer counterparts of verbs that have *man-* prefixed. The latter are actor-oriented verbs and are rendered as infinitive verbs in Dutch; they convey no aspectual notion, and the examples given by Tuuk are not in context. There is also an infix *<um>*. It does not often occur in transitive verbs, and if it does, it is just a variant form of *man-*; it is especially favoured in the ritual *poda* register. The affix *di-* etc. occurs in constructions where agent and undergoer are both prominent, even if they are not mentioned; *Ni-/<in>* occurs in subordinate clauses in which the agent is less specific, and in nominalisations.

Examples (1) and (2) illustrate the use of the prefix *di-* :

- (1) *di-ruar-i* *nasída* *tu* *balian*
 UO-come.out-APPL they towards outside
 ‘They went outside’ (Tuuk 160)
- (2) *mallañei ma* *porhis* *di-gohi* *ma* *tu* *huta*
 swim +modal.particle³ ant UO-fill to village
 ‘the ants swam in and filled the village’ (Tuuk 159)

Examples (3) to (7) illustrate the use of *ni-/<in>* in subordinate clauses:

² Nababan does not give a derivation with a specifically 2p pronoun.

³ Tuuk (1971:359-368) describes *ma* as a modal marker mainly expressing wish and desire as well as unfinished action. On page 367, he indicates that *ma* introducing several subsequent phrases may express simultaneous action: this seems to be the case in the sentence at hand.

- (3) *Pidoj na niultopmí [ni+ultop+-mu+i] ...*
 bird REL UO-shoot.with.blowpipe-2s.GEN-that
 ‘the bird you shot with your blowpipe...’ (Tuuk 167)
- (4) *niji na ni-lottik*
 tooth REL UO-file
 ‘filed teeth’
- (5) *pinalua [<in>+pa-lua] pe ursa on*
 <UO>caus-free +FUT deer this
 ‘This deer will be set free’ (Tuuk 169)
- (6) *ija p<in>isat, bottár gota-na*
 if <UO>-squeeze white gum-3GEN
 ‘if squeezed, the gum is white’ (Tuuk 169)
- (7) *aha niulám [ni+ula+mu] tu ladaŋ on?⁴*
 what UO-do-2s.GEN towards field;area this
 ‘what are you doing in these parts? (Tuuk 167)

Examples of *ni-/<in>* in nominalisations are given in (8). All are from Tuuk (1971:167).

- (8) *tinakkomí [<in> + takko+mu+i]*
 (UO+steal+2s.GEN+that)
 ‘the things you’ve stolen’

pinahan [<in> + pahan]
 (UO+feed)
 ‘cattle’

sinonduk (<in> + sonduk ‘the one to whom food is being served’) ‘husband’

Finally, Tuuk points out that *ni-* etc. also occurs in imperatives that are not directed at a particular person, and in UO constructions with no specific agent:

- (9) *ni-alap ma oguŋ i!*
 UO-fetch +wish gong that
 ‘Let the gong be fetched!’ (Tuuk 169)

Nababan describes *di-* etc. as a ‘simple’ transitive passive prefix, and *ni-* etc. as its completive counterpart. He attributes the same aspectual opposition to *maŋ-* and *<um>*. ‘Completive’ implies that the action has already taken place, in contrast to ‘simple’, which is neutral in terms of tense/aspect, and the promissory *-on*, which expresses future actions (see below). His active and passive affixes can be combined in the paradigm shown in table 4.

⁴ This sentence should probably be analyzed as containing an unexpressed relative marker, as follows:
aha NA niulám tu ladaŋ on? ‘What is it that you are doing in these parts?’

	active voice	passive voice
simple	<i>maŋ-</i>	<i>di-</i> etc.
completive	< <i>um</i> >	<i>ni-</i> etc.
promissory	—	<i>-on</i>
distributive	<i>masi-</i>	—
imperative	∅	—
potential	—	<i>tar-</i>

Table 4. Toba Batak voice affixes

A problem with Nababan's claims is that they cannot be verified because he does not give clear contrastive examples. Nor does he give examples in context. Although there is a small text at the back of his grammar, it does not contain instances of *ni-/<in>*. This is in contrast to Tuuk, who does provide many examples, although they are sometimes not translated⁵ and may also miss the appropriate context to demonstrate aspectual meaning (but then again, Tuuk does not argue that there is such a meaning).

Wouk (1984) investigates the conditions triggering the alternation between actor and undergoer orientation (or '+actor trigger' and '-actor trigger') in Toba Batak. Testing whether aspect is involved, she notes the tendency for *maŋ-* and *ni-* etc. to occur in imperfect clauses, although the alignment is not absolute, since in her data *maŋ-* still occurs in perfect clauses in 15% of the attested *maŋ-* cases, and *ni-* etc. occurs in perfect clauses in 5% of the attested *ni-* etc. cases. The prefix *di-* etc. is more or less neutral to perfectivity (45% of occurrences in perfect clauses and 55% in imperfect ones).

The tendency for *maŋ-* and *ni-* etc. to occur in imperfect clauses, as perceived by Wouk, is partly in contrast to Nababan's observation that *maŋ-* is aspect neutral and *ni-* etc. denotes completive aspect. Incidentally, Wouk also notes a tendency in her language consultants to translate *maŋ-* constructions into English with present tense verbs, and constructions involving *di-* etc. with past tense verbs. She eventually rejects aspectual motivations for voice triggering because in the case of *di-* etc., which is the most frequent UO marker, there is no correlation with aspect, and in the case of *ni-* etc., the correlation with imperfect aspect runs counter to predictability.

Tuuk (1864), Nababan (1981) and Wouk (1984) more or less agree in their interpretations of *tar-* and *-on*.

The prefix *tar-* is a potentive prefix expressing ability. (Tuuk also mentions the confix *ha- -an* as a variant form).

The suffix *-on* derives verbs expressing an intention or obligation. Nababan qualifies it as a 'promissory' suffix denoting future tense. Wouk labels it as a modal suffix marking irrealis. According to Tuuk, *-on* derivations function as predicates meaning 'something that has to be done':

- (10) *Indada au sukkunonmu [sukkun-on-mu], ama-tta i do*
 not 1s ask-UO-2s.GEN father-1s.GEN distal +affirmative
 'It is not me you should ask, but my father'

⁵ Tuuk seems to leave translations out in cases where previous explanations and examples already provide sufficient information to enable readers to sort out the meaning by themselves.

In other cases, *-on* derivations mean ‘something bound to happen’:

- (11) *Tu dia pe ibana sai pangora-on*
 towards where ever (s)he always shout-UO
 ‘wherever she goes they will shout at her’

According to Tuuk, they sometimes express future action, (although potentiality would currently be a more suitable denominator for this notion):

- (12) *Matsadi tongi on paman-on*
 sweet very this eat-UO
 ‘very sweet to eat’
- (13) *jadi-hon inum-on ni gaja*
 create-APPL drink-UO GEN elephant
 ‘make water that can be drunk by the elephants!’

3.2 Karo Batak

Karo Batak is a northern variant of Batak and different enough from Toba Batak to be considered a language in its own right. Its morphology does not express tense, aspect and mood (except for the imperative which is marked by absence of affixation to the verbal base) (Woollams 1996). It has a general Undergoer prefix *i-*, which is often realized as \emptyset , especially when various UO clauses are given in sequence:

- (14) *la banci \emptyset -simbak, la banci i-togan*
 not can UO-reject not can UO-contradict
 ‘It cannot be rejected, it cannot be contradicted’ (Woollams 1996:47).

A variant form *ni-* occurs in old texts; it also occurs in nouns, where it has a resultative meaning, such as *t<in>angko* ‘something stolen’ (< *-tangko* ‘to steal’), *s<in>uan* ‘crop’ (< *-suan* ‘to plant’), (Woollams 1996:89). Woollams furthermore distinguishes two *tar-* prefixes, *tar1-* expressing abilitative meaning, and *tar2-* denoting involuntariness, accidentality and/or spontaneity. However, both meanings are closely related, and *tar-* could also be described as a single prefix with potentive meaning.

4. TAM affixes in Javanese

Of the various dialects of Javanese, Standard Javanese and Old Javanese are the ones that have been studied most thoroughly. Standard Javanese is based on the court language of Yogyakarta and Solo. Old Javanese is the language of pre-15th century literature in Java and is still in use as a liturgical language in Bali.

1. The original PAn perfect aspect marker **ni-/*<in>* became an UO marker in Old Javanese. In standard Javanese this UO marker has largely been replaced by *di-*, although it does survive in literary style. Both Old Javanese *ni-/*<in>* and standard Javanese *di-* are UO markers in constructions with a foregrounded agent. If the agent is backgrounded or absent, Old Javanese *ka-* (*/k-*) and standard Javanese *kə-* (*/k-*) are prefixed instead to the verb (and the agent is introduced by a preposition). Neither of these dialects expresses tense or grammatical aspect morphologically. Old Javanese *<in>* is infix to the verb, which is followed by the agent in the form of a first, second, or third person enclitic pronoun or a noun phrase. The following examples are from Old Javanese (Zoetmulder 1983:50-51).

- (15) *t<in>uṅṅaṅ-an iré kay kuda*
 <UO>ride-APPL 3.GEN ART horse
 ‘He rode the horse’
- (16) *ika-ṅ wṛṣabha p<in>aṅguh-ta Airâwaṇa ikâ*
 that-REL buffalo <OU>meet-2.GEN Airâwaṇa that
 ‘The buffalo you came across, that is Airâwaṇa’
- (17) *yan kita huwus ka-təkân-a [ka-təka-an-a] swami...*
 if you already UO-arrive-APPL-IRR husband
 ‘If you already have found a husband,...’
- (18) *tan dadi ka-ton dé niṅ wwaṅ campur*
 not happen UO-see by person mixed
 ‘It is not possible that she be visible to impure people’

Standard Javanese *di-* is prefixed if the agent is a third person; if the agent is a first or second person agent, the agent is expressed by *ta?* ‘first person’ or *ko?* ‘second person’, or a noun phrase directly preceding the verb. Examples are given below:

- (19) *dòmpèt-mu nèng ndi? ta?-sèlèh-ké (nèng) méja*
 wallet-2.POSS LOC where 1-put-APPL LOC table
 ‘where is your wallet?’ ‘I put it on the table’
- (20) *dòmpèt-ku nèng ndi?*
 wallet-1.POSS LOC where
 ‘Where is my wallet?’
- ko?-sèlèh-ké (nèng) méja... / di-sèlèh-ké (nèng) méja*
 2-put-APPL LOC table 3-put-APPL LOC table
 ‘You put it on the table’ / ‘She put it on the table’
- (21) *dòmpèt-é k-èri nèng méja*
 wallet-DEF UO-leave LOC table
 ‘The wallet is left on the table’
- (22) *dòmpèt-é kə-təlisut*
 wallet-DEF UO-misplace
 ‘The wallet is misplaced’

The Old Javanese sample sentences in Zoetmulder (1983) generally refer to past events, which is probably related to the fact that they were all taken from literary sources. The standard Javanese sentences with *ta?*/*ko?*/*di-* are definitely neutral as to tense and aspect, as is shown in the following one, which combines with *arəp* (+future), *lagi* (+progressive) and *wis* (+perfect):

- (23) *iki dompèt-mu : arəp/ wis/ lagi di-sèlèh-ké nèng méja*
 this wallet-2s.POSS +FUT +PRF +PROG UO-put-APPL LOC table
 ‘Here’s your wallet: she’ll put it /has put it /is putting it on the table’

Standard Javanese *di-* is historically not related to Old Javanese *ni-* but must have developed from an earlier word *de* (< **day*/**dai*) ‘cause, reason; action, way, manner’. The latter still occurs as a nominaliser of verb clauses in Old Javanese (Adelaar 2009).

2. Both Standard and Old Javanese have a modal suffix *-a* (standard Javanese [-ɔ]), which is a reflex of PAn **-a* expressing optative/hortative in AO verbs (Ross

2009:296). In Old Javanese, ‘arealis’ *-a* adds to the verb the notions of future, wish, command, obligation, suitability, aim, potentiality, concession and irrealis (Zoetmulder 1983:150-163).

In (24) it expresses future tense:

- (24) *aku sumaputana [s<um>aput-an-a] kita ləbū*
 1 <AO>cover-APPL-IRR 2 sand
 ‘I’ll cover you with sand’ (Zoetmulder 1983:155)

In the following sentence, it expresses possibility or suitability:

- (25) *tan dadi mpu brahmāṇ āṇinum-a madya*
 not happen lord brahmin AO-drink-IRR alcohol
 ‘It is not possible (suitable) that a Brahmin drinks alcohol’ (Zoetmulder 1983:162)

In (26), it expresses a wish or a possibility:

- (26) *sabhāgya ṅhulun maty-a dé-nta*
 happy 1 die-IRR because-2.GEN
 ‘I’d feel happy if I were to die because of you’ (Zoetmulder 1983:160)

The imperative is also expressed by the absence of affixes, as in (27):

- (27) *laku tēbər ta kita!*
 move fly EMPH 2
 ‘Come on, fly away!’

Note that in the imperative, verbs with <in> lose this UO infix and have *-ən* suffixed. For instance, *aṅ-(h)undaṅ* ‘to call’ has an UO counterpart (*h*)<in>*undaṅ* ‘be called’, but it becomes *undaṅ-ən* in a UO imperative construction such as (28):

- (28) *undaṅ-ən juga sira!*
 call-imp.UO just only 3
 ‘Just call him! [lit. ‘that he be called’] (Zoetmulder 1983:114)

Standard Javanese irrealis *-a* expresses a potential, intention, conditional, optative or hortative (Ogloblin 2005:605-606).

It expresses a conditional in (29), and a hortative in (30):

- (29) *daya-daya təkā-n-a ing omah*
 do.one’s.best arrive-n⁶-IRR LOC house
 ‘she did her best to arrive home’

- (30) *ng-ombé-a banyu godhogan!*
 AO-drink-IRR water boiled
 ‘Drink boiled water!’

It not only occurs with verbals but also with pronouns, adverbs, auxiliaries, conjunctions and the like (e.g. *aku* ‘I’ --> *aku-a* ‘if it were me’; *mréné* ‘here’ --> *mréné-a!* ‘please come here!’; *kəmul* ‘blanket’ --> *kəmul-a!* ‘use as a blanket...!’ (Ogloblin *ibid.*).

In the low register (*ngoko*) form of Standard Javanese, the imperative in AO verbs is marked by the absence of AO affixes on the verbal base. Standard Javanese has a suffix

⁶ This *-n-* often appears between a vowel-final root and a vowel-initial suffix.

-*ən* marking imperative mood in UO verbs which otherwise have no suffix, as in the following example:

- (31) *nutup*[*N-tutup*] —> *lawang-é* *tutup-ən!*
 AO-close] door-DEF close.IMP.UO
 ‘to close ‘Close the door!’⁷

3. Another modal category in Javanese is Old Javanese *ndak-*, standard Javanese *dak-* or *tak-*, which is a propositive prefix expressing an intention or preposition made by a first person, as demonstrated in the following Old Javanese sentence (Zoetmulder 1893:54):

- (32) *ilu ta, ndak wör-akən kita*
 follow EMPH PRPS fly-APPL you
 ‘Come along, I’ll take you through the air!’

One would be tempted to explain these proclitic pronouns as clitic forms of the first person singular pronoun *aku*. However, their origin is more complex. Zoetmulder shows that they derive from an Old Javanese deictic particle *nda* ‘look! there!’ which is also used in commands and exhortations (‘Come!’) and in the case at hand is followed by a clitic *-(a)k* ‘conjunctive particle with connotation of the first person’ (Zoetmulder 1982).

The Standard Javanese 1st person propositive *tak/dak/ndak* occurs in AO constructions and expresses a readiness or intention. It can be separated from the following verb by another word and does allow the co-occurrence of a first person pronoun as a subject. Compare (32), in which *tak* immediately precedes the verbal head, and (33), in which it is separated from it by *dhéwéan waé*:

- (33) *aku tak nusul* [*N-susul*] *Bapak dhéwéan*
 I PRPS AO-follow father alone
 ‘Let me follow Father by myself’

- (34) *aku tak dhéwéan waé nusul Bapak*
 I PRPS alone just, only follow father
 ‘Let me alone follow father’

In UO clauses such as (35), this morpheme is cliticised to the verbal base in combination with *-é* (or *-ipun* in high register forms):

- (35) *tak=plathok-an-é* *kayu-mu*
 PRPS=chop-APPL-PRPS wood-2.GEN
 ‘Let me chop your wood’

Although the propositive suffix *-é* (*-ipun*) is identical in form with the third person possessive suffix, it probably derives from PAN **-ay*⁸, which is the projective marker in locative and circumstantial voice (Ross (2001, see table one above). If so, the high register propositive suffix *-ipun* (which in most other contexts is also a third person possessive suffix) is due to false analogy.

⁷ I am grateful to Mrs. Elisabeth Riharti (lecturer of Indonesian in the Asia Institute, Melbourne University, and native speaker of Javanese) for providing this example.

⁸ Adelaar (2011) and Wolff (1973).

5. TAM affixes in Malayic

Malay and most other Malayic varieties have gone further than Javanese in losing their grammatical aspect and mood morphology. Nevertheless, the PAn modal suffix **-a* is still extant in (among others) Old Malay and Kanayatn (Kendayan), where it expresses conjunctive mood (Adelaar 1992).

Nevertheless, in the Kanayatn branch of Malayic, some verbal affixes do express grammatical aspect. Transitive verbs can have a nasal prefix in both AO and UO voice. However, whereas the nasal is always present in AO voice, in UO voice, completed action is marked by its presence, whereas non-completed action is marked by its absence. The following four sentences are taken from Salako, a Kanayatn subdialect. Sentences (36) and (37) show the presence of the nasal prefix in transitive verbs in any AO construction, whereas (38) shows its presence in a clause expressing completed action, and (39) its absence in a clause expressing non-completed action (Adelaar 2008:13-14):

- (36) *lâ munuh [N-bunuh] epekŋ aŋkoà*
 3 N-kill pig that
 'He killed that pig.' (Actor-oriented)
- (37) *lâ anà? munuh (N-bunuh) epekŋ aŋkoà*
 3 not N-kill pig that
 'He did not kill that pig.' (Actor-oriented)
- (38) *Epekŋ aŋkoà dah ià munuh [N-bunuh]*
 pig that already 3 N-kill
 'He killed that pig.' (Undergoer-oriented)
- (39) *Epekŋ aŋkoà anà? ià bunuh*
 pig that not 3 kill
 'He did not kill that pig.' (Undergoer-oriented)

As in other Malayic languages, the nasal prefix in Kanayatn must be a reflex of the Proto Malayic AO prefix **maŋ-* (which in turn reflects PAn **maŋ-*). However, its development into a marker of completed action in UO constructions is unexpected and cannot be explained as a retention from Proto Malayic or PAn. In western Malayo-Polynesian languages nasal prefixation tends to mark Actor-orientation and is associated with low transitivity, while completed action is rather associated with high transitivity. The Kanayatn development may be due to contact with Bidayuhic languages (West Borneo), but this remains to be demonstrated. (It would also beg the question of how nasal prefixation came to mark completed action in Bidayuhic languages, and hence how the latter became a-typical within the general Austronesian typology).

6. Reflexes of the PAn perfect tense marker **ni-/*<in>* and other TAM affixes in South East Barito languages.

As already indicated, South East Barito languages are spoken in Indonesian Borneo and in Madagascar. Those spoken in Borneo have their home in Central Kalimantan and South Kalimantan provinces. Maanyan is the best documented language among them. Together with Samihim (which appears to be very similar to Maanyan, [Adelaar 1995]), it is also the South East Barito language that is most closely related to Malagasy as far

as shared sound correspondences and vocabulary are concerned. In this section I discuss Maanyan and Malagasy.

6.1 Maanyan

In Maanyan, neither tense, nor mood, are expressed morphologically (imperative is marked by absence of inflexional morphology). There are at least two UO constructions, which are used in slightly different ways:

1. *na-* + verbal base: the emphasis is on the completion of the action (perfect aspect), while the agent is somewhat backgrounded and may or may not be expressed by a prepositional phrase introduced by *daya*, as demonstrated by the following sentence⁹:

- (40) *Puang pikir ammau, hi Gayuhan balalu*
 not think long ART Gayuhan then
nyamulu [N-saN-wulu], nulu [N-tulu] palus na-retet-retet katuluh
 AO-APPL-take.off.body.hair AO-burn then UO-R-cut all
lunek-ni sementara ulu-ni na-taleung na-simuh daya
 meat-3GEN while head-3GEN UO-set.aside UO-save, store by
Gayuhan, takut rasa ineh-ni amun hawi teka ume.
 Gayuhan afraid know mother-3GEN if,when return from field

‘Without further ado, Gayuhan skinned it and burned it. Then the meat was cut up while Gayuhan set aside its head and stored it so that his mother would not find out when she came back from the field’.

2. Verbal base immediately followed by the agent which is a genitive pronominal clitic or a noun phrase: emphasis is on the agent, and the action is imperfect. An example is given in (41):

- (41) *Ude yeru hanye nuen [N-luen] dami mandru palus*
 after that 3s AO-cook as.soon.as cooked (rice) then
kuta-ni re-erai dahulu puang ka-andrei
 eat-3GEN one-one all not +non.controlled-wait
ineh-ni teka ume
 mother-3GEN (come).from field

‘When he had cooked side dishes and as soon as the rice was done, he ate it all by himself without waiting for his mother to come from the field’

The prefix *na-* is a reflex of the PAN perfective marker **ni-/*<in>*. Its different vowel is due to the fact that in Maanyan, PAN antepenultimate vowels (**a, *i, *u*) have generally merged to *a*, and since most Maanyan roots are disyllabic, the prefixes they take are usually in antepenultimate position.

Another derivation, *ka-* + verbal base, is characterised by the fact that the agent is not in full control of the action. It can be undergoer-oriented (as in *ka-elan* ‘to be awoken’, from *elan* ‘to wake up’), and is often designated as such in the literature. However, this

⁹ Both Maanyan sample sentences (above) are taken from the Hi Gayuhan story, which I recorded during fieldwork in Tamiang Layang (Central Kalimantan Province, Indonesia) in July-August 2010. The story-teller was Mr. Karno A. Dandan, retired headmaster of the public high school in Tamiang Layang and (at the time) 66 years old. I am grateful to him for providing the story and for his assistance in transcribing it.

orientation is not essential to its function, as there are also verbs such as *ka-dinung* ‘to (happen to) see, visible’, *ka-itung* ‘to remember, come to mind’, and *ka-eau* ‘to talk’ (compare *ninung* ‘to see’, *ingat, ngingat* ‘to remember’, *ng-eau* ‘to say’). The latter suggest that *ka-* indicates a lack of agentivity rather than undergoer orientation.

6.2 Malagasy

Malagasy is one of the few West Indonesian languages that has a tense system with dedicated tense markers distinguishing past, present and future. Malagasy AO verbs and stative verbs distinguish past tense (*n-*, *nu*), present tense (*m-* or \emptyset -) and future tense (*h-*, *ho*), as seen in the contrastive examples in (42), (43) and (44):

- (42) *mangalatra Paoli*
 m-aN-halatra Paoli
 PRS-AO-steal Paul
 ‘Paul steals/is stealing’

nangalatra Paoli
 n-aN-halatra Paoli
 PST-AO-steal Paul
 ‘Paul stole’

hangalatra Paoli
 h-aN-halatra Paoli
 FUT-AO-steal Paul
 ‘Paul will steal’

- (43) *miakatra aho*
 m-i-akatra aho
 PRS-AO-lift 1s
 ‘I lift’

ni-akatra aho...,
 n-i-akatra aho
 PST-AO-lift 1s
 ‘I lifted’

hi-akatra aho
 h-i-akatra aho
 FUT-AO-lift 1s
 ‘I will lift’

- (44) *m-a-lemy*
 PRS-STAT-wet
 be wet’

n-a-lemy
 PST-STAT-wet
 ‘(was) wet’

h-a-lemy
 ‘(will be) wet
 FUT-STAT-wet
 ‘(will be) wet’

Undersived verbs have no prefix with *m-* and do not make a distinction between present and past. However, they mark future with *ho*, as shown in (45):

- (45) *tonga izao izy*
 arrive now 3
 ‘she’s arriving now’
- tonga omaly izy*
 arrive yesterday 3
 ‘she arrived yesterday’
- ho tonga rahampitso izy*
 FUT arrive tomorrow 3
 ‘she’ll arrive tomorrow’

In UO verbs, tense is expressed by prefixation of \emptyset -/n-/h- if the verbal base begins with a vowel:

- (46) *ome-na azy ny vola*
 give-UO 3.OBL DEF money
 ‘the money is given to him’
- (47) *n-ome-na azy ny vola*
 pst-give-UO 3s.OBL ART mone
 ‘the money was given to him’
- (48) *h-ome-na azy ny vola*
 fut-give-UO 3s.OBL ART money
 ‘the money will be given to him’

If the base begins with a consonant, the present is not marked, whereas past verbs obtain *no-*, and future verbs obtain *ho-*:

- (49) *vono-in-ny ny akoho*
 kill-UO-3S.GEN DEF chicken
 ‘He is killing the chicken’
- (50) *no-vono-in-ny ny akoho*
 PST-kill-UO-3S.GEN DEF chicken
 ‘He killed the chicken’
- (51) *ho-vono-in-ny ny akoho*
 FUT-kill-UO-3S.GEN DEF chicken
 ‘He will kill the chicken’

The historical relation between **ni-*/*<*in*> and Malagasy past tense markers is even more direct between PAn and Sakalava, one of the regional Malagasy dialects. Sakalava marks past tense by prefixing *ni-* to AO verbs that have no other prefix (e.g. *tonga* ‘to arrive’), and by infixing <*in*> to UO verbs. Dahl gives the following Sakalava examples:

- (52) *ni-tonga omaly ie*
 PST-arrive yesterday 3s
 ‘she arrived yesterday’ (Dahl 1951:181)

- (53) *finilin'olo* [*<in>+fili+-(e)n-olo*] *omale ny sefo*
 <PST>choose-UO person yesterday DEF chief
 'They chose a new chief yesterday' (Dahl 1951:207)

These past tense affixes are further support for Dahl's (1951) theory that the Malagasy past tense has evolved from PAn **ni-/*<in>* (see below).

Incidentally, deictic adverbs are also marked for tense: they receive *t-* in past tense (however, present and future tense are not morphologically marked). Compare the following examples, of which (54) and (56) indicate the non-past, and (55) and (57) the past:

- (54) *e-to an-trano-ko izy*
 visible-PROX LOC-house-1s.PROX 3
 'He's here in my house/He will be here in my house' (I see him)
- (55) *T-e-to an-trano-ko izy*
 PST-visible-PROX LOC-house-1s.GEN 3
 'He was here in my house (I saw him)'
- (56) *A-o am-bata ny pataloha-nao*
 invisible-prox.inside LOC-suitcase DEF pants-3s.GEN
 'Your pants are/will be/ in the suitcase (not within sight)'
- (57) *T-a-o am-bata ny pataloha-nao*
 PST-invisible-here.inside LOC-suitcase DEF pants-3s.GEN
 'Your pants were in the suitcase (not within sight)'

This past tense marking *t-* is also used with the multipurpose preposition *amin-* and with some interrogative pronouns. Compare (58) with (59):

- (58) *aiza Raikoto?*
 where Raikoto
 'where is Raikoto?'
- (59) *t-aiza Raikoto?*
 pst-where Raikoto
 'where was Raikoto?'

According to Dahl (1988), these tense distinctions are generally due to Bantu influence, although formally the past tense marker *n-* is related to Maanyan *na-* and ultimately derives from PAn **ni-/*<in>*.

He also argues that Malagasy *ho* is based on an erroneous interpretation of the Coastal Bantu (or 'Sabaki') 'infinitive' marker **ku* as a future marker, which is maintained in non-infinitive verbs based on a monosyllabic root. Compare the structure of a Coastal Bantu verb in future tense taken from Dahl 1954:358):

pronominal prefix + *ta(ka) [+FUT] + *ku [+INF] + lexical verb.

This is shown in the following Kiswahili example:

- (60) *a-ta-ku-ja*
 3P-FUT-INF-come
 'They will come'

Tracing *ho* to the Coastal Bantu infinitive marker **ku* makes sense. However, Dahl's proposed pathway is problematic and unnecessarily complicated: it is not likely that an affix so close to the verbal root (as **-ku-* in *wa-ta-ku-ja*) was borrowed into Malagasy as

an external prefix *ho-/h-*, let alone as a free-standing form *ho*. Furthermore, in Kiswahili and other Coastal Bantu languages, the prefix *ku-* does occur at the beginning of any ‘infinitive’ verb: it is likely that this general infinitive prefix was re-interpreted as a future marker (rather than an infix *-ku-* variant only occurring in future tense verbs derived from monosyllabic roots, as claimed by Dahl).

In contrast to Maanyan, Malagasy has several modal suffixes, but it is not altogether clear how they relate historically to PAN modal suffixes (see below). Malagasy *-a*, *-y* and *-o* are imperative suffixes. In very general terms, *-a* occurs with AO verbs, *-y* with UO verbs in which the stressed syllable already contains *-o-*, and *-o* with other UO verbs. Compare the following examples based on the verbs *mòdy* ‘to return’, *manàsa* ‘to launder, wash’ and *manòro* ‘to show’ respectively:

- (61) *m-odi-a!*
 AO-return-IMP
 ‘Come back!’
- (62) *Ø-sasa-o ny lamba!*
 AO-launder-IMP ART clothes, textile
 ‘Do the laundry!’
- (63) *mba a-toro-y lalana aho azafady*
 +request UO=show-IMP.UO road 1s please
 ‘Please show me the way!’ (Rasoloson and Rubino 2005:479)

Formally and semantically these suffixes agree rather well with **-a* (a projective marker suffixed to AO verbs), and **-u* and **-i*, atemporal markers suffixed to non-AO verbs (see table one). However, in inherited vocabulary final **a* always became Malagasy *y*. From a sheer sound change perspective, this would mean that *-y* (and not *-a*) reflects PAN **-a*. Furthermore, the *-o/-y* alternation is phonologically motivated (showing a phonotactic constraint also observed in the lexical history of Malagasy). So, it is not entirely clear how to interpret these suffixes historically, even if some of them may be inherited from PAN.

7. Concluding remarks

In the languages under investigation there is definitely a reduction of the original PAN aspect and mood affixes, and in general, there are often no new morphological developments to compensate for the reduction. Malay, Maanyan and Karo Batak have gone furthest in this respect, having no aspect and mood affixes at all.

The PAN modal suffix **-a* has retained its original form, meaning and function more successfully than the aspect affixes. Only the Batak languages seem to have lost **-a* completely. Malay has also lost it, but it was maintained in several other Malayan varieties.

The only language that has clear tense distinctions is Malagasy. As semantic categories, they are clearly innovative and due to contact with coastal Bantu languages in the past. Malagasy also has various modal suffixes: at least some of these must be retentions from PAN, although their exact history requires further investigation.

Among West Indonesian languages Malagasy is somewhat remarkable in having a fully fledged tense system. However, morphological tense also exists in other languages including Sumbawa (Lesser Sunda Islands, Shiohara, this volume). A burgeoning tense distinction is also apparent in Jakarta Indonesian (Hidayat, this volume).

The historical developments of the PAN perfect marker **ni-/*<in>* are remarkable for two reasons. First, we see a development from a perfect aspect marker in PAN to an UO marker in Maanyan and other South East Barito languages in Borneo, and then again, from an UO marker in South East Barito to a past tense marker in Malagasy (so, from perfect to UO to past). It seems that between PAN and Malagasy there is a tendency to come full circle. Second, while the development from UO to past tense is in accordance with a very common grammatical change (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2002), the development from perfect aspect to UO is much less obvious.

The present comparison is rather sketchy and does not go very deeply into the various aspects that are pertinent to a comparative historical study of tense, aspect and mood markers. One factor complicating this comparison is the sometimes very different ways scholars deal with grammatical aspect. This is particularly clear in the Toba Batak case, where Nababan, Wouk and Tuuk each tell a rather different story.

Abbreviations

1,2,3	first, second, third person	AO	actor-oriented
APPL	applicative	ART	article
CAUS	causative	DEF	definite
EMPH	emphasis	exc.	exclusive
FUT	future tense	GEN	genitive (indicating agent or possessor)
IMP	imperative	inc.	inclusive
INF	infinitive	IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative	N	homorganic nasal (prefix)
OBL	oblique	p	plural
PAn	Proto Austronesian	POSS	possessive
PRF	perfect aspect	PROX	proximate
PRPS	propositive	PST	past tense
R	reduplication	REL	relative marker
s	singular	STAT	stative
TAM	tense, aspect and mood	UO	undergoer-oriented

References

- Adelaar, Alexander. 1995. L'importance du samihim (Bornéo du Sud) pour l'étymologie malgache, in B. Champion (ed.): *L'étranger intime. Mélanges offerts à Paul Ottino*. Centre d'Anthropologie Généralisée, Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines. 47-59. St. Denis: Université de la Réunion, Océan Éditions.
- Adelaar, Alexander. 1992. The relevance of Salako for Proto-Malayic and for Old Malay epigraphy, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde* 148:382-408.
- Adelaar, Alexander. 2008. On the classifiability of Malayic, in Y. A. Lander and A. K. Ogloblin (eds): *Language and text in the Austronesian world. Studies in Honour of Ülo Sirk*. LINCOM Studies in Austronesian Linguistics 06, 1-22. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Adelaar, Alexander. 2011. Javanese -aké and -akən: a short history, *Oceanic Linguistics* 50/2.
- Adelaar, Alexander. Unpublished. (2010 *fieldnotes on Maanyan*).
- Dahl, Otto Christian. 1951. *Malgache et maanyan. Une comparaison linguistique*. Avhandling utgitt av Instituttet 3, Oslo: Egede Instituttet.

- Dahl, Otto Christian. 1954. Le substrat bantou en malgache, *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap* 17:325-362.
- Dahl, Otto Christian. 1988. Bantu substratum in Malagasy, *Études Océan Indien* 9 (Paris: Institut National des Langues et Cultures Orientales):91-132.
- Heine, Bernd, and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1981. *A grammar of Toba Batak*. Pacific Linguistics Series D Nr. 37. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ogloblin, Aleksander. 2005. Javanese, in: Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds): *The Austronesian languages of South East Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge; 590-624.
- Rajaonarimanana, Narivelo. 2001. *Grammaire moderne de la langue malgache*. Langues Inalco. Paris: Langues et Mondes L'Asiathèque.
- Rasoloson, Janie, and Carl Rubino. 2005. Malagasy, in: Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds): *The Austronesian languages of South East Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge; 456-488.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice marking, in Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross (eds): *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics; 17-62.
- Tuuk, Herman N. van der. 1971. *A Grammar of Toba Batak* (Koninklijk Instituut Voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde Translation Series 13), The Hague: Nijhoff [first edition in Dutch: 1864-67, *Tobasche spraakkunst*, 2 Vols., Amsterdam: Muller].
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian, in A.B. Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal Kay Cecilio Lopez*, 71-91, Quezon City: Philippine Journal of Linguistics (Special monograph 4).
- Woollams, G. 1996. *A Grammar of Karo Batak, Sumatra*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wouk, Fay. 1984. Scalar transitivity and trigger choice in Toba Batak, in Paul Schachter (ed.) *Studies in the Structure of Toba Batak*. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5:195-219.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. 1983. *De taal van het Adiparwa. Een grammaticale studie van het Oudjavaans*. Dordrecht (Netherlands)/Cinnaminson (N.J.): Foris Publications.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. with the collaboration of S. O. Robson. 1982. *Old Javanese-English dictionary*, 2 vols, 's Gravenhage: Nijhoff.