

Tense, aspect, mood, and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia: Introduction

John Bowden

Jakarta Field Station

Department of Linguistics

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

Most of the papers in this volume were presented at the Workshop on TAM markers and evidentiality in Indonesian languages which was held at the Institute of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA) at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies on 17-18 February 2011. The paper in this volume by Palfreyman was not amongst those originally presented at the workshop, but I believe it adds considerable interest to the current volume by presenting the problem of aspect from two varieties of Indonesian sign language. The ILCAA workshop was one of a series of workshops on 'Descriptive studies on Indonesian languages' organized by the Linguistic Dynamics Science Project (Lingdy). The present volume covers a wide range of topics under the broad rubric of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality, and the languages are all united through being endemic to Indonesia, or most closely connected to Indonesian languages historically.

Although tense marking is usually seen as unusual in western Malayo-Polynesian languages (see, e.g. Himmelmann, 2005), tense marking is a feature that emerges in a number of the languages discussed in this volume. Adelaar's paper is one of these. Adelaar addresses the history of tense, aspect and mood marking in several west Indonesian languages: some Batak lects (chiefly Toba Batak), Javanese, southeast Barito and Malagasy (which originated in the Barito area). Adelaar shows that all of these languages have reduced the original Proto Austronesian morphology without having innovated any new affixes. The PAn perfect marker *ni-/*<in> has undergone a number of interesting changes, from perfect marking, to an undergoer marker in Maanyan and other South East Barito languages, and from undergoer marking to a past tense marker in Malagasy (presumably under the influence of Bantu languages).

Arka discusses TAM in standard Indonesian from the perspective of Lexical Functional Grammar. He proposes three kinds of TAM categories which can be insightfully used to divide the expression of TAM typologically: morphosyntactic, morphosemantic and contextual. While languages like English (with obligatory grammatical expression of tense) exhibit TAM expression by morphosyntactic means, Indonesian only allows the other two types: morphosemantic (e.g. by the use of auxiliaries) and contextual. Although Indonesian is usually seen (like most Austronesian languages) as 'tenseless', an important feature of Arka's paper is his argument that =*nya* nominalisation actually provides a mean for the expression of past tense in Indonesian.

Austin provides an overview of TAME marking in Sasak, which is spoken in Lombok. Sasak is typical of Austronesian languages spoken in western Indonesian in that it lacks any inflectional morphology, and does not mark tense. Instead, Sasak has a range of pre-verbal particles (which can host pronominal clitics) and these encode a range of aspectual, polarity and modal distinctions. While different forms are found in different dialects, their morphosyntactic behaviour is quite similar. Sasak has a quotative construction in which various verbs of speech, belief and perception can be used to encode evidential meanings.

Like Arka, Grangé discusses aspect in formal Indonesian, but does so from quite a different perspective. He surveys a wide range of pre-verbal aspectual markers which also often carry modal meanings. He also looks at the aspectual properties of several verbal derivational constructions, and like Arka, at the enclitic =*nya*. In total, Grangé examines 14 pre-verbal aspectual markers which can be used alone or often in conjunction with one another. His paper provides an extensive overview of the functions of these free markers and contrasts them with the bound ones.

Hidajat's paper examines a different kind of Indonesian from that discussed by Arka and Grangé. She looks at the aspectual function of the active verbal suffix *N-* in basilectal Jakarta Indonesian. It has been claimed that the nasal prefix marks progressive aspect, but Hidajat shows that in fact the nasal prefix is compatible with perfective markers such as *dah/udah*. It turns out that in fact, the nasal prefix in basilectal Jakarta Indonesian is used to mark verbs in narratives while bare verbs are used mainly in non-narrative contexts.

The paper by Inagaki discusses tense, aspect, mood, and evidentiality marking in Kadorih, a language spoken in the upriver region of Central Kalimantan. There are no dedicated affixes for marking any TAME categories in Kadorih. Aspect is marked by a variety of items including auxiliaries, adverbs, verbs and others while tense is marked only by temporal nouns and adverbs. Modality is indicated by auxiliaries, verbs and nouns while evidentiality is encoded with particles and verbal nouns.

Jukes outlines the system of aspectual and modal clitics in Makassarese from South Sulawesi. This set consists of two proclitics: *ta=* (NEG negator) and *la=* (FUT future); and four enclitics: =*mo* (PFV perfective), =*pa* (IPF imperfective), =*ja* (LIM limitative), and =*ka* (or 'or', also a question tag). Interestingly, the enclitics =*mi* (perfective) and =*pi* (imperfective) have also been borrowed into Makassar Malay where they are often attached to Indonesian auxiliaries *sudah* and *belum*, deriving *sudahmi* 'already' and *belumpi* 'not yet'.

Musgrave takes a formal approach in his discussion of polarity, modality and tense/aspect in standard Indonesian. He examines the evidence for functional categories in Indonesian, which he takes as an exemplar of formal Malay varieties. Musgrave argues that that it is a mistake to assume that a full range of functional heads above VP and above NP is obligatory in Indonesian syntax. In his view, while some functional heads (those associated with negation and modality) are possibly obligatory at a clausal level, others (including determiners at noun phrase level and heads associated with tense and aspect at clause level) are optional. He concludes that his findings necessitate taking another look at many earlier analyses of formal Malay syntax.

Palfreyman's paper discusses completive markers in two varieties of Indonesian sign language: that of Solo in Java, and that of Makassar in South Sulawesi. Palfreyman finds that each of these varieties has at least four completive particles, which may cliticise, and which can also be formed by silent imitation of the lip pattern of a spoken language word. The forms have several different functions, at the sentence level, the discourse level and the interaction level, and are typified by form-function asymmetry. The author shows that there are interesting similarities with varieties of spoken Indonesian, as well as with other sign languages. The high number of completive markers, though, is unusual for sign languages and possible grammaticalisation paths for all these various forms are explored.

Shiohara's paper describes the forms and functions of the markers of tense, aspect, modality and evidentiality in the Sumbawa language of western Sumbawa island. Most

striking about Sumbawa is the fact that it exhibits three tense distinctions (past /present /future), which is not common among western Austronesian languages. No PAn verbal morphology is retained, and tense, aspectual and modal distinctions are mainly achieved by two morpho-syntactic categories, namely the tense-modal (TM) marker and the aspect-modal (AM) clitic. The negator *nó* appears in eight combinations with the tense marker *ka* ‘past’ and/or the aspect-modal clitics.

Soriente describes various ways of marking aspect, tense, modality and evidentiality in four languages from northeast Borneo: Lebu’ Kulit, and Òma Lóng (both Kenyah varieties) as well as Punan Tubu’ and Penan Benalui. These last two languages are spoken by former hunter-gatherers. None of these categories are expressed morphologically except for the infix <en> which marks both the undergoer voice and the meaning of perfectivity in Punan Tubu’ and Penan Benalui. Otherwise independent lexemes are used to encode all of the TAME meanings, with a verb meaning ‘finished’ generally used to mark the perfective and quotative verbs used to encode evidentiality.

Tense and aspect in Bantik are described in the paper by Utsumi. Like Sumbawa and Malagasy, Bantik is one of the relatively rare western Austronesian languages with morphologically marked tense, in this case an opposition between past and non-past. The language also marks progressive, habitual and iterative aspects. Utsumi provides a classification of the interaction between the inherent aspectual qualities of verbs and tense marking and thus lays out many of the complexities of the Bantik system.

Yanti’s paper describes some of the syntactic and semantic properties of tense, aspectual and modal auxiliaries in the Malay of Jambi city in Sumatra. Her paper also demonstrates how auxiliaries behave differently from main verbs and examines in particular detail the properties of the modal auxiliary *biso* ‘can’. Yanti argues that it can occupy two distinct syntactic positions and supports this with evidence based on *biso*’s cooccurrence with aspectual markers, modals and on evidence based on certain kinds of syntactic fronting.

References

- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2005. “The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: typological characteristics”. In A. Adelaar and N. P. Himmelman (eds) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110-171. London/New York: Routledge.