

OBSERVATIONS ON TYPOLOGICAL EVOLUTION IN INDONESIAN LANGUAGES

NATALIA ALIEVA

1. The present observations deal with the language structures expressing subject, object and attributive relations; as the comparison of these structures makes the essence of syntactical typology, this paper can be considered to deal with the problems of syntactical typology.

This view on the essence of syntactical typology is based on I.I. Meschaninov's concepts of the various types of language structure, these types being: the nominative type, the ergative type, and the possessive type. I must stress that the study of the possessive type is important, not only for the correct interpretation of contemporary language systems, but especially for the study of the evolution of language types.

It has already been stated in the literature, that the ancient possessive structures in some instances might have been recognised as sources for the nominative and ergative structures of the modern languages. I hope to show below that the typical structures of modern IN languages have also developed from the possessive structures. I am not the first to state this, but I wish to attract attention to this fact again and to give more arguments in support.

2. The IN languages are absolutely deprived of case forms in the nouns; the subject and object relations between verb and noun are rendered by:

a) verb morphology (affixes of transitivity and voice, incorporated pronoun forms marking subject or object);

b) synsemantic words* (syntactical particles marking subject and object relations between verb and noun);

c) word-order;

d) different subordinate and absolute forms in personal pronouns.

* auxiliary words

Method "d" is the most general one in IN languages. The synthetic ("a") and the analytic ("b" and "c") methods have different weight in different languages.

3. Verb and noun as categories in the IN languages are very near to each other - even to the impossibility of distinguishing them otherwise than in a concrete sentence. This similarity exists despite the apparent differentiation of these categories by paradigms of verbal forms rendering syntactical relations. Among Soviet authors L. Shkarban has clearly shown this feature in her works on Tagalog grammar, while A.P. Pavlenko has made some interesting observations on the basis of Indonesian and Sundanese language material.

It seems obvious to me that such interrelation of the verb and noun in IN languages is determined by the IN pronoun system; in many languages the same forms of personal pronouns which serve to express the possessor (the subject of possession) in the noun group, are used with the verb to render the subject of action.

4. In the case of root-words with verbal meaning the two kinds of construction may not be differentiated; these are the structures containing the relations (a) 'the action - the subject of action' and (b) 'the possessed object - the subject of possession (the possessor)'. Examples:

Malay: *datangnya* = *datang* 'to come' + *nya* 'his, her', short possessive form of the pronoun, 3rd person; cf. *rumahnya* = *rumah* 'house' + *nya* (ibid.).

Tagalog: *sabi mo* = *sabi* 'to say, the said word' + *mo* 'your', short form of the possessive pronoun, 2nd person; cf. *bahay mo* = *bahay* 'house' + *mo* (ibid.).

Bugis: *teamu* = *tea* 'to be not wanting' + *mu* 'you, your', short pronoun, 2nd person; cf. *bolamu* = *bola* 'house' + *mu* (ibid.).

5.1. When analysing derived verbal forms with different voice meanings we can again trace the connection with possessive constructions of the noun, but this connection is of a different character for the passive and the non-passive verbal forms.

Tagalog (with other Philippine languages) is most relevant in this respect; with the affixed and affixed-reduplicated forms of the passive voice the actor is expressed in each case by the same means as the possessor; these means are the full and short forms of possessive

pronouns and the syntactical markers *ng*, *nina* (the last two being used when the actor is expressed by a noun, and not a pronoun). Examples:

- (a) *Pinupunit mo ang papel ko 'you are tearing my paper'*
- (b) *Ang iyong pinupunit ang papel ko 'what you are tearing is my paper'*
- (c) *Pinupunit ng bata ang papel ko 'the child is tearing my paper'*

ang papel ko 'my paper'; pinupunit 'is being torn'; mo and iyong 'your'; ng bata 'of a child'; ng is a marker of possession, cf. payong ng bata 'a child's umbrella'.

5.2. In some IN languages a number of passive verbal forms are made with the help of prefixes coinciding with the prepositions of place or direction; for such forms the parallelism with the 'preposition-noun' constructions can easily be seen, for example:

Malay: *didengar 'to be heard', didengar-nya 'to be heard by him (her)'; cf. di rumah 'in house', di rumahnya 'in his house'.*

Sunda: *dihakan 'to be eaten', dipegat 'to be grasped'; cf. di imah 'in house', di imahna 'in his house'.*

Exactly the same phenomenon takes place in the Bugis language (which is not at all closely related to Malay); the morpheme *ri* serves as prefix of the passive voice and also as preposition of place. This also takes place in other languages.

In Sundanese and Balinese there is a prefix *ka*, building passive and medial verbal forms and at the same time there is a preposition of direction *ka*, for example:

Sunda: *katipu 'to be deceived', ka kebon 'to the garden'.*

Bali: *kapinggih 'to be glorified', ka pakencan 'to the court'.*

5.3. Such phenomena of the bifunctional character of the morphemes *di*, *ri*, and *ka* testify to the close connection between verb and noun and, in some instances, to the connection between the verbal morphology and the noun possessive constructions. Similar facts regarding the bifunctional nature of synsemantic morphemes added to the parallelism between noun possessive constructions and verbal passive forms occur in some other cognate languages in connection with other synsemantic morphemes.

The versatile and widespread character of this phenomenon which therefore belongs to the indigenous structures of the nuclear grammatical system of IN languages makes it possible to postulate the evolution of the IN verbal passive forms from the noun possessive construction.

6.1. For the verbal forms with non-passive meanings (i.e. active, medial, intransitive) the connection with the category of possessivity can also be traced, but in quite another way. In all descriptions of IN languages known to me, types of word-building by affixation are found with a semantic component of possession. This semantic component of possession should be understood as a semantic field comprising the primary meaning '*to have, to possess*' and some secondary meanings as '*to produce it, to acquire it, to become it, to be considered as that*' ('*it*', '*that*' is the notion rendered by the root morpheme).

In a concrete derivative verb the semantic component of possession can be represented by its primary meaning '*to have, to possess*' or by one of the above-mentioned secondary meanings (this is determined by the grammatical form and the meaning of a concrete word).

6.2. In verbs derived from substantive root-morphemes, this semantic component can be represented by two meanings: the primary one, and one of the secondary meanings; so, the verbal prefix, joined to a morpheme meaning '*child*', produces in many IN languages verbs with meanings '*to have a child (children)*', '*to give birth to a child*'.

6.3. If the same prefixes are joined to the morphemes with verbal meaning, then the derivative verbs have different secondary semantic components which are yet not in contradiction with the primary meaning of possession.

6.4. In different IN languages the morpheme *ma-* and its variants *me-*, *maN-*, *meN-*, *m-*, *mar-*, *mag-*, *ba-*, *be-*, *bar-*, *ber-*, etc., prevail as prefixes producing such non-passive verb forms as were referred to above.

Although the main inventory of synsemantic morphemes in IN languages was formed rather long ago and remained relatively uniform and stable, it should not prevent us from searching for possible genetic relations of the synsemantic morphemes, in particular of affixes, to the root morphemes. It seems quite natural to compare the above-mentioned prefixes with the words meaning '*to have, to possess*'.

The first correspondence which always seemed striking to me is the Tagalog verb *may* '*to have*', which also comes as a non-semantic morpheme in units of the kind *may-sakit* '*sick*', from *sakit* '*illness*'.

The second coincidence which may prove to be a correspondence was found by me in an Old Malay text. That is the morpheme *ma* in the inscription '*Minye Tujoh*' (of the 14th century, in the region of Aceh).

Ma is used there not as a prefix but as a word at the end of a verse line and it rhymes. Here is the transliteration of the two lines with word-by-word translation according to Stutterheim:

- (B1) gutra bha(ru) bhasa(ng) mpu hak kadah pase ma
house Bharubha have right Kedah Pasai having
- (B2) tarukk (ya) tasih tanah samuha
sprout water earth all

It says about '*the Queen of the Faith Varda (?) Rahmattallah /from/ the House Bharubha (?) which has rights on Kadah and Pase, having sprouts ... all over the world*'.

After Marrison's article ma is usually translated as '*with, together with*' (which also is not an affix). In my opinion ma here takes the position of a verb before a noun-object taruk (or - according to Marrison - before homogeneous noun-objects).

Therefore the syntactical structure of this segment of the text rather prompts one to translate this ma by the verb '*have, possess*' either in predicative or in attributive function. If ma and taruk hadn't been placed in different lines such a pair of morphemes would have been very similar to a prefixed verb.

6.5. In this context it is interesting to mention also, but without drawing any definite conclusions, that in some Mon-Khmer languages there are verbs beginning with m- in the meanings of '*to have, to be present, to be able to*'; these are:

Modern Khmer: mɛən,
 Old Khmer: mən,
 Spoken Mon: mən,
 Sre: man.

6.6. Concluding this part of my paper I can say with some confidence that a historic relationship can be traced from the affixal patterns of the passive and active verbs to the category of possession in general and to noun possessive constructions in particular.

7. In order to complete the picture I would like to note the following fact. In many IN languages there are transitive verb constructions of the ergative type with the nuclear conjugated (personal) verb-form. Such a verb-form consists (1) of a pronoun morpheme belonging to a non-possessive series and (2) of a verb-base without any of the mentioned voice prefixes. In such forms the other way of verb-building may have materialised - the pure syntactical way, from the predicative group.

8. These different ways of evolution and formation of the verb category in IN languages are, so to say, very well 'secured' by the richness of the pronoun system of IN languages. Many of them have three, or four, or five rows of personal pronoun forms, full and short, prepositive and postpositive, functioning as subject, object or possessive attribute markers (see Haaksma 1933).

9. In some cases the plain verbal patterns used here are not nuclear and widespread structures in the modern languages (as Malay: *tanyaku*, *datangmu*; Tagalog: *may-sakit*). Such forms in a modern language system are peripheral rather than nuclear, but they can prove to be rudiments of former systems and the researcher must not abandon them.

The patterns used here present interesting material for investigation of the inherent processes of verb-building in IN languages - from the plain diffuse word to which the verb-noun differentiation cannot be attributed, through possessive and predicative syntactical groups, to the plain and then - to the more complicated affixal verb patterns and to the verb-noun differentiations.

N O T E

I am very grateful to the organisers of SICAL in general, and particularly to Professor G.B. Milner, for their efforts and for the attention given to such an inactive participant as I proved to be. My thanks also go to H. Kähler, J.P. Sarumpaet, I. Dyen, D.S. Walsh, P.B. Naylor, L.A. Reid, and M. Haslev for helpful comments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ESSER, S.J.

- 1929 'Nogmaals de vervoegde vormen'. In: *Feestbundel uitgegeven van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap*, deel 1:161-81. Weltevreden: Kolff.

HAAKSMA, R.

- 1933 *Inleiding tot de studie der vervoegde vormen in de Indonesische talen*. Leiden: Brill.

HOLMER, N.M.

- 1963 'The Morphological Structure of the Austroasiatic Languages'. In: H.L. Shorto, ed. *Linguistic Comparison in South East Asia and the Pacific*, 17-23. London: S.O.A.S.

KERSTEN, J.

- 'Tata Bahasa Bali'. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.

KRUS, M. and L.I. SHKARBAN

- 1966 *Tagal'skij jazyk*. Moscow.

MARRISON, G.E.

- 1951 'A Malay Poem in Old Sumatran Characters'. *JMBRAS* 24:162-5.

PAVLENKO, A.P.

- 1965 *Sundanskij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka.

SHKARBAN, L.I.

- 1974a 'K semantičeskoj harakteristike passivnyh zalogov v tagal'skom jazyke'. *Problemy semantiki*, 196-213. Moscow: Nauka.

- 1974b 'Problemy izučeniya zalogov v tagal'skom jazyke'. *Jazyki Kitaja* 224-44.
- 1976 Glagol v sovremennom tagal'skom jazyke. Candidate dissertation, Moscow.
- SHORTO, H.L.**
- 1971 *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries*. London: Oxford University Press.
- SIRK, Yu.H.**
- 1974 'Osnovnye sintaksičeskiye značeniya bugijskih nesvobodny ličnomestoimenny morfem'. In: *Jazyki Kitaja i Jugo-Vostočnoj Azii: Voprosy Grammatičeskogo Stroja*, 164-87. Moscow: Nauka.
- 1975 *Bugijskij jazyk*. Moscow.
- SLAMETMULJANA**
- 1964 *Asal Bangsa dan Bahasa Nusantara*. Djakarta: P.N. Balai Pustaka.
- STUTTERHEIM, W.F.**
- 1936 'A Malay *sha'ir* in Old Sumatran Characters of 1380 A.D.'. *Acta Orientalia* 14:268-79.
- WILS, J.**
- 1950 'De z.g. "possessieve flectie"'. *Bingkisan Budi*, 310-21. Leiden: Sijthoff.
- 1952 *Het passieve werkwoord in de Indonesische talen*. VKI 12.
- YAMADA, Yukihiro and Shigeru TSUCHIDA**
- 1975 *Philippine Languages*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.