

Split S in the Indonesian Area: Forms, Semantics, Geography

Marian Klamer, Leiden University

marian.klamer@let.leidenuniv.nl

10th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics (10-ICAL),

17-20 January 2006, Palawan, Philippines

1. Introduction

- (1) Split S (SS): intransitive argument S is encoded through case marking and/or verbal agreement as a transitive agent (A) or a transitive patient (P).
- (2) Aim: Study formal and semantic patterns of SS systems in Indonesian area
- (3) Area: Indonesia + E Timor, - Papuan mainland, - Borneo.
400 languages > 39 selected in sample, see Table 1.
- (4) Outline:
 - What SS is, and what it is not.
 - Four case studies: Forms and Semantics of SS
 - Conclusion: No unifying semantic/structural feature of SS in this area¹
 - Geographic distribution: Seems skewed for E Indonesia, is in fact random

2. SS in the Indonesian area: what it is, and what it is not

- (5) Diagnostic of SS in this survey:
 1. MULTIPLE alignment of S...
 2. ...must occur with morphologically SIMPLE verbs.
- (6) Languages with split intransitivity but without multiple alignment of S are excluded
Languages where multiple alignment of S depends on verbal derivation are excluded

3. Four case studies of SS in the Indonesian area

3.1. Acehnese (Durie 1985, 1987)

Austronesian, North Sumatra

A = verbal proclitic, P = optional enclitic:

- (7) a. Gopnyan ka lon=ngiang(=geuh)²
 s/he In 1s=see=3s
 ‘I saw him/her’ (Durie 1987:369)

¹ See also Klamer (to appear), which also contains case studies of Mori Bawah, Larike and Kambara.

² **Notational conventions and abbreviations.** A clitic is separated from its host by [=], an affix by [-].
Abbreviations: 1,2,3=person, Cnj=conjunction, Compl=completive aspect, Dei=deictic element, Dem=demonstrative, Dist=distal, e=exclusive, Emph=emphasis, f=female, i=inclusive, Impf=imperfective aspect, Inc=inceptive, Irr=irrealis mood, Iter=iterative aspect, Loc=locative preposition, Mod=mood marker, n=neutral, nh=non-human, Neg=negation, obj=objective, p=plural, Part=participle, Poss=possessor, Pfv=perfective, Red=reduplication, Rel =relative clause marker, s=singular subj=subjective, I, II, IV =P-marking paradigms

- (8) Verb class (i) **Verbs aligning S like A**: S must be animate
 Verbs of motion and posture with animate argument: *jak* ‘go’, *döng* ‘stand’, *beudöh* ‘get up’, *iem* ‘be still’; Verbs of bodily activity (*khêm* ‘laugh/smile’, *klik* ‘cry’, *muntah* ‘vomit’); Verbs of speech, thought, mental activity (*marit* ‘talk’, *kira* ‘think’); Some emotion verbs (e.g. *chên* ‘love/feel sympathy’)(Durie 1985:63-64)
- (9) Geu= jak gopnyan
 3s go s/he
 ‘S/he goes’ (Durie 1987:369)
- (10) Verb class (ii) **Verbs aligning S like P**: S need not be animate
 Events and states (*rhët* ‘fall’, *reubah* ‘topple over’, *jeuet* ‘become’, *trôh* ‘happen/arrive’); Many emotion verbs (*ku’eh* ‘envy’, *seugan* ‘not want to’)
 Personal attributes (*beuhë* ‘brave’, *caröng* ‘clever’, *gasien* ‘poor’),
 Bodily and mental states of animate arguments (*sakêt* ‘sick/hurting’, *gatay* ‘itchy’,
mumang ‘confused’, *dawôk* engrossed) (Durie 1985:64-66).
- (11) Gopnyan rhët(=geuh)
 s/he fall 3s
 ‘S/he falls’ (Durie 1987:369)
- (12) Verb class (iii): **Verbs that align S like A OR like P**. Overlaps with class (i) and (ii):
 Many emotion verbs (*cinta* ‘love/favour’, *galak* ‘like’, *beungeh* ‘angry’), Verbs of thought or mental activity (*syök* ‘suspect’, *yakin* ‘believe/be sincere’), Ability (*jeuet* ‘able’, *keuneuk* ‘likely to’), Aspect (*mulayi* ‘begin’, *piyôh* ‘stop’), Personal attributes or attitudes (*horeumat* ‘polite’, *kaya* ‘rich’, *malee* ‘shy’), Motion (*ilê* ‘buzz off!’), and the verbs *udêp* ‘live’ and *matê* ‘die’ (Durie 1985: 66-67).
- (13) S=A ‘wanting participant’ (Durie 1985: 55, 56)
 Rila ji= matê
 ready 3.(familiar) dead
 ‘He was ready to go to his death’ (Durie 1985:57)
- (14) S=P ‘ultimately affected participant’ (Durie 1985: 55, 56)
 ... matê(=jih)
 dead 3.(familiar)
 ‘... he died’ (Durie 1987: 376)
- (15) Class (i) and (ii) are semantically distinguished by obligatory vs. non-obligatory animacy of S, class (iii) is a mixed bag.
- (16) S alignment in Acehnese is mostly determined by verbal class (i, ii). The S of class (iii) verbs is marked as A when it is volitional, controlled; as P when it is not. In class (iii), the alignment of S thus depends on the agentive properties of S.

(35) Class (ii) **S aligns like P** (objective prefix): denotes STATES
pehaka ‘be wet’, *hauku* ‘be hot’, *modongo* ‘angry’, *kuata* ‘strong’, *omu*
‘jealous’, and verbs with ‘dummy’ subjective 3neutral prefix, preceding the
prefix that marks S (Holton 2003: 56, fn 13), e.g. *bole* ‘be tired’

(36) Mi-pehaka
3f.obj-wet ‘She is wet’

(37) I-mi-bole
3.subj-3f.obj-tired ‘She is tired.’ (Lit. ‘It tires her’) (ibid, p. 57)

(38) Class (iii) **S aligns like A OR like P**: EVENT or STATE interpretation

(39) a. To-birahi
1s.subj-happy ‘I rejoice’ (ibid, p. 58)

b. I-hi-birahi
3.subj-1.obj-happy ‘I am happy’ (lit. ‘It happies me’) (ibid, p. 58)

(40) Tobelo fluid SS (Holton 2003: 58): TELIC VS. ATELIC interpretation

| | S=A | S=P |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>-eluku</i> | to tell lies | be a liar |
| <i>-kioko</i> | go to sleep | be asleep |
| <i>-modongo</i> | fear | be afraid |
| <i>-hihanga</i> | go astray | be lost |
| <i>-tikiti</i> | cough | cough continuously |
| <i>-tohata</i> | angry | evil |

(41) Also possible: INCHOATIVE VS. STATIVE interpretation

(42) a. Mo- hiri b. I- mi- hiri
3f sick 3 3f sick
‘She’s getting sick.’ ‘She’s sick.’ (ibid: 58)

(43) Class (i) and (ii): aspect of verb DETERMINES alignment of S:
(i) EVENT verbs > S = A, (ii) STATE verbs > S = P

Class (iii) is unspecified for aspect; interpretation is RESULT of alignment of S

S=A: active, telic, dynamic, inchoative interpretation

S=P: stative, atelic interpretation

3.4. Kedang (Samely 1991)

E Flores, Austronesian.

- (44) Unlike Acehnese, Klon, and Tobelo, the variable alignment of S in Kedang does not depend on verbal classes. Aspect of verbs does not play a role either.
- (45) Kedang A=free preverbal pronoun, P=free postverbal pronoun, Samely 1991: 70-72 (> marks breathy vowels)

| | S & A, pre-verbal | P, post-verbal |
|-----|-------------------|----------------|
| 1s | >ei | >eqi |
| 2s | | o |
| 3s | | nuo |
| 1pi | | te |
| 1pe | | e |
| 2p | | me |
| 3p | | suo |

- (46) Pronominal ENCLITICS marking P or S in Kedang (cf. Samely 1991: 70-72 vv.)

| | Paradigm I (PI) | Paradigm II (PII) |
|-----|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1s | =ku | =u |
| 2s | =ko | =o |
| 3s | =i | =ne |
| 1pi | =te | |
| 1pe | =ke | =e |
| 2p | =me | |
| 3p | =deq | =ya |

- (47) >Ei >oroq [nuo maqo doiq] [paq nuo ehing =i]
 I suspect s/he steal money but s/he deny 3s.I
 'I suspect he steals money but he denies it' (Samely 1991:73)

- (48) a. S=A: free preverbal pronoun

>Ei pan >owe >ul...
 I go Dei market
 'I go to the market...' (ibid., p. 79)

- b. S=P: enclitic

Pan >oteq =o?
 go Dei 2s.II
 'Going up, are you?' (ibid., p. 71)

(49) a. S=P: less agentive

Ebeng boraq bahe nape e bale =ke
 watch look.at Compl then 1p.Exc return 1p.e.I
 ‘When we finished watching, we returned’ /
 ‘After we will have finished watching, we will return.’ (ibid., p. 91)

b. S=A: more agentive

Bahe suo bale =dèq.
 then they return Pfv
 ‘Then they returned home.’ (ibid., p. 158)

(50) a. S=P less agentive

Heri, o kua kueq =ko?
 Heri you why.2s cry 2s.I
 ‘Heri, why do you cry?’

b, S=A more agentive

Nuo kueq oti mawang =i
 s/he cry Ag.focus 2.harm 3s.I
 ‘He cries because you harmed him.’

(51) Compare: Non-verbal predicates are stative > S = P

(52) >Anaq usun tèhèq tèlè: “kusing =ne.”
 child small speak say cat =3s.II
 ‘The children say: “It’s a cat” ’ (ibid., p. 153)

(53) Split P is reflected in alignment of S: S = PI in (50a), S=PII in (48b).
 When is S marked with PI, and when with PII?

(54) Examples of Kedang verbs with S = PI or S = PII

| S=PI | | | S=PII | | |
|--------------|---------------------|------|---------------------|-------------------|------------|
| <i>nore</i> | exist (‘there are’) | p.84 | <i>tawe</i> | laugh | p.90 |
| <i>beq</i> | be here | 72 | <i>pan</i> | go | 70, 88, 89 |
| <i>bale</i> | return | 91 | <i>hamang</i> | dance | 93 |
| | | | <i>bèyèng</i> | run | 91 |
| | | | <i>nihon</i> | be light (of day) | 74 |
| | | | <i>mawin</i> | be wet | 91 |
| | | | <i>adaq >alu</i> | behave refined | 76 |
| | | | <i>mate</i> | dead | 93 |
| <i>bute</i> | sleep | 73 | <i>bute</i> | sleep | 73 |
| <i>bikil</i> | broken | 73 | <i>bikil</i> | broken | 73 |
| <i>moruq</i> | fall | 73 | <i>moruq</i> | fall | 73 |

(55) Three verbs occur in both columns > No lexical classes of verbs
 Both columns contain actives and statives > Lexical aspect is not crucial

- (56) S aligned like PI or PII changes the interpretation of the predicate (cf. Tobelo (iii))
 PII (*bute=ne*) conveys the STATIC nature of the action described (person is sound asleep, or has slept for a considerable time)
 PI (*bute=i*) emphasises the DYNAMIC side of the action (person has not slept for long but fell asleep only recently.” (Samely 1991:72)
- (57) Nuo bute =ne, doq-doq nuo hoko =i. Eeh, bute =i watiq.
 s/he sleep 3s.II suddenly s/he get.up 3s.I excl sleep 3s.I again
 ‘He slept, (then) suddenly got up. Why, now he has fallen asleep again!’ (ibid., p. 73)
- (58) PII “describes the state that the flashlight is presently not usable because it is broken”, (59a), PI “draws attention to the actual breaking as the cause for its present state of being unusable” (Samely 1991:73), i.e. *bikil* gets a dynamic event reading in (59b)
- (59) a. Koq senter bikil =ne *state*
 1s.Poss flashlight broken 3s.II
 ‘My flashlight is broken.’ (ibid., p. 73)
- b. Koq senter bikil =i *event*
 1s.Poss flashlight broken 3s.I
 ‘My flashlight got broken.’
- (60) - Free pronouns and lexical NPs: nominative-accusative alignment
 - Dependent pronouns: absolutive-ergative alignment
 - Split P > S goes along in split and may be marked as PI or as PII.
 > Result: PII indicates a stative and PI an eventive reading of predicate

4. Summary and conclusions

- (61) • The semantic parameters of agentivity, control and volition of S involved in SS in Acehnese and Klon are similar
- Klon marks S like A by default, the other languages do not
 - SS in Acehnese, Klon and Tobelo are mostly determined by the class a verb belongs to (only class (iii) allows fluid S in these languages), in Kedang SS completely fluid
 - The fluid marking of S in class (iii) of Klon relates to the non-agentivity of S, fluid marking of S in class (iii) of Tobelo determines the aspectual interpretation of the verb
 - Kedang and Klon also have a split P, in Kedang this split is mirrored in variable marking of S as PI or PII, in Klon it is not
- (62) Conclusions
- The semantics that play a role in the SS patterns in the Indonesian area are similar to those observed in splits elsewhere (cf. Mithun 1991, Dixon 1994). They refer to the agency of the argument, or to the lexical aspect of the verb (state vs. event).
 - There is no typical Austronesian SS, nor a typical Non-Austronesian SS.
 - There is no semantic or structural feature that can characterise SS in this area

5. The geographical distribution of SS in Indonesia

- (63) The number of languages in the sample with SS that are spoken in the eastern part of Indonesia is 14, in the west only 2, see Table 2. What does this tell us?

Table 2. Summary of Table 1 – The areal spread of SS in the sample

| No. of lgs in Indonesia excluding Borneo and Papua | West | | East | | Total | |
|---|------|-------|------|--------|-------|--------|
| | 72 | | 313 | | 385 | |
| sample languages (see list in Table 1) | 7 | +SS 2 | 32 | +SS 14 | 39 | +SS 16 |
| | | -SS 5 | | -SS 18 | | -SS 23 |

- (64) Null hypothesis: west and east have no statistically significant different distribution of SS. To evaluate hypothesis, Fisher's Exact Test for Count data is applied
- (65) Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data
 TABLE = [2 , 5 , 14 , 18]
 Left : p-value = 0.3834739717092759; Right : p-value = 0.8790509966980553
 2-Tail : p-value = 0.6776009159910279
- (66) The 2-Tail p-value = 0.678 shows that we cannot reject our nul hypothesis > there is no significant difference in the spread of SS. [To reject the hypothesis at the 5% significance level, the p-value would have to be $p < 0.05$ but our p-value of 0.678 is much larger]
- (67) Significance of distributions can only be studied with proportional data from a representative sample; data must be evaluated with appropriate tests
- (68) It is very questionable if SS (as defined here) is a meaningful areal feature for the Indonesian area. How can SS be borrowed, what characteristic would then diffuse? Our case studies suggest that there is no form or semantic feature shared by the SS systems in Indonesia in general – E or W -- so that diffusion cannot be shown.

Selected references (The paper in the Proceedings contains a full list)

- Baird, Louise. 2004. Klon pronouns. Talk presented at the Vrijdagmiddaglezing Colloquium, Leiden University, November 5, 2004.
- Baird, Louise. 2005. Doing the Split-S in Klon. In: Jenny Doetjes and Jeroen van de Weijer (eds.), *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2005*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-12.
- Baird, Louise. In preparation. *A grammar of Klon*.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 2004. Typology and linguistic areas. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43,1: 221-239.
- Durie, Mark. 1985. *A grammar of Acehnese on the basis of a dialect of North Aceh*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Durie, Mark. 1987. Grammatical relations in Acehnese. *Studies in Language* 11.2:365-399.
- Holton, Gary. 2003. *Tobelo*. Languages of the World/Materials. Munchen: Lincom.
- Klamer, Marian. To appear. Semantic alignment in the Indonesian area: forms, semantics, geography. To appear in: Soeren Wichman and Mark Donohue (eds.), *The Typology of Semantic Alignment Systems*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivation. *Language* 67.3: 510-546.
- Samely, Ursula. 1991. *Kedang (Eastern Indonesia): Some aspects of its grammar*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Table 1. Split S in the Indonesian language sample

| | -SS | +SS | An/NAN | |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|--------|---|
| Sumatra | | | | |
| Karo Batak | x | | AN | Woollams 1996, 2005 |
| Nias | | x | AN | Brown 2000, 2005 |
| Acehnese | | x | AN | Durie 1985 |
| Java, Madura | | | | |
| Javanese | x | | AN | Uhlenbeck 1949/1978; Oglobin 2005 |
| Sundanese | x | | AN | Muller-Gotama 2001 |
| Madurese | x | | AN | Davies 1999 |
| Bali, Lombok | | | | |
| Balinese | x | | AN | Arka 2003 |
| Flores, Bima, Sumba | | | | |
| Ngadha | x | | AN | Djawanai 1983 |
| Bimanese | x | | AN | Owens 2000 |
| Keo | x | | AN | Baird 2001 |
| Kedang | | x | AN | Samely 1991 |
| Lamalera | | x | AN | Keraf 1978 |
| Kambera | | x | AN | Klamer 1998; in press |
| Sulawesi | | | | |
| Muna | x | | AN | Van den Berg 1989 |
| Tukang Besi | x | | AN | Donohue 1995 |
| Bajau | x | | AN | Donohue 1996b, Verheijen 1986 |
| Mori Bawah | | x | AN | Mead 2005 |
| Alor/Pantar | | | | |
| Blagar | x | | TNG | Steinhauer 1993/1999 |
| Teiwa | x | | TNG | Klamer, in preparation |
| Alorese | x | | AN | Klamer, in preparation |
| Klon | | x | TNG | Baird 2004, 2005 |
| Abui | | x | TNG | Kratochvil, in preparation |
| Tanglapui | | x | TNG | Donohue 1997 |
| Timor archipelago | | | | |
| Tetun Fehan | x | | AN | Van Klinken 1999 |
| Mambai | x | | AN | Hull 2001 |
| Kemak | x | | AN | Hull 2001 |
| Makasai | x | | TNG | Brotherson 2003 |
| Leti | x | | AN | Van Engelenhoven 2004 |
| Bunak | x | | TNG | Friedberg 1978 |
| Halmahera | | | | |
| Tidore | x | | WP | Van Staden 2000 |
| Taba | | x | AN | Bowden 2001 |
| Tobelo | | x | WP | Holton 1997 |
| Pagu | | x | WP | Wimbish 1991 |
| C/S Maluku | | | | |
| Buru | x | | AN | Grimes 1991 |
| Dobel | | x | AN | Hughes 2000 |
| Larike | | x | AN | Laidig and Laidig 1991, Laidig 1992 |
| Selaru | | x | AN | Coward & Coward 2000 |
| NE of Bird's Head, Papua | | | | |
| Biak | x | | AN | Steinhauer 2005, Van den Heuvel, in preparation |
| Saweru | | x | GB | Donohue 2001 |