

SIMILARITIES BETWEEN INDONESIAN AND TAGALOG AND THEIR HISTORICAL BASIS

John U. Wolff
Cornell University

Among students of the grammar of Indonesian and Philippine languages it is often taken as an unquestioned and obvious truth that Indonesian and the languages of the Philippines are typologically of a very different sort, and that languages of the Philippines preserve (or perhaps have developed) a complex, synthetic type of grammar, whereas Indonesian shows a simpler analytic type. We maintain that this notion is somewhat inaccurate: Indonesian and the Philippine languages show a remarkable similarity of semantic structure, even though the overt affixational shapes of Indonesian show little that is on the surface comparable to what occurs in the Philippines and even though there is much which is systematically expressed by affixes in the Philippine languages which has no analogue in Indonesian. Further, it seems clearly to be the case that Indonesian is the innovating language in most of the features in which Indonesian differs from Philippine languages, and much of what we can observe as productive processes in the Philippines is a continuation of features which characterized the proto-language.

In this paper we will examine Indonesian and Tagalog, and look at the morphological data which lead us to this conclusion. (We confine ourselves to morphology, and we are not in a position to do an exhaustive study of this. If we were to look at everything, including the syntax, the evidence would be even more overwhelming than what we can present here.)

1. The system of verbal affixation in Tagalog

Tagalog has a set of inflectional affixes, primary affixes and secondary affixes which are added to roots or to affixed bases to produce the verb forms which occur.¹ The inflectional affixes are the tense-aspect affixes, which have no parallel in Indonesian and will not be discussed here (although I am convinced that these affixes reflect a feature of the proto-language — Wolff 1973). The primary affixes are the active-passive affixes, to which there is a parallel in Indonesian: active *-um-*, direct passive *-in*, local passive *-an*, conveyance passive *i-*. We follow Bloomfield's nomenclature except in the case of the *i-* passive (Bloomfield's "instrumental passive") which we call the "conveyance

passive", as this name is more in line with its semantic characteristics than Bloomfield's term. The productive secondary affixes are as follows: verb-forming affixes (we can say little else about the semantic content of these affixes) *paN-* and *pag-*; the causative *pa-*; the accidental/potential *ka-*.

There are five or six other productive secondary affixes in Tagalog, but since these do not have parallels in Indonesian, there is little that can be said about them here. In fact, if we count all of the secondary affixes which occur in languages of the Philippines, Northern Celebes, Northern Borneo and Formosa, we would probably come up with a large number, but many of these occur only in a very restricted number of languages. In any case, we cannot here venture an opinion on the antiquity of any of the secondary affixes other than *pag-*, *paN-*, *pa-* and *ka-*. The morphophonemics of the primary affixes when combined with the secondary affixes is somewhat complex. The active affix *-um-* added to bases with *paN-* and *pag-* forms *maN-* and *mag-* respectively (i.e., we consider the affixes *maN-* and *mag-* of Tagalog to consist of *-um-* plus *paN-* and *pag-* respectively, and there is fairly good descriptive evidence to make this a valid analysis.) With *ka-*, *-um-* forms *maka-*. In Tagalog *-um-* rarely occurs added to bases with *pa-* except in a few petrified forms where it forms *ma-*.² Instead we get an active *magpa-*, which is formed by adding *-um-* to a base which contains both *pag-* and *pa-*. When the direct passive affix *-in* is added to bases with *pag-*, the *pag-* is dropped with a few exceptions; when *-in* is added to bases with *paN-*, *paN-* is often dropped; when the local passive affix with *-an* is added to bases with *paN-* and *pag-*, the *paN-* and *pag-* may well be dropped: in some cases it is dropped, in other cases it may be dropped, and in some cases it is not droppable; when the conveyance passive with *i-* is added to bases with *paN-* or *pag-*, the *paN-* or *pag-* may be dropped, but in many cases it is not dropped. With the affix *pa-* there is no morphophonemic alternation with the passive affixes: i.e., we get *pa-in*, *pa-an*, and *ipa-*. With the affix *ka-*, *-in* forms *ma-*; *-an* forms *ma-an*, and *i-* forms *mai-*. Examples of these formations are given in the following paradigm:

	Root Voice Alone	Root + <i>pag-</i>	Root + <i>paN-</i>	Root + <i>ka-</i>	Root + <i>pa-</i>
	bili 'buy'	pagbili 'sell'	pamili 'buy'	kabili 'happen to buy'	pabili 'allow to buy'
<i>-um-</i>	bumili	magbili	mamili	makabili	magpabili

	Root Voice Alone	Root + <i>pag-</i>	Root + <i>paN-</i>	Root + <i>ka-</i>	Root + <i>pa-</i>
	<i>-in</i> <i>bilhin</i> ³	<i>none</i>	<i>pamilhin</i>	<i>mabili</i>	<i>pabilhin</i>
	<i>-an</i> <i>bilhan</i>	<i>pagbilhan</i>	<i>pamilhan</i>	<i>mabilhan</i>	<i>pabilhan</i>
	<i>i-</i> <i>ibili</i>	<i>ipagbili</i>	<i>ipamili</i>	<i>maibili</i>	<i>ipabili</i>

The so-called passive affixes in Tagalog function much like prepositions or case endings: the suffix *-in* refers to a recipient directly affected by the action: *bilhin* 'buy (the recipient)'; *pamilhin* 'buy (the recipient)'; *mabili* 'can buy, happen to buy (the recipient)'; *pabilhin* 'cause (the recipient) to buy'. The local passive *-an* refers to a recipient of the action which is the place or the person for whom: *bilhan* 'buy from, at', *pagbilhan* 'sell at', *pamilhan* 'buy from, at', *pabilhan* 'cause someone to buy at, from'. The conveyance passive *i-* most commonly refers to a recipient which is the thing conveyed or put or given somewhere by the agent of the action: *ibili* 'spend (recipient), use (recipient) to buy', *ipagbili* 'sell (recipient)', *ipamili* 'use (recipient) to buy', *maibili* 'can, happen to use (recipient) to buy', *ipabili* 'cause (recipient) to be bought'.

2. The Indonesian system compared to Tagalog

Indonesian also has a system of affixes one set of which functions like the active in Tagalog and three of which have preposition-like meanings, which are comparable to the three passive affixes of Tagalog. First, the preposition-like affixes in Indonesian: they are zero (in Indonesian the absence of a suffix is as much a meaningful element as the presence of a suffix), local *-i*, and conveyance *-kan*. We use parallel terminology for the affixes of both languages because we wish to bring out the point that the Tagalog and the corresponding Indonesian suffixes are very similar in their semantic content. For active affixes, Indonesian has *ber-* and *meN-*, the former cognate with Tagalog *mag-* and the latter with Tagalog *maN-*.⁴ There is no Indonesian cognate of *-um-* except in petrified forms (e.g., *maju* 'go forward' to a root *aju*; *mimpi* 'dream' to a root *impi*; *madu* 'second wife' to a root *adu* 'fight, rival'; *gemetar* (=getar) 'tremble'), although *-um-* is a productive affix in closely related languages (e.g., *-um-* was productive in older stages of Toba Batak).

We give the Indonesian forms of *beli* 'buy' which are parallel to our Tagalog paradigm (and the roots in both languages are cognate): active *membeli* 'buy', direct passive (third person)⁵ *dibeli*, instrumental passive (3rd person) *dibelikan* 'spend in buying'. There is no local passive for the root *beli*. To show the parallelism of conjugation we take Tagalog *pagha:loq* 'mix' and Indonesian *campur* 'mix':

	Tagalog	Indonesian
Active	<i>magha:loq</i>	<i>mencampur</i>
	'mix (something)'	'mix (something)'
	<i>magkaha:loq</i>	<i>bercampur</i>
	'be mixed together'	'be mixed together'

	Tagalog	Indonesian
Direct Passive	<i>paghalu:qin</i>	<i>dicampur</i>
	'mix (recipients) together'	'mix (recipients) together'
Local Passive	<i>paghalu:qan</i>	<i>campuri</i>
	'mix into (recipient)'	'mix into (recipient)'
Instrumental Passive	<i>ipagha:loq</i>	<i>campurkan</i>
	'mix (recipient) into'	'mix (recipient) into'

Although a simple inspection of the paradigm will not reveal the extent to which there is cognation between the Tagalog affixes and the Indonesian affixes, additional data will show that with the exception of *-kan*, the affixes here given are in fact old — i.e., continuations of something inherited from the proto-language, and most important, the semantic content of the slots in these charts are remarkably parallel.

2.1 Comparison of the semantics of the Tagalog and Indonesian active verb forms

First we discuss the active affixes. As we stated above, Indonesian *ber-* is cognate with Tagalog *mag-* and *meN-* is cognate with *maN-*. In the case of the latter affixes, there is one-to-one phonemic correspondence, except that the morphophonemics of *N* in Indonesian differs in slight detail from the morphophonemics of *N* in Tagalog. In the case of the affix *ber-* there is no explanation as to why Indonesian has *ber-* instead of the expected *mer-*, but the prefix *ber-*, whatever its origin, is clearly a replacement in the modern Malay dialects of an earlier *mer-* (the prefix which appears in our oldest extant Malay inscriptions), and other languages closely related to Malay all show forms with initial *m* in this prefix. Further, as we stated in footnote four, the relationship between *ber-* and *per-* is comparable to the Tagalog *mag-* and *pag-* on the basis of petrified forms, and similarly *meN-* is related to *peN-* in a way which is comparable to the *maN-/paN-* of Tagalog.

Further, there are some parallels of meaning between the *ber-* and *mag-*. Indonesian *ber-* in many cases forms a middle-type verb, a verb which is intransitive (i.e., is not followed by another form which is the recipient of the action) and in which the agent or the subject of the sentence is somehow viewable as the recipient of the action: *berganti* 'change clothes' (as opposed to *mengganti* 'change something'), *berbungkus* 'be wrapped up' (as opposed to *membungkus* 'wrap something up'), *bersisir* 'comb one's hair' or 'get one's hair combed' (as opposed to *menyisir* 'comb something'), *belajar* 'study (get oneself taught)' (as opposed to *mengajar* 'teach someone'), etc. Often *ber-* has a clearly reflexive meaning: *bertengkar* 'quarrel with each other', *berteman* 'be friends with each other', *berkakak-adik* 'be siblings'. *Ber-* is also productive with noun bases to form a verb

which means 'have, use (noun)': *beristeri* 'have a wife', *berdaun* 'have leaves', *berspèda* 'ride a bicycle'.

Finally, the prefix *ber-* is added to a few roots to form verbs which mean 'do (so-and-so) habitually or normally as an occupation': *bertanam* 'plant (so-and-so) as a food crop' (cf. *menanam* 'plant something (in the ground)'); *berjual* 'sell as an occupation' (cf. *menjual* 'sell something (not necessarily more than once)'). Although there are many uses of Tagalog *mag-* which are not paralleled by *ber-*, there are nevertheless meanings of *mag-* which are analogous to the middle meanings discussed above and are still very productive in Tagalog: *magbi:his* 'change clothes', *magba:lot* 'wrap something around oneself', *magsuklay* 'comb one's hair'; *mag-a:ral* 'study'; *mag-a:-way* 'quarrel', *magkebi:gan* 'be friends with one another'; *magku:ya* 'people who are related by being an older brother and younger sibling'. The parallelism between Tagalog *mag-* and Indonesian *ber-* in the middle meaning comes out in verb forms with a plural morpheme *-an* which occur both in Tagalog and Indonesian (they must be inherited from a morpheme in the proto-language). In Tagalog verb forms with *-an* must have *mag-*, and in Indonesian verb forms with *-an* must have *ber-*. In both languages *ber-an* and *mag-an* refer to mutual or plural actions. Tagalog examples: *magsi:ga:wan* 'shout (plurally)', *magbidahan* 'tell stories to one another', *mag-a:wi:tan* 'sing (plurally)', *mag-awayan* 'fight with one another'. Indonesian examples: *berteriakan* 'shout (plurally)', *berceritaan* 'tell stories to one another', *bernyanyian* 'sing (plurally)', *bertengkaran* 'fight with one another', etc.

The Indonesian *ber-* forming verbs to nouns has a parallel in Tagalog: *mag-asa:wa* 'have a wife, husband', *magda:hon* 'have leaves'. Finally, there may possibly be a Tagalog analogue to the Indonesian verbs of the type *berjual* and *bertanam*, described above. In Tagalog *mag-*, usually added to a root with accent shift or short vowel reduplication, forms plurals, a meaning which may be related to the *ber-* of *bertanam* and *berjual*.

The prefix *mag-* in Tagalog in many cases is a transitive-verb forming affix, as illustrated by *magha:loq* 'mix something into something else' in our paradigm, and a highly productive type in Tagalog. The transitive function of *mag-* in Tagalog may in fact be a reflection of something old, as there are petrified transitive forms with *ber-* in Indonesian (*berbuat* 'do', *berolèh* 'obtain', and some other forms in set phrases or in literary language).

For the prefix *meN-* in Indonesian there is no close parallel with the meanings of Tagalog *maN-*. What has happened in Indonesian is that some of the functions of the infix *-um-* (which was lost) were taken over by *meN-*, and some by *ber-*. Further the transitive meanings of *ber-* were taken over by *meN-*, so that *meN-* now has a wide ranging meaning and is not semantically comparable to Tagalog *maN-*, other than it forms active verbs, as Tagalog *maN-* does.

Before we continue with the preposition-like affixes, we must digress to discuss developments in the Indonesian system.

2.2 Changes which the Indonesian verbal system has undergone

As stated in Sec. 1 above, the Tagalog active infix *-um-* and the preposition-like passive affixes *-in*, *-an*, and *i-* are primary affixes — i.e., they do not form bases to which other affixes can be added. For reasons explained in Wolff 1973, we consider this to reflect the earlier situation from which the current Indonesian system developed. In any case, in the Indonesian system these parallel affixes have a different status: the preposition-like suffixes (parallel to the passive affixes in Tagalog) are secondary affixes — i.e., they form bases to which the primary affixes may be added, or to which inflectional affixes may be added. The primary affixes which may be added to bases in Indonesian are the active affixes *meN-* and *ber-* (analogous to the Tagalog affixes *maN-* and *mag-*) and the inflectional affixes are the person-passive prefixes *ku-* 'first person', *kau-* 'second person', and *di-* 'third person'.⁶ Thus, the local suffix *-i* is added to a root to form a base to which the primary affix *meN-* may be added (the primary affix *ber-* cannot be added to bases with *-i*) or to which the personal-passive affixes *ku-*, *kau-*, and *di-* may be added. For example, in adding the local suffix *-i* to *campur* 'mix' we get *-campuri* to which may be added *meN-* (*mencampuri* 'mix into') or *ku-* (*kucampuri* 'I mix something into it'), or *kau-* (*kaucampuri* 'you mix something into it') or *di-* (*dicampuri* 'it has something mixed into it'). Similarly, the conveyance suffix *-kan* is added to roots to form bases to which the primary affixes *meN-* and the passive affixes may be added. (Again, *ber-* does not occur with bases which contain conveyance *-kan*).⁷ Adding *-kan* to *campur* produces *-campurkan*, to which the active prefix *meN-* may be added giving *mencampurkan* 'mix (recipient) into something', and the passive prefixes may be added forming *dicampurkan* 'be mixed into something', *kaucampurkan* 'you mix (recipient) into something', etc.

There are no active prefixes which may be added to the forms with the passive affixes in the Philippine languages, and this typological difference allows for Indonesian to express meanings analogous to those expressed by Philippine affixational patterns for which Indonesian has no analogue.⁸ But this difference in the status of the Tagalog passive suffixes and the Indonesian preposition-like suffixes, does not change their basic similarities and parallelisms of meaning.

2.3 Comparison of the semantics of the Tagalog passives and their Indonesian analogues

Although the Tagalog passive affixes and the Indonesian preposition-like, verb-forming affixes have a different status in their respective verbal systems, their semantics are remarkably similar, and in many cases the formations have a clear historical connection. First we may look at the direct passive *-in* and its Indonesian analogue zero. The Tagalog

suffix *-in* is derived from a Proto-Austronesian suffix *-en*, the shape which this suffix has in many of the Philippine languages and which is also attested in the modern Javanese passive imperative ending *-en* (as in *pangan-en* 'eat it!'). Indonesian preserves a reflex of this affix in nominal formations with *-an* derived from verbal roots, e.g., *impian* 'a dream' (cf. *mimpi* 'to dream') *makanan* 'food' (cf. *makan* 'eat'), etc. In Indonesian the ending zero for the active verb forms which refer to a recipient which is directly affected by the action is most certainly a continuation of the form of the proto-language, as it is a widely attested construction in various languages of the Philippines and Indonesia. The passive with zero affix to refer to a recipient which is directly affected by the action is also in my belief a continuation of an old formation. In Philippine languages nouns which refer to the result of the action of a verb can be formed to verb roots by the addition of no affix whatsoever and their use very much approaches that of direct passive verbs: *dala* 'bring' and 'something brought', *bigay* 'give' or 'gift', *ha:loq* 'mix' or 'something mixed in', *hadlang* 'obstruct' or 'obstruction', etc.⁹ This construction is found in many other Austronesian languages and is probably a feature of the proto-language.¹⁰ In any case, it seems to be the case that the affixational system in which words which referred to the direct recipient of the action were formed to verbal roots included forms with a zero affix (as well as forms which contained *-en*, and other affixes as well — cf., Wolff 1973). In Tagalog these unaffixed roots are not part of the verbal system, but are separate nominal or stative derivations. In Indonesian these apparently became part of the verbal system.

The range of meanings covered by the direct passive suffix in Tagalog and the direct (zero) form in Indonesian are very much parallel: both refer to a recipient which is directly affected by the action. E.g., Indonesian: *dibawa* 'be brought', *dimakan* 'be eaten', *dibeli* 'be bought'; Tagalog: *dalhin* 'be brought', *kaqi:nin* 'be eaten', *bilhin* 'be bought', etc. However, in Indonesian the conveyance form with *-kan* has been extended very widely with adjective and stative roots, as we shall see shortly, and the zero-affixed form with these roots is rare in Indonesian, whereas in Tagalog the direct passive with these roots is highly productive and forms verbs which mean 'be made (adjective)' or 'be brought into (such-and-such) a state', e.g., Tagalog *siraqin* 'be destroyed', *putiqin* 'be made white', etc. Indonesian has a few verbs which refer to a direct object formed from adjective and stative roots, e.g., *rusak* 'broken', *dirusak* 'be broken (by someone)'; but most verbs of this sort derived from adjective or stative roots have a suffix *-kan*: *putih* 'white', *diputihkan* 'be made white'.

The similarity between the Tagalog local passive and the Indonesian suffix *-i* is obvious at first glance. First, it should be noted that *-i* is in morphophonemic alternation with *-an* in Indonesian. The alternant *-an* is chosen in conjunction with the potential morpheme *ke-* (Section 3). E.g., *datang* plus *-i* forms a base *-datangi*, to which the active and

the passive affixes may be added. When the passive prefix *di-* is added we get *didatangi* 'be come to'; when the potential/accidental prefix is added (Section 3), we get *kedatangan* 'have something come to one'. This alternation of *-an* and *-i* is widely attested in the languages of the Philippines and Indonesia, but by chance it is lost in Tagalog. An example from Cebuano: *biyaq-an* 'be left behind' *biyaq-i* 'leave it behind (imperative)'.

Further, the similarities of meaning between the local passive in Tagalog and the *-i* suffix in Indonesian are striking. Basically, the local passive in Tagalog refers to a recipient which is the place of the action: *pasu:k-an* 'enter (so-and-so)', *datn-an* 'come to (such-and-such a place)', *bisita:h-an* 'visit (such-and-such a place)', *pilibu:t-an* 'surround' *dagdag-an* 'add to', etc. In Indonesian this is also the basic meaning of *-i*: *masuk-i* 'enter (so-and-so)', *datang-i* 'come to (such-and-such a place)', *kunjung-i* 'visit (such-and-such a place)', *lingkar-i* 'surround', *tambah-i* 'add to', etc. With noun roots the suffix *-an* forms local-type verbs in Tagalog which mean 'put (noun) on to (recipient)', 'provide recipient with (noun)', and the suffix *-i* in Indonesian has precisely the same meaning with noun roots. Tagalog: *gastah-an* 'provide the expenses (*gasta*) for', *tubi:g-an* 'add water (*tu:big*) to', *takdaq-an* 'set limits to', *mantah-an* 'cover with a blanket', *pangala:n-an* 'give a name to', etc. Indonesian: *biaya-i* 'provide the expenses (*biaya*) for', *air-i* 'add, provide water (*air*) to', *batas-i* 'set limits to', *selimut-i* 'cover with a blanket', *nama-i* 'give a name to'. With many roots the local passive has a metaphorical use — i.e., strictly speaking the recipient of the action is not the place of the action. Significantly, the same classes which have this metaphorical *-an* in Tagalog also have a similar metaphorical *-i* in Indonesian. Tagalog verbs meaning 'to look at, study, investigate, try, experience, understand', and the like, have an *-an* when referring to a recipient which is directly affected by the action, and their Indonesian analogues have *-i* in the same meanings. Examples from Tagalog: *pag-ara:lan* 'study', *pagmasd-an* 'observe', *bantay-an* 'guard', *pagdaan-an* 'experience', *ma:la:m-an* 'know', *intindih-an* 'understand', etc. These forms almost invariably correspond to Indonesian forms with *-i*: *pelajar-i* 'study', *amat-i* 'observe', *awas-i* 'guard', *alam-i* 'experience', *ketahu-i* 'know', *paham-i* 'understand', etc. With roots which refer to speaking, the form which refers to the recipient which is the person addressed most commonly has *-an* in Tagalog and *-i* in Indonesian: *sabi:h-an* 'tell (someone)', *sigaw-an* 'shout at', *balita:q-an* 'give news to', etc. Indonesian: *kata-i* 'tell', *teriak-i* 'shout at', *berita-i* 'give news to', etc. With adjectives or statives the suffix *-an* may form verbs which mean 'bring something into (such-and-such a state)'. These formations are not productive in either Tagalog or Indonesian, *pu:n-an* 'make something complete (*punoq*)', *lakh-an* 'make something big (*laki*)', *taga:l-an* 'make something take a long time', etc. Indonesian: *lengkap-i* 'make something complete', *sesak-i* 'make something

chock-full', *keras-i* 'make something tight', etc. With roots which refer to personal feelings, the local suffixes can be added to some roots to form verbs which refer to a recipient which is the 'thing at which, on account of which one has (such-and-such) a feeling'. Again, this usage is not productive in either language: *kataku:t-an* 'be afraid of', *iyak-an* 'cry about', *magustoh-an* 'be liked', *pagsisi:h-an* 'be regretted'; Indonesian: *takuti* 'be afraid of', *tangis-i* 'cry about', *disenang-i* 'be liked', *disesal-i* 'be regretted', etc. The fact that both languages have comparable non-productive usages is clear evidence that we are dealing with an old formation and an old semantic category.

The similarities in the conveyance forms in Tagalog and Indonesian are no less startling than the similarities of the local forms, even though the Indonesian suffix *-kan* is not cognate with the prefix *i-* in Tagalog. We consider the prefix *i-* in Tagalog to be a reflex of a form found in the proto-language (for reasons discussed in footnote 8 of Wolff, 1973). Indonesian *-kan* is clearly an innovation: it derives from the preposition *akan* which became attached to the root.¹¹ In any case, many of the meanings of *-kan* have strong parallels with the meanings of *i-* in Tagalog.

First and foremost, verbs which refer to a recipient of an action done in a direction away from the agent, or which is moved to a place away from where it started out from, most frequently have a suffix *-kan* in Indonesian and have a prefix *i-* in Tagalog if they are passive. We give the Indonesian forms with *-kan* and the local *-i* for contrast and then we give the Tagalog pairs which are analogous. Indonesian: *diberikan* 'be given away' (cf. *diberi* 'be given to'), *didatangkan* 'be brought here' (cf. *didatangi* 'be gone to'), *dimasukkan* 'be put inside' (cf. *dimasuki* 'be gone into'), *dicampurkan* 'be mixed into something', *dicampuri* 'have something mixed into it'. Tagalog: *ibigay* 'be given away' (cf. *bigyan* 'be given to'), *ihatid* 'be delivered' (cf. *hatdan* 'be delivered to'), *ipa:suk* 'be put inside' (cf. *pasu:kan* 'be entered into'), *ipagha:loq* 'be mixed into something' (cf. *paghalu:qan* 'have something mixed into it'), etc. With verbs which refer to speaking, *-kan* in Indonesian most frequently refers to a recipient which is the thing said, and in Tagalog the form with *i-* often has a similar meaning. Indonesian: *dikatakan* 'be said', *dièksprèsikan* 'be expressed', *diformulasikan* 'be formulated', etc. Tagalog: *ipaha:yag* 'be expressed', *ibalangkas* 'be formulated', etc. An extension of this conveyance meaning is the instrumental meaning which arises from the notion of 'conveying something to (do-so-and-so) to something else'. E.g., (Indonesian) *dipukulkan* 'be beaten against something, be used to hit with', *dituliskan* 'be used to write with', etc. (Tagalog) *ihampas* 'be beaten against something', *isu:lat* 'be written with', etc.

Another meaning of *-kan* which is clearly relatable to Tagalog *i-* is the formation of a verb which refers to a recipient which is the 'reason on account of which the agent is (feels, becomes, etc.) (so-and-so)'. Tagalog *ipag-a:linla:ngan* 'be in doubt about', *ipangamba* 'be apprehensive about', *ikalungkot*

'be sad about', *ikapagtaka* 'be surprised about', etc.¹² Indonesian: *disangsikan* 'be doubted about', *dikuatirkan* 'be felt apprehensive about', *disedihkan* 'be felt sad about', *dihèrangkan* 'be surprised about', etc.

Finally, both Tagalog *i-* and Indonesian *-kan* may form verbs which refer to a recipient which is the beneficiary of the action. Tagalog: *ipagba:lot* 'be wrapped up for', *iku:haq* 'be gotten for', *ibili* 'be bought for', *ipaglu:-toq* 'be cooked for', etc. Indonesian: *dibungkuskan* 'be wrapped for', *diambilkan* 'be gotten for', *dibelikan* 'be bought for', *dimasakkan* 'be cooked for', etc.

There is another very productive meaning of *-kan* in Indonesian, but this meaning cannot be clearly related to a meaning of *i-* in Tagalog: the causative meaning of *-kan*, whereby *-kan* is added to roots which are adjectives or statives to form a verb which means 'cause the recipient to become (so-and-so)': *diputihkan* 'be made white', *dihilangkan* 'be made to disappear', etc. There are forms with *i-* with a stative root which have similar meanings in Tagalog, but I believe that these may well be a natural expansion of the conveyance meaning, and I do not see them as evidence for continuing a meaning which is continued by the causative *-kan*. E.g., *iwalaq* 'make to disappear' (i.e., 'put something someplace so that it is gone').

3. Derivative affixes in Tagalog and Indonesian

The prefix *pa-* 'causative' in Tagalog clearly reflects an affix of the proto-language. It has disappeared without a trace in Indonesian (its place has been taken by *-kan* for the most part), but the prefix is so widely spread that its antiquity is not in doubt. Toba Batak retains this prefix productively and the meanings of forms which have the direct and the conveyance affixes added to bases with *pa-* are parallel in Tagalog and Batak, such that there can be no doubt that the prefix *pa-* is inherited from the proto-language.¹³ The Tagalog prefix *pag-* is cognate with Indonesian *per-*, and as pointed out in footnote 4, above, there are features of the distribution of *pag-* and *per-* which show clearly that they are reflexes of a prefix of the proto-language. Further, in Section 2.1, we point out similarities between *mag-* and *ber-* (which in their deep structure or historically can be considered to contain the morpheme *pag-* and *per-* respectively). The meanings of *pag-* and *per-* are elusive and range widely. We doubt that they can be profitably compared.¹⁴ Similarly the prefix *paN-* in Tagalog is clearly relatable to Indonesian *peN-*, but there is little in the meaning of these two affixes which is connectable apart from the fact that there is a connection between *peN-* and *meN-* analogous to the connection between *paN-* and *maN-*.¹⁵

Finally, there is the potential/accidental prefix *ka-* in Tagalog for which there is an analogue *ter-* in Indonesian.

The prefix *ter-* in Indonesian is in morphophonemic alternation with *ke-*.¹⁶ Therefore, the shape *ka-* (which only shows up in a few places on the surface of the Tagalog paradigm) is clearly a reflex of a form which occurred

in the proto-language. (Further, a reflex of a morpheme *ka-* of the proto-language is widely distributed through Hesperonesian languages, and traces are found further east as well.) In meaning the Tagalog *ka-* and Indonesian *ter-* cover almost the same ground: they refer to a clearly non-intentional action and also to a potential action.¹⁷ In Tagalog this category is obligatory: by choosing a non-potential form the speaker states that the action is intentional and not potential. In Indonesian this category is not obligatory: in colloquial styles, *ter-* is used with only a certain number of roots, although in formal, written Indonesian it occurs with any root in the language. Further, in Indonesian *ter-* normally only occurs in forms which have a passive meaning, whereas in Tagalog *ka-* occurs with active and with passive verb affixes. E.g., Tagalog *makabili* (= *-um-* plus *ka-* plus *-bili*) 'can buy, manage to buy, happen to buy', *mabili* (= *-in* plus *kabili*) 'can be bought, manage to be bought, happen to be bought'. In Indonesian the only potential direct form is *terbeli* which usually has a passive meaning 'can be bought, manage to be bought, happen to be bought'.¹⁸

FOOTNOTES

1. The term inflectional affix refers to affixes which can be added to all (or almost all) of the bases in a certain form class. E.g., the tense, number, mode affixes in Romance languages, etc. In the Philippines the tense and aspect morphemes and certain nominal formations are inflectional, in that all verb bases take this set of affixes. Primary and secondary affixes are those which are not necessarily added to all members of a given form class; rather, each affix is added to a given subset of roots. Roots of a similar meaning tend to have similar sets of affixes which occur with them, but this is not necessarily the case: roots with very similar meanings may occur with quite different patterns of affixation. The secondary affixes are the affixes which are added to roots to form bases to which the primary and then the inflectional affixes are added (or the inflectional affixes are combined with the primary affixes). The primary affixes are the affixes which are added to bases (which may or may not contain secondary affixes). E.g., a form like *pag-a:-ara:lan* 'will be studied' consists of a root *a:ral* to which the secondary verb-forming affix *pag-* has been added, forming a base *pag-a:-ral*. To *pag-a:ral* a primary affix *-an* is added forming *pag-ara:lan*, to which the inflectional affix 'long-vowel reduplication' referring to future tense is added.

2. E.g., *mali:goq* 'bathe' to the root *pali:goq*. This formation is more productive in other languages of the Philippines, Northern Celebes, etc.

3. The root *bili* has an alternate form *bilh-* before suffixes which begin in a vowel.

4. Although there is no productive way that *ber-* and *meN-* could be described as com-

binations of a primary and a secondary affix, analogous to the analysis we have made for the Tagalog, there are enough isolated remnants in Indonesian to give us the impression that this was once the case. Thus, the passive of *berbuat* 'do' is *diperbuat* 'be done'; *berolèh* 'obtain' has a passive *diperolèh*; *beranak* 'give birth' has a passive *diperanakkan*. *Mengapa* 'do what, why?' has a passive (in rather archaic language) *dipengapakan* 'what was done to (recipient)'. This also comes out in noun formations from verb bases, where verbs with *ber-* tend to have a derived noun formation with *per-* and verbs with *meN-* tend to have a derived noun formation with *peN-*: *bertambah* 'increase', *pertambahan* 'increase, growth'; *menambah* 'add to', *penambahan* 'increase, process of making something grow'.

5. Indonesian and most of the languages in Indonesia have developed personal prefixes for the passive for which there is no parallel in Philippine languages.

6. Since *kau-* and *ku-* are not polite usage, these affixes may be replaced in the first and second person by a large number of other forms, producing periphrastic passives. Further, if the third person agent is 'he' or 'she', there is an additional suffix *-nya* added to the verb.

7. There are forms affixed with *ber-* *kan*, but *-kan* in this case is a different morpheme from the instrumental *-kan*. Although homophonous in standard Indonesian and Malay, there are dialects (e.g. Minangkabau) in which the two have different shapes.

8. For example, Indonesian has lost any analogue to the potential/accidental secondary affix for active verbs (cf. Section 3, below), which in Tagalog is expressed by *ka-*; and thus Indonesian has no systematic equivalent of the difference of the type expressed by *dumating* 'come, arrive' vs. *maka:rating* 'happen to arrive' (the latter form being analyzable morphologically as *-um-* added to a base consisting of *ka-*: plus *dating*). However, Indonesian has *datang* 'come, arrive' to which a secondary affix *-i* may be added forming *-datangi*, to which the passive and the active affixes may then be added, e.g., *didatangi* 'be come to' (to which Tagalog *datnan* corresponds) and active *mendatangi* (to which there is no Tagalog analogue). The meanings covered by the two forms *datang* and *mendatangi* cover approximately the same range as the meanings covered by the Tagalog forms *maka:rating* and *dumating*, and thus we may say that the creation of these new active forms in Indonesian has made up for the loss of affixational types and that it was probably the coming into being of the new types which allowed the old forms to fall into disuse.

9. Bloomfield (1917) has two pages of examples, many of which compare the nominal and the verbal uses of these roots, Sections 341.3(b) and 342.

10. In Indonesian this formation is not productive, but there are certainly many examples: *bungkus* 'wrap' or 'package', *ikat* 'tie' or 'something tied around', *jawab* 'to answer' or 'an answer', etc.

11. At various times scholars have attempted to link this *-kan* with similar affixes found in languages of Celebes and in Oceanic languages, but the morphemes involved do not exhibit sound correspondences such that it would be possible to reconstruct a proto-form from which these suffixes developed, and I believe these are independent developments (although in Celebes, at least, contacts — direct or indirect, with Malay may well have influenced the development of these reminiscent constructions). There are two reasons why *-kan* in Indonesian does not look old: (1) not all dialects of Malay have *-kan* (e.g., Minangkabau has *-an* for the conveyance suffix); (2) in meanings of *-kan* apart from the conveyance and causative meaning, there is a paraphrase consisting of an intransitive verb or adjective plus *akan*, which has a meaning very similar to the meaning of the transitive verb which contains *-kan* (e.g., *takut akan* 'be afraid of' and the transitive verb *takutkan* 'fear'; *bertanya akan* (literary form) 'ask about' and the transitive verb *tanyakan* 'ask about', etc.). It is not a big change for a transitive form to develop from this paraphrase, which would then be in competition with other transitive forms which derived from an earlier stage. This does not account for the development of *-kan* as the affix of the conveyance meaning, and at this point it is not possible to give such an account.

12. I only know of examples in Tagalog of the conveyance form in this meaning with bases which contain a derivative affix (and most often a prefix *ka-*). But in any case, the formation is very productive in Tagalog.

13. The direct passive in Tagalog and the direct form in Batak to bases with *pa-* refer to a recipient which is 'caused to do (so-and-so)', whereas the conveyance forms of verbs with causative *pa-* refer to the 'thing which is caused to have (so-and-so) done to it'. E.g., direct passive (Tagalog) *pakaqi: nin* 'be caused to eat' (Batak) *papahan* 'make an animal eat'; (Tagalog) *ipaka:qin* 'be fed to', Batak *papahatton* 'be fed to'. (The Batak forms can be explained as follows: *papahan* consists of *pahan* 'for an animal to feed' plus *pa-* causative. This *-papahan* then gets an affix zero to form the direct form (just as the direct form in Indonesian is derived with zero affix). *Papahatton* consists of the conveyance suffix *-hon* (of the same origin as Indonesian *-kan*) added to the base *-papahan*. This point is discussed in Section 2.4.1, Wolff 1973.)

14. There is a causative meaning of the prefix *pag-* in Tagalog with roots which refer to motion, where the *pag-* forms verbs which refer to a recipient which is conveyed, and this formation is productive: e.g., *bilhin* 'be bought' vs. *ipagbili* 'be sold'; *sakyan* 'be ridden on' vs. *ipagsakay* 'be brought on a vehicle'. There is also a causative meaning of the prefix *per-*, but it does not occur with bases which refer to motion and therefore is not comparable to the Tagalog form.

15. There is a prefix *peN-* in Indonesian which forms nouns which refer to an instrument, and this form is reminiscent of the instrument former *pang-* in Tagalog, but *pang-* and *peN-*

are not formally relatable, since the prefix *pang-* in Tagalog does not undergo the morphophonemic alternations analogous to those which Indonesian *peN-* undergoes. Further, the formation of an instrumental with *peN-* or a cognate thereof is not found elsewhere — at least I have not found it. Quite possibly, *pang-* in Tagalog is a loan prefix from Malay. This would account for the fact that *pang-* behaves in a different way morphophonemically from *paN-*.

16. The rule is as follows: *ter-* may be added to any base to which the active prefix *meN-* or the passive prefixes may be added. Thus for *beli* 'buy' there is a paradigm: *membeli, dibeli, kubeli* (and the other person forms of the verb), and *terbeli*. If a base has a suffix *-kan*, the *-kan* often (but not always) is dropped when *ter-* is added: *mengatakan, dikatakan, kukatakan, (etc.)*, *terkata* or *terkatakan* to the base *-katakan* 'say something'. If the base has a suffix *-i* when the accidental/potential morpheme is added it has the shape *ke-* and the suffix is shaped *-an* (with some exceptions). Thus the paradigm of the base *-lindungi* 'shelter' is *melindungi, dilindungi, kulindungi (etc.)*, *kelindungan*.

17. Philippine languages also have a derivative affix used together with the potential to form verbs which refer to non-intentional action, but usually verbs with the potential affix alone may have a non-intentional meaning. Perhaps this reflects a situation in which the potential and the non-intentional forms were once distinguished, but in any case, at the present time the potential affix covers the range of potential and non-intentional meanings in the Philippines and in Indonesia.

18. In some Malay dialects *ter-* is still productively used in active meanings, and this usage is occasionally reflected in literature. E.g., from *Papan Reklame* by S. Hasibuan: *Wan Saleh terbeli murah dan kini bebaslah ia menjual barangnya seharga biasa*. 'Mr. Saleh managed to buy his things at a low price, and now he was free to sell them at the normal price.' *Ter-* in an active meaning in current Indonesian is only found in a few forms of the type like *terkencing* 'micturate', *tertidur* 'fall asleep', etc., which refer to a clearly accidental action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1917. Tagalog texts with grammatical analysis. *University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 157—566). Urbana, Illinois. Reprinted 1967 by the Johnson Reprint Corporation, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10003.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in proto-Austronesian, in Andrew Gonzales, ed., *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez. Philippine Journal of Linguistics, Special Monograph Issue No. 4*, December 1973, pp. 71—91).

Wolff, John U. 1980. *Formal Indonesian:
reference grammar and exercises for
students.* Southeast Asia Program

Publications, Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York, 14853.

* * *