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. 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 ma-, 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-. Instead we get an active magpa-, which is formed by adding -um- to a base which contains both pa- and paN-. 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 dropped; when the conveyance passive with -i- is added to bases with pag- or paN-, the pag- or paN- 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 maN- -an forms ma-an, and -i-forms maN-. Examples of these formations are given in the following paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Voice Alone</th>
<th>Root + pag-</th>
<th>Root + paN-</th>
<th>Root + ka-</th>
<th>Root + pa-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bili</td>
<td>pagbili</td>
<td>pamili</td>
<td>kabili</td>
<td>pabili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'buy'</td>
<td>'sell'</td>
<td>'buy'</td>
<td>'happen'</td>
<td>'allow to'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-um-</td>
<td>bumili</td>
<td>magbili</td>
<td>mamili</td>
<td>makabili</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
magpabili
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)'; pabilhin '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 'send (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-. There is no Indonesian cognate of -um- except in petrified forms (e.g., madu 'go forward' to root adu, mimpi 'dream' to a root imp; madu 'second wife' to a root adu 'fight, rival'; gemeter (=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 bell 'buy' which are parallel to our Tagalog paradigm (and the roots in both languages are cognate): active membeli 'buy', direct passive (third person) 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 cempur 'mix'.

Although a simple inspection of the paradigm will not reveal the extent to which there is cognition 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 morphophones of N in Indonesian differs in slight detail from the morphophones 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 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'), berdisir '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', berspédá 'ride a bicycle'.

Finally, the prefix ber- is added to a root 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 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 passives discussed above and are still very productive in Tagalog: magbíhás 'change clothes', magba-lot 'wrap something around oneself', magseklay 'comb one's hair'; mag-a-aral 'study'; mag-a-way 'quarrel', magkebítgam 'be friends with one another'; magkuyá '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-. Both languages ber-an and mag-an refer to mutural or plural actions. Tagalog examples: magelágawan 'shout (plurally)', magbíhásan 'tell stories to one another', mag-a-aralan 'sing (plurally)'; mag-a-wayan 'fight with one another'. Indonesian examples: berterikan 'shout (plurally)', berterițaam 'tell stories to one another', bernangyatan 'sing (plurally)', bertengkaran 'fight with one another', etc.

The Indonesian ber- forming verbs to nouns has a parallel in Tagalog: mag-a-awa 'have a wife, husband', magdañon '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 plural, 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 maghatálog '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 (berbuát 'do', beroléth 'obtain', and some other forms in set phrases or in literary language). For the prefix meñ- in Indonesian there is no close parallel with the meanings of Tagalog mak-. What has happened in Indonesian is that some of the functions of the infix -um- (which was lost) were taken over by meñ-, and some by ber-. Further the transitive meanings of ber- were taken over by meñ-, so that meñ- now has a wide ranging meaning and is not semantically comparable to Tagalog mak-, other than it forms active verbs, as Tagalog mak- 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 -ín, -án, 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 prepositions which are 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 meñ- and ber- (analogous to the Tagalog affixes mak- and mag-) and the inflectional affixes are the person-passive prefixes ku- 'first person', kau- 'second person', and di- 'third person'. The local suffix -i is added to a root to form a base to which the primary affix meñ- 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 meñ- (mencampur 'mix into') or ku- (kucampuri 'I mix something into it'), or kau- (kau-campuri '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 meñ- and the passive affixes may be added. (Again, ber- does not occur with bases which contain conveyance -kan).

Adding -kan to campur produces -campurkan, to which the active prefix meñ- may be added giving mencampurkan 'mix (recipient) into something', and the passive prefixes may be added forming dicampurkan 'be mixed into something', kucampurkan '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. 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 -ín 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 suffix in nominal formations with suffix -en derived from verbal roots (cf. minpli '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', dala 'gift', kailoq 'mix' or 'something mixed in', kailoq 'obstruct' or 'obstruction', etc. This construction is found in many other Austronesian languages and is probably a feature of the proto-language. 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 zero, 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 become 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: dalikin 'be brought', kaqin 'be eaten', bilhun 'be bought', etc. However, in Indonesian the conveyance form with -kan has been extended very widely with adjectival 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 miraquin 'be destroyed', putiquin 'be made white', etc. Indonesian has a few verbs which refer to a direct object formed from adjectival and stative roots, e.g., rusak 'broken', dirasaq 'be broken (by someone)'; but most verbs of this sort derived from adjectival or stative roots have a suffix -kan: putih 'white', diputiqkan '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 -datang1, 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 and Bisaya: '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: patuwik-an 'enter (so-and-so), dat-an 'come to (such-and-such a place)', bistilah-an 'visit (such-and-such a place)', pilibutan 'surround' tagidan-an 'add to', etc. In Indonesian this is also the basic meaning of -i: masaq-i 'enter (so-and-so)!', datang-i 'come to (such-and-such a place)', kunjung-i 'visit (such-and-such a place)', lingkari-an '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)', 'put (noun) with (recipient)', 'put (noun) to (recipient)', and the suffix -i in Indonesian has precisely the same meaning with noun roots. Tagalog: gastah-an 'provide the expenses (gua'to) for', tugig-an 'add water (tugig) to', takdun-an 'set limits to', mantah-an 'cover with a blanket', pangalain-an 'give a name to', etc. Indonesian: biyaq-i 'provide the expenses (biyaq) for', air-i 'add, provide water (air) to', batar-an 'set limits to', wultr-an 'cover with a blanket', namaq-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-araiq-an 'study', pagmab-an 'observe', bantay-an 'guard', pagda'an-an 'experience', ma'larq-an 'know', intindih-an 'understand', etc. These forms almost invariably correspond to Indonesian forms with -ti: polajarq-i 'study', amatq-i 'observe', awaq-i 'guard', alamq-i 'experience', ketahieq-i 'know', pahamq-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: sabith-an 'tell (someone)', sitag-an 'shout at', babataq-an 'give news to', etc. Indonesian: kataq-an 'tell', terlakq-i 'shout at', bertaqq-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, puin-an 'make something complete (puunq)', lakh-an 'make something big (lakh)', tagarq-an 'make something take a long time', etc. Indonesian: lantqapq-i 'make something complete', sesqkq-i 'make something complete,
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: katukut-an 'be afraid of', iyak-an 'cry about' maqatoh-an 'be liked', pagatishk-an 'be regretted'; Indonesian: takut 'be afraid of', tangis-i 'cry about', diaeneai-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. In some cases many of the meanings of the prefix 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 Tagalog i- for contrast and then we give the Tagalog pairs which are analogous. Indonesian: dibertik an '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'), diampurkan 'be mixed into something', diampuri 'have something mixed into it'. Tagalog: ibbig 'be given away' (cf. bigyan 'be given to'), itatid 'be delivered' (cf. tamitd 'be delivered') ipag 'be put inside' (cf. pasukan 'be entered into'), ipaghalaq 'be mixed into something' (cf. paghaluqan '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: dikatakkan 'be said', diktupukan 'be expressed', diformulasikan 'be formulated', etc. Tagalog: ipahayag '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) dicitupukan 'be beaten against something, be used to hit with', dituliskan 'be used to write with', etc. (Tagalog) ikampas 'be beaten against something', soulat '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:liniangan 'be in doubt about', ipangamba 'be apprehensive about', ikalungkot 'be sad about', ikapagaya 'be surprised about', etc. Indonesian: diangakkan 'be doubted about', dikaatirkan 'be felt apprehensive about', diacinahkan 'be felt sad about', dihewankan '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: ipagabilot 'be wrapped up for', ikuhaq 'be gotten for', ibili 'be bought for', ipagu: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)'; dipathukan 'be made white', dihalangkan '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 analogous to the causative -kan. E.g., iwas '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. 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. 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 maN- analogous to the connection between paN- and maN-.

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-. 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 Hesperonian 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. 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 non-obligatory: in colloquial styles, _ka_- is used with only a certain number of roots, although in formal, written In-
donesian it occurs with any root in the lan-
guage. 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',

_makabili_ (= -in plus _ka-bili_ 'can be bought, managed to be bought, happen to be bought'. In Indonesian the only potential direct form is _terboli_ which usually has a passive meaning 'can be bought, manage to be bought, happen to be bought'.

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 ne-
cessarily 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 oc-
cur with them, but this is not necessarily the case: roots with very similar meanings may oc-
cur with quite different patterns of affixa-
tion. 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-
aranjado_ 'will be studied' consists of a root _aranjado_ to which the secondary verb-forming af-
fix _pag_- has been added, forming a base _pag-a-
aranjado_. To _pag-a-
aranjado_ a primary affix _-an_ is added forming _pag-a-
aranjado_, to which the inflec-
tional affix 'long-vowel reduplication' refer-
ing to future tense is added.

2. E.g., _mallaq_ 'bathe' to the root _pall:goq_. This formation is more productive in other languages of the Philippines, Northern Celebes, etc.

3. The root _bili_ has an alternate form _bilin_- before suffixes which begin in a vowel.

4. Although there is no productive way that _ber_- and _meli_- could be described as com-

inations 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'; _borol
'obtain' has a passive _diperoleh_; _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 _meli_- tend to have a derived noun formation with _penel_-: _bertambak_ 'increase', _pertambahkan_ 'increase, growth'; _menambah_ 'add to', _penambahan_ 'increase, pro-
cess 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_ add-
ed 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 sec-
ondary affix for active verbs (cf. Section 3, below), which in Tagalog is expressed by _ka_;
and thus Indonesian has no systematic equiva-
 lent 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 _datang-i_ to which the passive and the active affixes may then be added, e.g., _ddatang_ 'be come to' (to which Tagalog _datnan_ corre-
sponds) and active _mendetang_ (to which there is no Tagalog analogue). The meanings covered by the two forms _datang_ and _mendetang_ 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 ex-
amples: _bungkua_ 'wrap' or 'package', _ikat
'tie' or 'something tied around', _jawab_ 'to
teacher' 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 protogram 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 odd: (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) papahon 'make an animal eat'; (Tagalog) tulakak 'be caused to', Batak papahatton 'be fed to'. (The Batak forms can be explained as follows: pahaton consists of pahan 'for an animal to feed' plus pa- causative. This -pahan 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 -kon (of the same origin as Indonesian -kan) added to the base -pahan. This point is discussed in Section 2.4.1, Wolff 1973.)

14. There is a causative meaning of the prefix pah- in Tagalog with roots which refer to motion, where the pah- 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. ipagakoy 'be brought on a vehicle'. There is also a causative meaning of the prefix pah-, 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 pah- 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 pah-

are not formally relatable, since the prefix pah- in Tagalog does not undergo the morphophonemic alternations analogous to those which Indonesian pah- undergoes. Further, the formation of an instrumental with pah- 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-behavior is a different way morphophonemically from pah-.

16. The rule is as follows: ter- may be added to any base to which the active prefix me- or the passive prefixes may be added. Thus for bal'i '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 ka- 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 baisa. '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 terkena 'micturate', tertidur 'fall asleep', etc., which refer to a clearly accidental action.
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