



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A grammar of Mualang : an Ibanic language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia

Tjia, J.

Citation

Tjia, J. (2007, April 25). *A grammar of Mualang : an Ibanic language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11862>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/11862>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

6 PREDICATE NOMINALS AND RELATED CONSTRUCTIONS

In Chapters 4 and 5 I have dealt specifically with noun phrases and prepositional phrases. This chapter will continue the discussion of the use of these kinds of phrases at the higher, that is, the clause-level. In Mualang, as in other languages, predicates and their obligatory arguments are the core constituents of the clause. In general, the predicate slot can be occupied by 1) a verb (or a verb phrase) or 2) a non-verb form, such as a noun or noun phrase or prepositional phrase. Discussion of the first type of predicate will be deferred until Chapter 7, whereas the second one will be my concern here. I will use the term “predicate nominals” (section 6.1) to refer to clauses in which the main semantic content of the predication is embodied in a noun (which category for the purpose of the present discussion includes pronouns, quantifiers and demonstratives) or a noun phrase. Closely related to predicate nominals are predicate locative, existential, and possessive clauses (Payne 1997:111ff), each of which will be discussed below in sections 6.2, 6.3, and 6.4 respectively. Although the last two constructions usually involve a verbal predicate, they will be covered in this chapter due to their structural and semantic interaction with other predicate types. The interrelationship between all these predicate types has been well proven across languages (see e.g. Lyons (1968:388ff), Clark (1978), Freeze (1992)).

So-called “attributive” or “adjective” clauses, which are equivalent to English attributive clauses, are also often included in the description of predicate nominals. The Mualang equivalents of these clause types will be discussed in Chapter 8 on intransitive clauses since “adjective” is not considered to be a separate word class in the grammar of Mualang. However, in subsection 6.1.2 the use of static intransitive (or “adjective-like”) verbs will be touched upon in relation to comparative clauses.

6.1 Predicate nominals

Clauses with predicate nominals have the structure NP (NEGATION-ASPECT) NP without an intervening copula. The NP predicate may be a single noun, pronoun, demonstrative, quantifier, or a noun phrase. The occurrence of a negation or aspectual marker is optional. The structure of the clause may be the same as that of a NP, e.g. *uma ia* ‘can mean ‘that rice field’ (a NP) or ‘the rice field is that (one)’ (a clause). In a clause, a slight intonational pause after the NP subject demarcates it from the predicate, whereas within a NP no such pause intervenes between the constituents. In terms of word order, SUBJECT PREDICATE is the unmarked one, although the reversed order occurs as well. The reverse word order is clearly marked by a rising intonation contour on the whole NP predicate, indicating focus on the

predicate part. There are three main notions that can be accomplished through predicate nominal constructions: equation (6.1.1), comparison (6.1.2), and exclamation (6.1.3).

6.1.1 Equative clauses

In equative clauses the subject is a given entity and the predicate asserts (usually new) information about it. If the main semantic content of the predicate is a noun phrase (6-1), pronoun (6-2) or demonstrative (6-3), they are coreferential with the subject of the clause. If the predicate is a quantifier, as in (6-4), it is functionally descriptive of the subject:

(6-1) *Adat ia' babi tujuh iku'.*
 custom that pig seven CLASS
 'The custom (to fine an infringement) is seven pigs.'

(6-2) *Nya' ia.*
 that 3s
 'That's him.'

(6-3) *Uma ku nya', ukay tu'.*
 rice.field 1s that CONT.NEG this
 'My rice field is that one, not this'

(6-4) *Sida' mayuh.*
 3p many
 'They are many.' (or: 'There are many of them.')

In some cases the determination of which constituent constitutes the subject and which one the predicate would at first glance be questionable, especially when a demonstrative occupies a syntactic position as in (6-2 and 6-3). However, by definition, the constituent that presents the new information is considered the predicate. In (6-3) the negation indicates what is the predicate, namely *tu'* 'this', since only predicates can be negated. As for the subject, it can be marked as "topical", that is with *tu'* 'TOP' (see further section 9.3 in Chapter 9), e.g.:

(6-5) *Juah tu' nama nsia.*
 J TOP name human
 'As for Juah, it is a human's name.'

The nature of negation in predicate nominals is different from the one in predicate verbals. As negation will be treated more fully in Chapter 9, it is mentioned here only briefly. If the predicate contains a referent of the subject, as in (6-1 to 6-3), it is negated by the negator *ukay*, as seen in (6-3). If the predicate is descriptive of the subject as in (6-4), it is negated by *naday*. Note, however, that the

negator *ukay* can also be used instead of *naday* to lend contrastive focus to the predicate: ‘not A (but B)’. Compare for instance (6-6a and b):

- (6-6) a. *Kubur Aji Melayu naday s-iku*.
grave haji M NEG ONE-CLASS
‘Haji Melayu did not have just one grave.’ (lit. ‘Haji Melayu’s grave was not just one.’)
- b. *Kubur Aji Melayu ukay s-iku*.
grave haji M CONT.NEG ONE-CLASS
‘It wasn’t (only) **one** grave that Haji Melayu had.’

(6-6a) is a clausal negation, containing the speaker’s negative assertion that the number of Haji Melayu’s grave is more than one; whereas in (b) the speaker counter-asserts someone’s (e.g. the hearer’s) mistaken belief about the number of Haji Melayu’s grave.

Clausal modification for aspect and modality are always possible with descriptive predicates as in (6-4). For other predicates such a modification seems to operate only with nouns that potentially imply some physical or temporal change or development. E.g. *dara* ‘young woman’ (6-7), *miak* ‘child’ (6-8) and *tawas* ‘noon’ (6-9):

- (6-7) *Lama’ ka lama’ ia tih nyaw dara*.
long to long 3s tih PERF young.woman
‘With the passing of time she had become a young woman.’
- (6-8) *Ia agi’ miak*.
3s still child
‘She was still a child.’
- (6-9) *Ari nyaw tawas*.
day PERF noon
‘It was already noon.’

6.1.2 Comparative clauses

Mualang uses different grammatical strategies for comparison of an entity having a gradable quality to some other entity with the quality in the same degree and in a higher degree. In this section I will discuss three types of comparative constructions distinguished in Mualang: comparison of equivalence (6.1.2.1), of higher degree (6.1.2.2), and of maximal degree (superlative) (6.1.2.3). There are four main elements that typically appear in a comparative construction (cf. Payne 1997:89): 1) the *subject* of the clause; 2) the *standard*, against which the subject is compared; 3) the *marker* of comparison, and; 4) the comparative *quality*.

6.1.2.1 Comparative clauses of equivalence

Basically there are three kinds of syntactic structural patterns that can be used to express comparison of equivalence: a) comparison with equative clauses (6.1.2.1.1), b) comparison with attributive clauses (6.1.2.1.2), and c) comparison with active clauses (6.1.2.1.3).

6.1.2.1.1 *Comparative equative clauses of equivalence*

In this type of comparison, the quality of the subject is compared to that of the “standard” element by using the marker *sebelah/bela* or *sama* ‘same’. *Sama* is a Malay/Indonesian borrowing. For the sake of convenience, I will only use *bela* in the examples below to represent these markers. The quality itself is expressed in possessive noun phrases in which the entities under comparison are the possessor of the possessed quality. Since quality is coded in a verb, it must be nominalized with the nominalizer *pe(N)*-. The whole construction, thus, appears as follows:

POSSESSIVE.NP_[QUALITY/SUBJECT]-MARKER-POSSESSIVE.NP_[QUALITY/STANDARD]

Some examples are:

- (6-10) [*PeN-besay ia*]_{NP} *bela’* *aba’* [*peN-besay ku*]_{NP}.
 NOM-big 3s same with NOM-big 1s
 QUALITY/SUBJECT MARKER QUALITY/STANDARD
 ‘He is as big as me.’ (lit. ‘His bigness is the same compared with my bigness.’)

Some syntactically reduced structures occur beside the “full-fledged” construction of (6-10) each with its own semantic nuance:

- (6-11) a. *PeN-besay ia bela’ peN-besay ku.*
 NOM-big 3s same NOM-big 1s
 ‘He is as big as me.’ (lit. ‘His bigness is the same as my bigness.’)
- b. *PeN-besay ia bela’ aba’ ku.*
 NOM-big 3s same with 1s
 ‘His size is the same as mine.’ (lit. ‘His bigness is the same compared with me.’)
- c. *Ia bela’ peN-besay aba’ ku.*
 3s same NOM-big with 1s
 ‘He is of the same size compared with me.’)
- d. *Ia bela’ peN-besay ku.*
 3s same NOM-big 1s
 ‘He is of the same size as me.’ (lit. ‘He is the same as my bigness.’)

e. *Ia peN-besay ku.*
 3s NOM-big 1s
 ‘He is my size.’ (lit. ‘He is my bigness.’)

f. *PeN-ting’i’ ku urang ia’.*
 NOM-tall/high 1s person that
 ‘Of my length is that person.’

Form (e) is the smallest structure possible, in which the quality of the standard element becomes the quality compared. The use of the prefix *peN-* here is obligatory and may therefore be viewed as marker of comparison (cf. **Ia besay ku* ‘3s-big-1s’ etc. is not grammatical). Example (f) differs from (e) and the other examples in that it has the order predicate-subject, emphasizing the predicate, also intonationally focus.

6.1.2.1.2 Comparative attributive clauses of equivalence

In comparative attributive clauses the use of the marker *sebelah/bela’* or *sama* ‘same’ and the preposition *aba’* ‘with’ are obligatory. The quality appears in the form of a verb stem. For example:

(6-12) a. *Ia bela’ ting’i’ aba’ ku.*
 3s same tall/high with 1s
 SUBJECT MARKER QUALITY STANDARD
 ‘He is equally tall as me.’

b. **Ia bela’ ting’i’ ku.*
 3s same tall 1s

c. **Ia ting’i’ (aba’) ku.*
 3s tall with 1s

The verb stem may also appear in initial clause position if focussed:

(6-13) *Besay ia bela’ aba’ ku.*
 big 3s same with 1s
 ‘Equally big is he compared with me.’

6.1.2.1.3 “Dynamic” comparative active clauses of equivalence

The present description of this type of comparison should be considered as a preliminary and tentative note which needs to be reexamined with a larger number of speakers. The comparative construction in (6-14) below was found in a story; in it, the comparative quality is expressed with a static intransitive verb marked with the active prefix *N-*; the structure looks like: NP_{SUBJECT} N-V_{MARKER-QUALITY} NP_{STANDARD}:

- (6-14) *Dulaw tih [besay gerama'] [N-besay]*
 previously *tih big crab* ACT-big
 SUBJECT MARKER-QUALITY

[kuali s-igi'].
 cooking.pan ONE-CLASS
 STANDARD

'In the past the size of crabs was as big as a cooking pan.' (or possibly:
 'In the past the size of crabs equaled a cooking pan in size.')

In elicitation, the following clause with the quality *besay* 'big' appeared to be also acceptable:

- (6-15) *Kera' N-besay mpliaw.*
 long.tailed.macaque ACT-big tail-less.gibbon
 'The *ker*a' is as big as the *mpliaw*.' (or: 'The *ker*a' equals the *mpliaw*
 in size.')

It seems that the verb *besay* 'big' in such active comparative clauses expresses a general idea about size. The majority of the speakers that I questioned about it judged the use of static intransitive verbs other than *besay* 'big' in such a comparative construction as ungrammatical, e.g.:

- (6-16) **Pun tu' N-ting'i' pun ia'.*
 tree this ACT-tall tree that
 'This tree is as tall as that tree.'

Two young speakers (aged between 24 to 30 years old) accepted clauses like (6-16) with the comparative meaning as grammatical as long as they do not involve a human subject, since in that case *N-ting'i'* would be interpreted as a causative:

- (6-17) *Urang tu' N-ting'i' pun ia'ku.*
 tree this ACT-tall tree that/1s
 'This person made that tree/me higher.' (*'This person is taller than that tree/me')

6.1.2.1.4 "Absolute" comparative attributive clauses of equivalence

If the elements compared serve both as and the standard of comparison, i.e. "X and Y are of the same Quality", the marker *bela'/sebel*a' 'same' will obligatorily be used and the quality appears either as a verbal stem (6-19) or with the nominalizer *peN-* (6-18), e.g.:

- (6-18) a. *Kemua bela' peN-baruh.*
 1d.excl same NOM-low
 'Both of us are equally short.'
- b. *Bela' peN-besay rumah seniku' ia'.*
 same NOM-big house 3d that
 'Of the same size – are the houses of the two of them.'
- c. *PeN-ting'i' sida' ia' bela'.*
 NOM-high 3p that same
 'The height of them is the same.'
- (6-19) a. *Sida' ia' bela' ting'i'.*
 3p that same high
 'They are of the same height.'
- b. *Bela' ting'i' sida' ia'.*
 same high 3p that
 'Of the same height – they are.'

6.1.2.2 Comparative clauses of higher degree

The order of the elements in the comparative construction of higher degree is SUBJECT-QUALITY-MARKER-STANDARD. This differs from the comparative construction of equivalence in the absence of a marker that precedes the quality and in the presence of the preposition *ari* 'from' before the standard. The subject may be in clause-initial position, which is the unmarked position (6-20a, 6-21 and 6-22), or it may follow the expression of the quality, which then becomes focused, as in (6-20b):

- (6-20) a. *Pasak besay ari tiang.*
 peg big from pole
 SUBJECT QUALITY MARKER STANDARD
 'The peg is bigger than the pole.' (a proverb meaning one's consumption is bigger than one's gain)
- b. *Besay pasak ari tiang.*
 big peg from pole
 QUALITY SUBJECT MARKER STANDARD
 'It is bigger – the peg than the pole.'

- (6-21) *Batang ting'i' ari tung'ul.*
 trunk high from tree.stump
 SUBJECT QUALITY MARKER STANDARD
 'The trunk is higher than the stump.' (a proverb meaning acting beyond one's rights or limits; being higher in position than one deserves to be)

- (6-22) *Nisi' tay tuay ari ku.*
 EXIST.NEG REL old from 1s
 SUBJECT QUALITY MARKER STANDARD
 'There is no one who is older than I am.'

In some instances the marker *lebih* 'more' is used before the quality element as in (6-23). However, such a use of *lebih* is most likely a case of Malay/Indonesian influence, since the construction without *lebih* as described for (6-20 – 6-22) is much more frequent in texts of elder speakers. Note that *lebih* is not used in (6-20) and (6-21) which are traditional sayings/proverbs. Besides, the use of *lebih* seems to be semantically redundant in Mualang:¹

- (6-23) *Tung ku lebih galak ari tung m'ih.*
 part 1s more fertile from part 2s.masc
 SUBJECT QUALITY MARKER STANDARD
 'My part (a tree) grows more fertile than your part.'

In contrast to the comparison of higher degree, no special grammatical marker is employed for a comparison of a lesser degree. It is simply lexical, that is, another static verb with the opposite meaning would be used, for example, *mit* 'small' over *besay* 'big', e.g.:

- (6-24) *Pipit mit ari manuk renyaw.*
 sparrow small from chicken rooster
 'Sparrows are smaller than roosters.'

6.1.2.3 Superlative clauses

There are two types of superlative constructions, namely those with the marker *paling*, secondly those with a cleft construction using the relativizer *tay/ti*.²

- (6-25) *Ia paling/ti ting'i' da kampung tu'.*
 3s very/REL tall LOC village this
 'He is very tall/the tallest in this village.'

¹ In contrast to Mualang, standard Indonesian typically employs *lebih* as the marker in comparative constructions of higher degree.

² The marker *paling* might be a Malay/Indonesian loan.

- (6-26) *Ia paling/ti panay da ntara sida' menyadi'.*
 3s very/REL smart LOC between 3p sibling
 'He is very smart/the smartest among those siblings.'

Although the construction with *tay/ti* is a cleft construction, the superlative reading can be understood via the context and the existence of the quality expression together with the locative phrase, which evokes a picture of the standard of comparison. The use of cleft constructions for comparison is most likely due to their contrastive function (see section 9.2.3 in Chapter 9). In superlative comparison, the element under focus is compared with other elements of the same group, e.g. with "all people in the village" in (6-25) or "the other siblings" in (6-26).

6.1.3 Exclamatory clauses

Formally, exclamatory clauses are expressed by nominalization of verbal clauses, yielding a possessive NP in which the subject of the corresponding/original clause has become possessor and the nominalized static intransitive verb is the possessed element. Such a form is illustrated in (6-29), in comparison to the ordinary verbal clause (6-27) and the regular possessive NP (6-28):

- (6-27) *Nsia ia' baik.*
 human that good
 'That man is kind.'
- (6-28) *Kira aday urang N-peda' peN-baik ku.*
 wish exist person ACT-see NOM-good 1s
 'I wish there would be someone who would see my kindness.'
- (6-29) *PeN-baik nsia ia'!*
 NOM-good man that
 'How kind that man is!'

Syntactically the possessive form in (6-28) is a constituent NP, whereas in (6-29) the whole form is a complete utterance. In (6-29) a typical long, high pitch falls on the final syllable of the nominalized verb indicating an emotional overtone. The rationale behind this usage of the possessive form is something like "the X's quality is such that I could say no more".

The nominalized form is often reduplicated and followed by the demonstrative *nya* 'that' to add more intensity. The associated pitch now shifts to *nya*.³

³ The use of a possessive NP construction for exclamatory clauses is not unusual. The Muna language, which is also a Western Malayo-Polynesian language, spoken in southeastern Sulawesi, exhibits a similar phenomenon as in Mualang (see Berg 1989:172ff for Muna). This phenomenon is also found in various Malay varieties. Indonesian utilizes *nya*, generally meaning '3s.non-subject', as in (i). Ambonese Malay, chiefly spoken in the central Moluccas, employs the possessive marker *pung*, as in (ii) (cf. Minde 1997:322). In all of these languages a special intonation marks the exclamatory rendering.

- (6-30) *PeN-besay-N-besay nya' rumah ia'!*
 NOM-big-N-RED that house that
 'How big that house is!' ('That house is HUGE!')
- (6-31) *PeN-bula'-N-bula' nya' m'ih!*
 NOM-lie-N-RED that 2s.masc
 'What a big liar you are!'
- (6-32) *Pe-nitaw'-nitaw' nya'!*
 NOM-stupid-RED that
 'How very stupid!'

For pragmatic focus on the subject, the subject may be fronted. Compare, e.g. (6-30) and (6-31) with (6-33) and (6-34) respectively:

- (6-33) *Rumah ia' peN-besay-N-besay nya'!*
 house that NOM-big-N-RED that
 'That house is so big!'
- (6-34) *M'ih peN-bula'-N-bula' nya'!*
 2s.masc NOM-lie-N-RED that
 'You're such a liar!'

6.2 Predicate locatives

A predicate locative is simply a juxtaposition of NP and (NEGATION-ASPECT) PP without any intervening copula (6-35). The PP predicate can be fronted for focus (6-36):

- (6-35) *Inay da pian.*
 mother LOC bathing.place
 'Mother is at the bath place.'
- (6-36) *Biasa da uma ia, nti' agi' lam.*
 usually LOC rice.field 3s if still morning
 'Usually he's in the rice field if it's still morning time.'

-
- (i) *Sopan-nya anak itu!*
 polite-3s child that
 'How polite is that child!'
- (ii) *Ana pung pamalas (saja e)!*
 child POSS lazy just e
 'How (just) lazy he is!' (lit. 'The child's laziness')

The prepositional phrase in the NP PP construction is not limited to a location; other semantic types of PP can also fill the predicate of the clause as in the following examples (see also Chapter 5 for other examples):

- (6-37) *Udah nya' sida' ka utan.* = destination
 already that 3p to forest
 'After that they went to the forest.'
- (6-38) *Tu' ngaw m'ih.* = benefactive
 this for 2s.masc
 'This is for you.'
- (6-39) *Ku aba' m'ih.* = associative
 1s with 2s.masc
 'I am with you.' (also: 'I and you')

The NP PP construction is typically negated with the clausal negator *naday* 'no, not' or the contrastive negator *ukay* 'no, not', as in (6-40 – 6-42) below. This differs from the use of negators in existentials (see section 6.3 below; for negation in general, see Chapter 9):

- (6-40) *Agi' jeman ia' sida' bibas, naday da baruh*
 still time that 3p free NEG LOC bottom
 kuasa raja.
 power king
 'During that time they were free, not under the authority of the king.'
- (6-41) *Ukay, ia ukay da uma, da rumah.*
 CONT.NEG 3s CONT.NEG LOC rice.field LOC house
 'No, he's not in the rice field (but) at home.'
- (6-42) *Bini m'ih naday ngaw kuli.*
 wife 2s.masc NEG for coolie
 'Your wife is not to be (treated as) a coolie.'

Location is a central element involved not only in the discussion of predicate locatives, but also in existentials and possessive clauses. The following sections will deal with the latter two clause types.

6.3 Existentials

Existential constructions assert the existence of an entity, typically in a particular location and/or time. However, location and time are adjuncts since they are optional syntactically. The intransitive existential verb *aday* is used in existentials. It will be glossed throughout as 'exist', but in addition to the notion 'exist, to be there'

(existential-presentative), it also covers the notion ‘to be in/at’ (locative) and ‘have, to be at (subject’s) disposal’ (possessive). The structure of existentials is analysed as follows:

1. *aday* NP (existential-presentative construction)
2. NP *aday* (NP) (non-existential-presentative construction)

The construction *aday* NP is an existential-presentative construction with a fixed order of constituents. It is typically used to introduce the existence or occurrence of a NP entity in discourse for the first time. As found across languages (see e.g. Freeze 1992), the NP argument of such an existential-presentative is typically indefinite, thus compare the following Mualang examples with their English renderings:

- (6-43) *Ha! Aday [s-iku’ gerama’ besay]!*
 uh exist ONE-CLASS crab big
 ‘Uh! There is a big crab!’ (Unexpectedly someone saw a crab in the trap)
- (6-44) *Jeman dulaw da se-buah kampung aday*
 time previously LOC ONE-CLASS village exist

[ini’ aba’ ucu’ ti miskin aba’ tay
 grandmother and grandchild REL poor and REL
pedih idup].
 difficult live
 ‘In the olden times in a village there were a grandmother and a grandchild who were poor and who lived in difficult circumstances.’
 (The opening of a story)
- (6-45) *Baru’ ilang kisah ia’ tih, aday [kisah Antu Belang].*
 then lost story that tih exist story ghost B
 ‘Then after that (part of the) story is over, there’s a story of ghost Belang.’
- (6-46) *Ari jawuh ia N-peda’ aday [tepayan].*
 from far 3s ACT-see exist jar
 ‘From a distance he saw there was a jar.’

The indefiniteness of the NP (or the fact that the NP referent is not identifiable, because it has not been mentioned in previous discourse), constrains the occurrence of the NP argument before *aday*. Thus (6-43b – 46b) are not alternatives for the structure *aday* NP:

- (6-43b) **Ha! [Siku’ gerama’ besay]_{NP} aday!*
 (6-44b) **Jeman dulaw da sabuah kampung [ini’ aba’ ucu’ tay miskin aba’ tay pedih idup]_{NP} aday.*

(6-45b) **Baru' ilang kisah ia' tih*, [*kisah Antu Belang*]_{NP} *adaya*.

(6-46b) **Ari jawuh ia meda' [tepayan]_{NP} *adaya*.*

Syntactically this means that the NP argument cannot occupy the subject slot in clause-initial position, hence the *adaya* NP structure is not an *adaya*-fronting construction. Given the fact that SVO is the unmarked word order in Mualang, the NP should be able to occupy that initial position if it is a typical subject as in “regular” clauses. This is in line with Givón (2001:191ff) who noticed the rather non-prototypicality of the “logical” subject of the existential clause as compared to a neutral-clause in all languages. Freeze (1992:555) argues cross-linguistically that the normal form of the existential has a locative argument in subject position. This is partly true for Mualang. The location element in Mualang is optional; however, if it surfaces syntactically, it is typically before *adaya* NP, as can be seen in (6-44 and 6-46) above.

The existential-presentative can be complex, in which case *adaya* takes a complement clause (see section 10.3 of Chapter 10), e.g.:

(6-47) *Peda' kah, m'ih, adaya urang datay!*
 look *kah* 2s.masc exist person come
 ‘Take a look please, you, there is someone coming!’

(6-48) *D=alam kampung adaya jelu tangan ba-kumpul.*
 LOC=inside village exist animal PROG ANPAS-collect
 ‘In the village there were animals gathering.’

(6-49) *Ia N-peda' adaya tajaw anyut, sangkut da*
 3s ACT-look exist k.o.jar be.swept.away stuck LOC

sabar bubu ia.
 fence.for.fishtrap k.o.fish.trap 3s

‘He saw there was a jar swept away (by the river), (that) got stuck at the fence leading to his fish trap.’

(6-50) *Melia' tih naday kala' adaya urang ba-jadi mali.*
 old.time *tih* NEG ever exist person ANPAS-become taboo
 ‘In the past there were never people engaging in a taboo marriage.’

We turn now to the second type of construction, “the non-existential-presentative”, namely NP *adaya* (NP). Consider again the examples (6-43 – 6-46); all the NPs following *adaya* are in brackets. *Siku'* in (6-43) has to be interpreted as an “indefinite marker”, not a number (see section 4.1.2.2.1; also section 9.1). In (6-44 – 6-46) the NPs appear in bare forms without any marker for (in)definiteness. Without contexts, they may have either interpretation, as indefinite or definite. However, in all these examples they have to be interpreted as indefinite because of their contexts (they have not been mentioned previously) and their structure (i.e. the existential-

presentative). Bare NPs may also have a definite interpretation if they are identifiable in discourse, e.g. in previous clauses. Thus compare the sequence in (6-51a and b):

- (6-51) a. *Diaw, nang ba-gu', aday antu!*
 quiet don't ANPAS-sound exist ghost
 'Be quiet, don't make any noise, there is a ghost!'
- b. *"Ha, ha!" [Antu] udah aday da baruh*
 laughing ghost PERF exist LOC bottom.part
- kayu da jalay Apay Aluy diaw.*
 A still tree LOC place father
- '"Ha, ha." The ghost was already under the tree where Aluy's father was standing still.'

(6-51b) has the structure NP *aday*, which is not presentative functionally. The NP argument is clearly the syntactic subject. The presence of the prepositional adjunct *da baruh kayu* 'under the tree' makes the construction NP *aday* LOC be read as a predicate locative, as seen in the English rendering. However, a "pure" predicate locative is verbless, as described in section 6.2 above. There is a subtle difference between the constructions of NP PP and NP *aday* PP: in the first construction, the location is the focus (although it implies the existence of the NP entity), whereas in the latter it is the existence of the NP entity in a particular place that is emphasized. If no location is mentioned, the notion 'to be there/present/in' is prominent:

- (6-52) *Wan aday bah?*
 2s.hon exist bah
 'You were really present?'
- (6-53) *Waktu sida' aday aba' apay-inay, naday*
 when 3p exist with father-mother NEG
- N-pakay umpan*
 ACT-eat cooked.rice
 'When they were with their father and mother, they did not eat rice'
- (6-54) *Ku aday, da-any'ung apay-inay ka pala' darung.*
 1s exist PASS-escort father-mother to head valley
 '(When) I was born, I was taken by my father and mother to the upper part of the valley.'
- (6-55) *Aday sida'?*
 exist 3p
 'Are they there (present in the house)?'

In (6-54) *aday* has an inchoative meaning ‘to be born, begin to exist’. In (6-55), *aday* is fronted for focus.

Existential clauses are negated with the existential negator *nisi* ‘(there is/was) nothing’, glossed as EXIST.NEG, and *naday* ‘not exist’.⁴ Usage and differences of the various negators are discussed specifically in Chapter 9. The following clauses serve as illustrations:

- (6-56) *Nisi’ ari alam gua.*
EXIST.NEG from inside cave
‘Nothing came out of the cave.’
- (6-57) *Baru’ tay layin nisi’ agi’.*
then REL other EXIST.NEG again
‘Then, there was nothing else.’
- (6-58) *Cuba nti’ naday kita’ wih.*
try if not.exist 2p wih
‘Imagine what it would be like if you weren’t here.’

A quantifying phrase can follow the construction NP *aday* to quantify the subject NP. It seems that *aday* displays a more copula-like function in such contexts:⁵

- (6-59) *Sida’ Buwi Nasi aday tujuh iku’ menyadi’.*
3p B N exist seven CLASS sibling
‘The *Buwi Nasis* consist of seven siblings’
- (6-60) *Sida’ ti ba-rumah kediri’ aday dua keluarga.*
3p REL ANPAS-house alone exist two family
‘Those/the ones who stayed by themselves in a separate house were two families.’
- (6-61) *Miak aday mayuh dia’.*
child exist many there.(near)
‘There were many children there.’

Finally, it should be mentioned here that the existential-presentative has developed also some sort of focus device. This pragmatic effect is discussed together with other pragmatic devices in Chapter 9. The verb *aday* is also used to express the notion of possession, as explained in the following section.

⁴ *Naday* also functions as the clausal negator ‘no, not’ (see section 9.5). There seems to be no difference in meaning between *naday* and *nisi* as existential negators.

⁵ However, a more typical function like the Indonesian linker *ialah/adalah* is absent in Mualang.

6.4 Possessive clauses

There are two types of possession predication in Mualang. The first one is marked by the use of the “absolute” possessive markers *mpu* and *nu*: both may be translated as ‘possession’ and are used in a predicate nominal construction: NP [*MPU/NU* NP] where the second NP refers to the possessor. The difference between their usages is subtle and requires more examination. One significant difference noticed is that *mpu* refers to an active possession or ownership over something, and can act as a verb meaning ‘to possess, to own’, as in (6-65); whereas *nu* on the other hand simply indicates that ‘something belongs to the possessor’, therefore it seems that it cannot be used with an “inalienable” entity like *anak* ‘child’ as in (6-63), while it can with *mpu* as in (6-62). The possessive NP may be fronted for focus purposes (8-64).

- (6-62) *Uma/anak tu' mpu ku.*
 rice.field/child this POSS 1s
 ‘This rice field/child is mine (or: is my own).’
- (6-63) *Uma/*anak tu' nu' ku.*
 rice.field/child this POSS 1s
 ‘This rice field is mine (or: belongs to me).’
- (6-64) *Nama ia', mpu ku tanah ia'.*
 name that POSS 1s land that
 ‘That means, that land is mine.’ (Lit. ‘my possession is that land’)
- (6-65) *Sapa mpu tajaw nya'?*
 who own k.o.jar that
 ‘Who owns the jar?’

The second type of possessive clause is marked by the use of the non-existential-presentative *aday*. The structure of the *aday*-possessive clause is NP₁ *aday* NP₂, in which NP₁ is the syntactic subject indicating the “possessor”, whereas the NP₂ refers to the “possessed entity”. This neutral word order is exemplified in (6-66a). For the purpose of focus, the predicate (6-66b) and the possessed element (6-66c) may be fronted. Note that in (6-66c) *babi* ‘pig’ and *manuk* ‘chicken’ are pronounced intonationally separate from *kita* ‘1p.incl’; if they are uttered under a single phrasal intonational contour, then they mean ‘our pig/chicken’, which results in a completely different construction.

- (6-66) a. *Sida' aday akal.*
 3p exist trick
 ‘They had a trick/an idea.’
- b. *Aday akal sida'.*
 exist trick 3p
 ‘A **trick**/an **idea** they had.’

c. *Nema babi kita udah aday, manuk kita*
 because pig 1p.incl PERF exist chicken 1p.incl

udah aday, lengkap dih rumpah kita tu'.
 PERF exist complete dih side.dish 1p.incl this

'Because we already have pigs and we already have chickens, our side dishes are now complete.'

The NP₂ is normally indefinite, regardless of animacy, cf. *akal* 'trick' in (6-66a) and *anak* 'child' in (6-67a). It may be definite in some cases, as in (6-67b) where it is modified by the demonstrative *tu* 'this'. However such a clause is most likely to occur in the presence of the possessed entity at the time of speaking.

(6-67) a. *Ku tu' aday anak.*
 1s this exist child
 '(As for me) I have a child (children).'

b. *Ku tu' aday anak tu'.*
 1s this exist child this
 '(As for me) I have this child (with me).'

The demonstratives may also appear in a construction like (6-67b) but the intended meaning is "like this/that", e.g.:

(6-68) *Ku aday isaw tu' da rumah.*
 1s exist machete this LOC house
 'I have this kind of machete at home.'

The NP₁ or the subject may be both human (6-66 and 6-67) above and non-human (6-69 – 6-71) below:

(6-69) *Rumah seniku' aday gang'ang.*
 house 2d exist balcony
 'The house of the two of them has a balcony.'

(6-70) *Dulaw tih Dampak aday rumah panyay.*
 previous.time tih D exist house long
 'Previously the village of Dampak had a (traditional) longhouse.'

(6-71) *Nyelipan nya' aday bisa.*
 centipede that aday poison
 'The centipede had poison.'

As seen in their English translation, the NP subjects in (6-67 – 6-71) can be interpreted as the possessor. However, such an interpretation is likely if the subject is animate, but seems to be less clear if the subject is inanimate. In the following examples the subjects (*rumah kami* 'our house' in (6-72), *tajaw nya* 'that jar' in (6-

73), and *rumah* ‘house’ in (6-74) look more like a location than a possessor (cf. (6-69 – 6-71):

- (6-72) *Kemari’ rumah kami aday urang ti N-curi.*
 yesterday house 2p.excl exist person REL ACT-steal
 a. ‘(?)Yesterday our house had a thief.’
 b. ‘Yesterday our house had a thief in it.’ (or: ‘Yesterday there was a thief in our house.’)
- (6-73) *Tajaw nya’ aday nsia d=alam nya’.*
 k.o.jar that exist human.being LOC=inside that
 ‘The jar had a person in it.’
- (6-74) *Da kampung sida’ urang pecaya’ nti’ naday N-jua’*
 LOC village 3p person believe if NEG ACT-give

ulih diri’ ka kawan ti semak, [rumah aday sial].
 gain self to friend REL close house exist unluck
 ‘In their village people believe that if somebody does not share his own (hunting) gains with his neighbors, his house has bad luck.’

Freeze (1992:582-583) observes that in English the nature of the possessive relation in a ‘have’ predication is constrained by the [human] value of the subject: if the subject is [+human], the “theme” (his term for the NP₂) can be both inalienably and alienably possessed. But, if the subject is [-human], then the “theme” has to be inalienably possessed (e.g. *the tree has branches*), or a ‘characteristically associated’ noun (e.g. *the flour has weevils (in it)*), otherwise there has to be an *in situ* locational phrase anaphoric to the [-human] subject (e.g. *the flour has a ring in it*, cf. **the flour has a ring*). This kind of possessive relation between the NP₁ and NP₂ seems to be also possible in Mualang *aday*-possessive constructions. However, in Mualang an anaphoric locational phrase as in English is optional: in (6-73) *d=alam nya’* may be left out without essentially changing the meaning of the clause. Actually, according to Freeze, it is a cross-linguistical fact that the NP₁ or the subject of the ‘have’ predication is locative (Freeze 1992). In Mualang, the locative nature of the subject as in (6-72) through (6-74) supports this view, and it is most likely that it is the inalienability of the NP₂ vis-à-vis the NP₁ subject (being characteristically associated with it) that enables the possessive reading in cases such as (6-67) and (6-69). If the NP₁ is location, then the NP₂ is the existing element whose location is specified in the NP₁. The *aday*-possessive clause thus basically shares a syntactic similarity with the *aday*-existential-presentative construction. This is not surprising as the interrelationship between locative, existential and possessive predications is well known cross-linguistically. Freeze (1992:586) argues that in many languages the structures of existential and possessive (‘have’) predication are identical, and only partially distinguished in some languages by the presence or absence of the preposition. Mualang seems to belong to the latter type. As seen in various examples of the existential constructions in 6.3, the location, if it surfaces, is expressed through a prepositional phrase, whereas in the possessive construction the

location appears in the syntactic subject position without a preposition. Some linguists (e.g. Freeze 1992) have argued that in the possessive construction the location argument is the result of “location raising”, that is, a locational adjunct becomes a syntactic locative subject. Thus compare the locational adjunct *da suti’ kampung* ‘in one village’ in (6-75a) with the locative subject *suti’ kampung* ‘one village’ in (b):

- (6-75) a. ...*da s-uti’ kampung aday tiga puluh*
 LOC ONE-CLASS village exist three unit.of.ten
 buah pintu.
 CLASS door
 ‘... in one (i.e. in each) village there were 30 families.’
- b. ...*s-uti’ kampung aday tiga puluh buah*
 ONE-CLASS village exist three unit.of.ten CLASS
 pintu.
 door
 ‘... one (i.e. each) village had 30 families.’

Also consider the locational prepositional phrase in (6-76a), the “location raising” in (b), and the “possessor (of the location) raising” in (c):

- (6-76) a. *Aday cula [da kaki Belang Patung].*
 exist horn LOC foot B P
 ‘There was a horn on Belang Patung’s foot’
- b. *[Kaki Belang Patung] aday cula.*
 foot B P exist horn
 ‘The foot of Belang Patung had a horn (on it)’
- c. *[Belang Patung] aday cula da kaki*
 B P exist horn LOC foot
 ‘Belang Patung had a horn on (his) foot’

Payne (1997:127) suggests the involvement of topicalization (highly correlated with definiteness and animacy) as a main functional difference between the elements in the existential, locational and possessive clauses. My preliminary study of some texts reveals that the *aday*-possessive construction is often used when the existence of the NP₂ is introduced, but it is the location or the possessor of the NP₂ that is topicalized (being the subject of the clause), exhibiting “topic continuity” (i.e. the location or possessor continues to be the topic of discussion). Consider the following examples. (6-77) is taken from a narrative story. In the previous paragraphs the story depicted how King Sua found Puyang Gana and took care of him. Then, he was said to have a daughter, who was introduced “all of a sudden”.

A similar introduction of the “possessed” element can be seen in (6-78) and (6-79) as well.

- (6-77) *Jadi Raja Sua tih aday anak in'u', nama Dara Reja'.*
 So King S tih exist child female name D R
- Aa pia'. "Aw'!" jaku' ia, "Tu'=m, n'u',*
 ah like.that. well say 3s this=m TOA
- ngaw laki di'."*
 for husband 2s.fem
 'So, King Sua, you know, had a daughter named Dara Reja'. Ah, that's so. "Well!" he said, "This (=Puyang Gana), my daughter, is to be your husband."
- (6-78) *Ha, pia'. Ku aday kisah ti lucu.*
 ha like.that 1s exist story REL funny
 'Ha, this is it. I have a funny story.'
- (6-79) *Putung Kempat tu' aday peN-sakit tay da-sebut*
 P K this exist NOM-sick REL PASS-mention
- urang peN-sakit bangkang.*
 person NOM-sick bruise/ulcer
 'As for Putung Kempat, she had a disease that people called *bangkang* (bruises and ulcers).'

The introductory function of *aday* is typical of the existential-presentative clause. It makes sense, then, that there is a structural similarity between the existentials and the *aday*-possessive construction. Note also that this is why in the latter, the NP₂ (or the "possessed" element) is normally indefinite, as is the case with the existential constructions. Another grammatical similarity between the two clauses is that both are negated by the existential negator *nisi'* or *naday* (see the examples for the existential-presentative in 6.3):

- (6-80) *Nyaw malam sida' nisi' guris.*
 already night 3p EXIST.NEG matches
 'It was already night and they had no matches.'
- (6-81) *Nyaw ke-lama' babi ia' sem'uh jara', ulih*
 already NOM-long pig that recovered jara' but
- nisi' jungur agi', aba' pen'ing kanan ia*
 EXIST.NEG snout again and ear right(side) 3s
- nisi' agi'.*
 EXIST.NEG again
 'After a long time the pig had recovered, but he had no snout anymore and his right ear was not there anymore.'

- (6-82) *Urang tuay kelia' naday alat-alat, naday senapang.*
 person old old.time not.exist tool-RED not.exist rifle
 'The old people of the past had no tools, no rifles.'

A note needs to be added on the quantifier *mayuh* 'many, much' and *sikit* 'a little, a few'. These quantifiers appear with or without *aday* in the existential and possessive clauses. It is probable that these indefinite quantifiers inherently contain the sense of existence. However, the use of *aday* seems to more explicitly emphasize the existence of an entity. The following are two examples (cf. also example (6-4) above):

- (6-83) *Urang tuay kelia' (aday) mayuh/sikit kata-kata mali.*
 person old old.time (exist) many/a.little word-RED taboo
 'The old people of the past had many/few taboo words.'

- (6-84) *Nya' mah N-suruh da daerah Sepawuk nya' (aday)*
 that mah ACT-cause LOC region S that exist

mayuh mas pitu'.

many gold like.this

'That is why in that Sepauk region there is a lot of gold now.'