

Aspect and modality in Indonesian

The case of *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah*, and *sempat*

PHILIPPE GRANGÉ

ABSTRACT

In this paper, I describe four Indonesian aspect markers, *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah*, and *sempat*, showing that the main opposition between them relies not only on their aspectual meanings, but also on the various modalities they express. The opposition between the very frequent markers *sudah* and *telah* is analysed in detail. The syntactic and semantic survey shows that these two markers are not synonyms in most contexts.

KEYWORDS

Indonesian, bahasa Indonesia, marker, aspect, modality, *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah*, and *sempat*.

The pre-verbal aspect markers in Indonesian form a complex system, where a modal meaning often appears entangled with aspect. In this paper¹, I intend to deal with four markers, *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah*, and *sempat*, that are often described as perfective aspect markers. It seems surprising that the Indonesian language has four different grammatical morphemes available to express one aspect; our hypothesis is that there are more than nuances between the aspect meanings of these markers, and that they are loaded with various modality meanings too. I will examine in detail *sudah* and *telah*, two very frequent markers of the perfect, and I will argue against a common view that these two markers are synonyms.

¹ I am grateful to Hein Steinhauer, Jean Chuquet, and Sue Ryan for their remarks and advice.

PHILIPPE GRANGÉ, born in 1962, got his first position as a teacher in Bandung in the 1980s. He is currently an associate professor of linguistics at the University of La Rochelle (France), where he founded and directed the University Centre for French as a Foreign Language, from 1997 to 2008. Now, he teaches general linguistics and Indonesian at the Department of Applied Foreign Languages. He has been active since long in academic and research cooperation between the University of La Rochelle and several universities in Asia-Pacific, particularly in Indonesia. He is currently the director of the Academic Institute for Asia-Pacific at the University of La Rochelle. His research in linguistics concentrates on semantics and syntax in the Indonesian language (especially time and aspect), and since a few years on the Lamaholot language (Eastern Flores). Philippe Grangé may be contacted at: pgrange@univ-lr.fr.

Firstly, after a review of basic definitions of aspect and modality, I will survey the syntactic and semantic oppositions between *sudah* and *telah*. Secondly, I will deal especially with *sudah*, the most frequent aspect/modality marker, the most complex too. Then I will compare it to *telah*. The last section deals with *pernah* and *sempat*, whose differences lay in their modal meanings as well.

1 A SHORT DEFINITION OF ASPECT AND MODALITY

First of all, aspect markers are not to be confused with the adjuncts of time (in Sneddon's terminology, Sneddon 1996). Adjuncts of time encompass dates and deictic adverbs like *kemarin* 'yesterday', and their role is to locate the events that we speak about in more or less precise points and spans on the time axis.

Aspect is a point of view on the process itself, independently from of any reference to past, present or future. According to Comrie (1976: 5), "Aspect is not concerned with relating the time of the situation to any other time-point, but rather with the internal temporal constituency of the one situation". Every linguistic representation of an event implies the representation of the time necessary for this event to take place, even if it is not actualized (it may remain virtual). Human language, although approximate in the measuring of time, has a wealth of possibilities to describe whether an event will last or be punctual (a 'once-off'), if it has reached its completion at the moment of reference, if the boundaries of this event need to be considered, and many more refinements: does it happen several times, is the moment of reference closer to the beginning or to the end of this event, etc. I will mostly rely on the still classical definitions of various verbal aspects, proposed by Comrie (1976).

Indonesian has a rich and complex system of pre-verbal markers, expressing aspect and/or modality. The markers *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah*, and *sempat* that I will discuss are non-deictic: their meaning is independent from the location of an event in time, although they may express the time incidentally, only by default (in other words, when no explicit or contextual indication of time is available). For instance, the perfective aspect marker *pernah* indicates by default that an event is located in the past. However, if associated with *akan* ('future'), the marker *pernah* is compatible with a virtual, uncompleted process.

An aspect marker does not necessarily produce the same meaning with every verb it marks². The marker *sudah* is particularly complex, as it interacts differently with the verbs, according to their respective type of process (embedded information about their "internal temporal constituency"). I will refer to Vendler's (1967) widely known classification of verbs although it is too rigid: for a given verb, the type of process may differ dramatically in various contexts. Vendler's four "time schemata" (verb classes) are "States", "Activities", "Accomplishments" and "Achievements". Verkuyl (1993: 35)

² Including the stative verbs traditionally called *adjektiva* by Indonesian grammarians.

has refined Vendler's verb classes by applying formal criteria. The distinctive criterion " \pm Progressive compatible"³ tests compatibility with the progressive aspect, for instance in English the *be V-ing* pattern. The criterion " \pm Definite" tests compatibility with a non-homogeneous bounded time interval. Finally, Vendler's classes may be represented as in Table 1 (adapted from Verkuyl 1993: 35).

	- Progressive compatible	+ Progressive compatible
- Definite	State	Activity
+ Definite	Achievement	Accomplishment

Table 1

There is no consensus among linguists about the distinction between Vendler's "Achievements" and "Accomplishments" classes; however, this issue is not relevant for our discussion.⁴ It is not easy to pick isolated verbs to illustrate Vendler's classes, because the type of process finally conveyed by a verb is highly context-dependent. Verbs that usually fit into the "State" verb class include *merah* 'be red', *kaya* 'be rich', *tahu* 'know', *ingin* 'desire', *mempunyai* 'possess'. Verbs whose type of process corresponds to "Activities" include for instance *melihat* 'look at', *lari* 'run', *mendorong* 'push'. Examples of "Achievements" are *memetik* 'pick off', *meninggal* 'die', *mendapatkan* 'find, obtain'. "Accomplishments" comprise, for example, *melahirkan* 'give birth', *membujuk* 'persuade', *memperbaiki* 'repair'.

The Indonesian speakers do not use *sudah* and *telah* indiscriminately; in many cases, the aspectual features of these markers seem insufficient to explain why they are not synonyms. The nuances between these markers may reveal the attitude of the speaker towards his/her utterance, in other words modality. "Modality is the grammaticization of speakers' (subjective) attitudes and opinions", wrote Bybee et al. (1994: 176). For most of the Indonesian pre-verbal markers, modal and aspectual meanings are entangled.

Our semantic terminology will limit itself to the metaterm *notion*. The meaning (*signifié*) of a lexical morpheme can be represented as an area bounded by a frontier. This conceptual area is called a notion, and the language can refer to I (interior of the notion), F (frontier) or E (exterior), see Culioli (1999). The state notions bonded to another notion will be called property. For instance, for the stative verb *kaya* 'be rich', I = property /being rich/; E = /not being rich/; while F can be referred to through various devices, like the adverbs *hampir* 'almost', *agak* 'nearly'. In this paper, certain aspectual and modal meanings

³ Verkuyl (1993) names this criterion " \pm Process". For the sake of terminological consistency with our use of the metaterm *process*, we prefer to label this criterion " \pm Progressive-compatible".

⁴ We agree with Verkuyl (1993: 42) who divides "Process" into "States" and "Actions"; then divides "Actions" into "Activities" and "Events"; and finally divides "Events" into "Accomplishments" and "Achievements".

will be analysed in terms of shifting between I and E.

2 SUDAH, TELAH: DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES

Indonesian has around fourteen markers⁵ that express *aspect*.⁶ These markers enable interpretation of the aspectual status of the event: its boundaries, completion, duration, repetition, etcetera. In addition, they may also express *modality*, a feature that I will discuss in sections 3.2 and 4. We should keep in mind that in Indonesian, an aspect may well be expressed without an aspect marker, like in example (1), as opposed to (2) and (3).

(1) *Tahun lalu, tanah ini dijual.*⁷

year pass land DET uv-sell

'Last year, this land was sold.'

(2) *Tahun lalu, tanah ini telah dijual.*

year pass land DET telah uv-sell

'Last year, this land has been sold.'

(3) *Tahun lalu, tanah ini sudah dijual.*

year pass land DET sudah uv-sell

'Last year, this land was sold already.' (Or) 'Last year, this land had already been sold.'

In this section, I will argue that, although the highly frequent markers *sudah* and *telah* seem to be close in meaning, they differ syntactically and semantically.

2.1 ARE SUDAH AND TELAH SYNONYMS?

There is a propensity to describe the aspect markers *telah* and *sudah* as synonyms, whose choice by the speaker would depend on the speech level or even on idiolectal uses.⁸ This claim appears categorically in Mac Coy (1986: 101): "Because *telah* is the synonym of *sudah*, both of them can be used interchangeably". This explanation does not hold, as will be shown below. Kaswanti Purwo (1984: 228) regrets that "Traditional grammarians such as Fokker (1951), Mees (1950), Alisjabanah (1954), dealing with the time markers in Indonesian, did not mention the differences between the words

⁵ A tentative list of aspect (and modal) markers in Indonesian includes *sedang, tengah, lagi; semakin; terus, masih, tetap; sudah, telah; pernah, sempat; belum, akan, bakal* (see Grangé 2006).

⁶ We will not concern ourselves here with affixes such as *ter-*, *ber-*, *meN-* *-nya*, that play a role in the expression of aspect.

⁷ Gloss: DET: determiner; IMPER: imperative; NEG: negative; INTERR: interrogative; EMPH: emphatic; SG: singular; PL: plural; AV: actor voice; UV: undergoer voice; RED: reduplication; REL: relative.

⁸ See Macdonald and Dardjowidjojo (1967: 162).

telah and *sudah*". Alwi (1992: 159) insists that "a specific survey about *sudah* and *telah* is still to be done, aimed at a more certain and comprehensive overview, outlining all the semantic, syntactic (and maybe pragmatic) issues".⁹ Other linguists noticed some fundamental differences between *sudah* and *telah*, for example Alieva (1991; 2001), Kaswanti Purwo (1984), Abbot (1995), and Tadjuddin (1993; 2005), although their approaches and findings differ.

There is no need to be a linguist to observe that *sudah* and *telah* are not so often interchangeable, a piece of evidence that goes against synonymy. Moreover, why should a language possess two different grammatical morphemes, appearing so frequently in speech, if they have the same meaning? Traditional descriptions propose an unsatisfactory account of the nuance between *sudah* and *telah*. I will briefly review some of these descriptions.

Speech levels?

A very common opinion is that the use of *telah* or *sudah* is linked to the speech level. Macdonald and Dardjowidjojo (1967: 162) wrote: "the premodifier *telah* also indicates completeness, and is parallel in meaning to *sudah*, from which it differs chiefly by being more formal. It is therefore more commonly found in written and formal spoken material; some authors prefer *telah*, others *sudah*, others use both in the same text, seemingly interchangeably". Sneddon (1996: 198) asserts that "The difference between the two is in register; *telah* is almost entirely confined to writing and very formal speech, while *sudah* occurs in all registers from informal speech to the most formal styles".

In my corpus¹⁰ from the Indonesian press (belonging to the formal speech level), I found 99 occurrences of *telah* and 154 occurrences of *sudah*. One could have expected the opposite. Unfortunately I could not compare this with any oral or informal corpus, where *sudah* could be even more frequent. Anyhow, the source of this opposition between the two markers is not primarily a matter of speech level. Sneddon's remark may be true, but the fact that *telah* is confined to written/formal speech seems to be a consequence of its aspectual and modal features, which are likely to occur in written materials. On the other hand, *sudah* frequently appears when speaking of everyday life and involving the persons present, therefore often within an informal speech level, once again because of its aspectual (and modal) features.

Long gone versus recent?

Abbot (1995: 67-68) writes that:

In the '*sudah*' marked sentences, the time frame is shorter, sometimes a matter of years,

⁹ "Telaah khusus mengenai *sudah* dan *telah* ini masih perlu dilakukan untuk memperoleh gambaran yang lebih pasti sehingga semua kendala semantis dan sintaksis (serta mungkin pragmatis) sehubungan dengan pemakaian kedua kata ini dapat dikemukakan secara tuntas" (Alwi 1992: 159).

¹⁰ Corpus of 50,760 words extracted from the Indonesian online medias *Kompas*, *Pikiran Rakyat*, *Jawa Pos*, *Bisnis*, *Gatra*, and *Intisari* between 6 and 11 December 2001.

but more commonly a matter of hours or minutes. In *'telah'* marked sentences, the time frame is nearly eternal. Although it is conceivable that these could be subjective (e.g. although the story time advances only ten minutes, these ten minutes seem like an eternity), a very consistent pattern emerges. *'Sudah'* is always used with relatively shorter periods of time, and *'telah'* is always used with much longer periods of time.

This assertion goes against evidence of the data. A geologist may well use *sudah* when recounting the rising of a mountain millions of years ago. A spokesman will use *telah* when informing the public of a death that just occurred. Again, the illusory opposition between *telah* 'long gone' and *sudah* 'recent' originates from their respective frequency in various types of discourse. When reporting topics that concern the speaker himself, mostly involving events that happened recently, *sudah* is more likely to occur. Still, this is a probability, not a rule.

It would take too long to examine other proposed analyses of *telah* versus *sudah* here: "marks durative verbs/marks non-durative verbs" or "foregrounded event/backgrounded event". Although one could find a general trend, once again linked to the type of discourse, so many counter-examples may arise that no general rule will emerge from this kind of alignment, see Grangé (2006: 193-197).

According to Gonda (1973: 565), the morpheme *sudah* "originates in Sanskrit *śuddha-* [...] 'cleared, pure etc.' in the sense of 'acquitted, complete'". In Malay/Indonesian, the meaning of *sudah* still echoes the original sense of 'complete, done', yet it is more complex and polyvalent. However, the opposition between *sudah* and *telah* is not only of a semantic nature. A quick look at the syntax may provide a preliminary account of their differences.

2.2 SYNTACTIC OVERVIEW OF *SUDAH* VERSUS *TELAH*

Recalling its predicative origin, *sudah* (unlike *telah*) can be completed by a few adverbs such as *saja* 'only, just' and can be used predicatively, in dialogues 4, relative phrases 5, interrogative 6 or emphatic sentences 7. *Sudah* can also undergo extraction/fronting movement 8, and extraction/backing movement 9:

- (4) *Jangan lupa membayar rekening listrik! – Sudah./*Telah.*
 IMPER-NEG forget pay invoice electricity – *sudah/*telah*
 'Don't forget to pay the electricity bill! – Done.'
- (5) *Apakah kali ini juga akan sama seperti tahun-tahun yang sudah?/*telah?*
 INTERR time DET too will same like year-RED REL *sudah/*telah*
 'Will it be like the previous years again this time?'

- (6) *Sudahkah/*Telahkah keluarga Anda terproteksi secara finansial?*
sudah INTERR/**telah* INTERR family 2PL protected manner financial
 'Is your family already financially protected?'
- (7) *Ah, sudahlah/*telahlah, kok jadi cengeng gini !*
Ah sudah EMPH/**telah* EMPH why become be whining alike
 'Ah, stop it, why are you moaning like this?'
- (8) *Sudah/*telah sepuluh tahun kami menikah.*
*Sudah/*telah* ten years 1PL marry
 'We have already been married for ten years.'
- (9) *Perjalanan yang melelahkan itu berakhir sudah /*telah.*¹¹
Journey REL tiring DÉT finish *sudah/*telah*
 'This exhausting journey is finally over.'

It may be quite a recent evolution of Indonesian that allows the use of *telah* followed by a clause indicating a time span, for instance:

- (10) *Ia telah sepuluh tahun bekerja sebagai penjual mobil.*
 3SG *telah* ten year work as salesman car
 'He has been working as a car salesman for ten years.'

I could not find any example of this structure earlier than the mid-nineteenth century in the corpus of the *Malay Concordance Project* by Proudfoot (2002). However, this use of *telah* remains barred when the sentence is negative:

- (11) *Ia sudah/*telah sepuluh tahun tidak bekerja.*
 3SG *sudah/*telah* ten years NEG work
 'He has not worked for ten years.'

Another striking recent evolution of Indonesian is the possibility for *telah* to mark stative verbs (*adjektiva* in the traditional terminology). Although Tadjuddin (1993: 184) expresses "the feeling that *telah* is seemingly taboo with *adjektiva*,"¹² one can find many examples of *telah* + stative verb, like *telah kaya* 'already rich'. Kaswanti Purwo (1984: 233) noticed three occurrences only of this pattern: *telah sepi* 'became quiet', *telah ramai* 'became noisy/crowded', and *telah lama* 'for a long time'.¹³ Nevertheless, many more examples can be gathered of stative

¹¹ This example is quoted formal Alwi (1992: 158).

¹² "kesan bahwa *telah* seolah-olah tabu bergabung dengan *adjektiva*", Tadjuddin (1993: 184).

¹³ We do not believe that *lama* 'time, lengthy' should be labelled as a stative verb here,

verbs marked by *telah*, and there are in fact few exceptions. From the list of 519 *ajektiva* (stative verbs) from Kridalaksana (1986: 57-60), I found only 25 that conflict with *telah*¹⁴ because they express permanent states, for example, *ajaib* 'be magical', non-reversible states for example *muda* 'be young', or states whose complementary antonym is not reversible, for example, *mentah* 'be raw', *asli* 'be original, authentic' (their antonyms, respectively *matang* 'cooked, ripe' and *palsu* 'fake', refer to non-reversible states).¹⁵

This syntactic constraint is obviously determined by semantic features, and may be described in more formal terms. When a stative verb is marked by *telah*, the speaker refers to the interior of the notion (I). The aspect marker *telah* indicates that something did not have this property (it was at E) then gained this property (and it is at I at the moment of reference). However, the possibility of a further shift from I to E is also a condition for using *telah*, hence the following rules:

- If a state is logically permanent, for instance *ajaib* 'magical', or non-reversible, as *manis* 'sweet', no shift from I to E ('not magical' or 'not sweet') is conceivable, thus the use of *telah* is barred.
- If a state is one-way reversible, as *mentah* 'raw', a shift from I to E 'not raw = cooked' is perfectly possible, but a further shift from E to I is logically inconceivable (from 'cooked' to 'raw'), which forbids the use of *telah*.
- If a state is two-ways reversible, that is to say if shifts from I to E and from E to I are logically possible, then this stative verb can be marked by *telah*.

To sum up, *telah* is not acceptable if a shift is logically impossible from E to I and/or from I to E. Unsurprisingly, the negative form blocks the use of *telah* with stative verbs referring to a non-reversible state: **telah tidak busuk* 'has become not rotten' is logically impossible, while one may say *telah tidak segar*

because *telah lama* is always followed by a verb, for example, *Dia telah lama bekerja* 'He has been working for a long time'. Thus we could not find the sentence **Dia telah lama* isolated. In *Dia telah lama bekerja* the morpheme *lama* is employed as an adverb.

¹⁴ Our survey through an Internet browser (2006) reveals that a few stative verbs from the list by Kridalaksana (1986: 57-60) are never marked by *telah* (but possibly by *sudah*): *mentah* 'raw', *curam* 'steep', *(ber)bahaya* 'dangerous', *mustahil* 'impossible', *aneh* 'bizarre', *asli* 'original, authentic', *unik* 'unique', *antik* 'antique', *istimewa* 'special', *kecil* 'small', *jelek* 'awful', *muda* 'young', *cemberut* 'grumpy, shirty', *genit* 'showy, flashy', *lucu* 'funny', *anggun* 'smart, stylish', *ganteng* 'virile', *manis* 'sweet', *cantik* 'cute, pretty' (but *telah cantik* 'pretty now, became pretty' can be said about a building), *sakti* 'holy', *agung* 'sacred, supreme', *ajaib* 'magic', *angker* 'haunted'. The string *telah susah* + verb can be found, but in this context *susah* 'with difficulties' must be considered as an adverb, not a stative verb. The same remark applies to *malas* 'lazy'. Contemporary Malay (*bahasa Malaysia*) seems more liberal in using *telah* + stative verbs, but we did not survey this particular dialect disparity.

¹⁵ None of the stative verbs incompatible with the aspect marker *telah* can be derived with *ketidak-* -*an* 'NEG- -ess' to form a noun. For instance, *telah puas* 'satisfied now' is acceptable, and we can form *ketidakpuasan* 'dissatisfaction'. On the other hand, **telah muda* 'young now, became young' is logically impossible (except in special contexts, like fairy tales or science-fiction), thus it is unlikely to form **ketidakmudaan* '*unyoungness'. This feature could be used as an asymmetric test: if we can form a noun with the pattern *ketidak-*(stative verb)-*an*, then this stative verb can be marked by the aspect marker *telah*. However, the reverse test does not apply.

'has become not fresh'.

Other states will be interpreted as one-way reversible in a less obvious manner. For instance, *telah tidak sehat* 'has become not healthy' versus **telah tidak sakit* 'has become not ill' leads to interpret that one can switch only from being 'not healthy' to 'not ill'. This rule has no logical grounds, having more to do with pragmatics. Such is the case with *telah tidak jujur* 'has become not loyal' versus **telah tidak licik* 'has become not tricky', where the cheating behaviour is supposedly sticking to someone's personality, therefore being 'not loyal' is assumed not reversible (or in more simple terms: 'being tricky' is everlasting).¹⁶

A number of stative verbs are not compatible with *telah* at the negative form only (beside the stative verbs never compatible with *telah*, see footnote 14). This category mostly includes verbs bearing a gradable meaning, such as *asyik* 'pleasant', *enak* 'delicious', *mahal* 'expensive', *murah* 'cheap', *tinggi* 'high', *besar* 'big', *kecil* 'small', that do not imply a binary choice between I and E.¹⁷

Unlike *sudah* which can mark virtually all verbs, *telah* is compatible with only a few intransitive dynamic verbs, for instance *telah hidup* 'has lived', denominal intransitive verbs prefixed by *ber-* as in *telah berkeluarga* 'has married' or even transitive verbs with a stative inherent aspect, for example *telah mempunyai* 'already owns, has acquired'. Besides, *telah* cannot mark a noun used as a stative verb:

- (12) *Anaknya sudah/*telah mahasiswa.*
 child-3SG *sudah/*telah* student
 'His/her child is already a student.'

Finally, we found many examples of coordinations between the markers *sudah* and *telah*. Obviously, the speakers do not consider this pattern as a redundancy. It leads us to believe that, at least in some contexts, these markers do not express the same aspect or modality.

- (13) *Berbagai persoalan yang sudah dan telah berlangsung di negeri ini.*
 some problem REL *sudah* and *telah* take place in country DET
 'Some problems that did and have taken place in this country.'

¹⁶ The stative verbs *jujur* 'loyal' and *licik* 'tricky' are compatible with *sudah* at the negative and affirmative forms, and with *telah* at the affirmative form. Another example is *telah tidak miskin* 'has become not poor' as opposed to **telah tidak kaya* 'has become not rich', while *telah miskin* 'has become poor' and *telah kaya* 'has become rich' are correct. There is no logical grounds to reject the idea that one would never switch from 'not rich', thus the rule applying here rests on pragmatics.

¹⁷ With various linguistic devices, such as the adverbs *agak* 'nearly' or *cukup* 'enough', the meaning may be neither I or E, but F (the frontier of the notion), see Culioli (1999).

(14) *Apa yang telah dan sudah dia lalui dalam usia ini?*

INTERR REL *telah* and *sudah* 3SG pass into age DET

'Given his age, what trials has he been through?'

The syntactic constraints distinguishing *sudah* from *telah* are significant, although they sometimes overlap. *Sudah* can always replace *telah* and produce well formed sentences, but the opposite is not true. Given these syntactic constraints,¹⁸ it is doubtful that *sudah* and *telah* are perfect synonyms. There may be a recent trend in Indonesian consisting in the use of *telah* in structures analogous to those where *sudah* is commonly found, especially with stative verbs. However, the incompatibility of *telah* with some stative verbs in the negative form, or with semantically non-reversible stative verbs, remains strong. I will now examine in more detail these markers with regard to their aspectual and modal meaning.

3 SUDAH: A WEALTH OF MEANINGS

Sudah is the most frequent aspect and modality marker in Indonesian. Like many frequent and familiar grammatical morphemes, its semantic substance is complex, and deserves a description in two parts: firstly, the aspect, secondly, the modality. This approach is somewhat artificial, because aspect and modality meaning are in fact combined in *sudah*.

3.1 ASPECTUAL VALUE OF SUDAH

As opposed to *telah*, the marker *sudah* emphasises the resulting state (the consequences of the process) rather than the event itself. *Sudah* indicates a process of change or an event, followed by a resulting state, whether the subject is animate or not. Such process of change may be either explicit:

(15) *Iwan sudah membeli mobil.*

Iwan *sudah* buy car

'Iwan has bought a car.'

or implicit:

(16) *Anaknya sudah mahasiswa/kaya.*

child-3SG *sudah* student/be rich

'His/her child is already a student/is already rich.'

In example (15), the resulting state is implicit: Iwan is supposed to still own

¹⁸ Not to mention lexical morphology: from *sudah*, we form *menyudahkan* 'terminate (trans.)', *menyudahi* 'eradicate, get rid of', *kesudahan* 'end', *berkesudahan dengan* 'to be done with', *sesudah* 'afterwards', and some other less used words. Besides, from *telah* we can only derive *setelah* 'afterwards, later on'.

his car at the moment of reference. In (16), the state is explicit: his/her child is a student or is rich already, while the process of change remains implicit: the speaker does not explain how this child enrolled as a student or became rich. Therefore this state cannot be labelled as a resulting state.

Anyhow, in (16), *sudah* means that a shift has happened from E 'be not rich' to I 'be rich', but excludes any further shift from I to E. So I is asserted as true at the moment of reference.¹⁹ In other terms, *sudah* specifies that the property gained (the resulting state) remains valid at the moment of reference (whether it coincides or not with the moment of speech). For this reason, the following example is not acceptable.

- (17) **Saya sudah kaya dan sekarang saya miskin.*
 1SG *sudah* be rich and now 1SG be poor
 *'I am already rich and now I am poor.'

In (17), the two properties 'being poor' (resulting state) and 'being rich' (current state) are logically incompatible, since the property 'be rich', I and E cannot be true at the same time. This sentence could regain acceptability by adding that 'at a certain period I was already rich, then I fell poor'. Specifying distinct moments of reference for the processes *sudah kaya* and *miskin* would make this statement logically consistent.

'*Sudah*' seen through Vendler's time schemata

The marker *sudah* interacts distinctly with the predicates, according to their inherent aspect. We will examine the various interactions of *sudah* with verbs that fit into Vendler's time schemata, although this classification lacks 'context-sensitivity'.

When *sudah* marks a dynamic verb as in *Es sudah mencair* 'The ice has melted' ("Accomplishment" in Vendler's terminology) or *Balon sudah meletus* 'The balloon has popped' ("Achievement"), a perfect aspect is actually conferred to the verb. There is indeed a resulting state: at the moment of reference, we consider a puddle of water or a burst balloon. In this case, with respect to Comrie's distinction between Perfective and Perfect,²⁰ I will tentatively label this aspect indicated by *sudah* as the "Perfect of result".²¹

¹⁹ For this reason, *sudah* may mark a stative verb in the negative form. As opposed to *telah*, with *sudah*, if the property is E, it remains E at the moment of reference. E is asserted true and no further shift to an inconceivable 'exterior of E' is possible.

²⁰ According to Comrie (1976: 62) there is a "tendency to confuse perfect and perfective. The perfect links a present state to a past situation, whether this past situation was an individual event, or a state, or a process not yet completed [...]" while (p. 21) "perfectivity involves lack of explicit reference to the internal temporal constituency of a situation [...] subsumed as a single whole". Of course, in Indonesian there are no tenses, thus no perfect tenses equivalent to the English ones.

²¹ This label is inspired by Comrie (1976: 56-58) describing the 'Perfect of result': "a present state is referred to as being the result of some past situation." The last example of his section about the 'perfect of result' concerns the Mandarin Chinese particle *-le*, and could fit

For some verbs labelled “Activities” in Vendler’s terminology,²² the aspect marked by *sudah* is less clear-cut. Depending on the context, the aspect of *sudah + bekerja* “work” may be understood as stative (18), as perfect of result (19), or as ingressive (20):

(18) *Iwan sudah bekerja, dia guru.*

Iwan sudah work 3SG teacher

‘Iwan works already, he is a teacher.’

(19) *Iwan sudah bekerja, dia cepat-cepat pulang.*

Iwan sudah work 3SG quick-RED come back

‘Iwan has worked, he quickly comes back home.’

(20) *Iwan sudah bekerja, dia di depan komputernya.*

Iwan sudah work 3SG at front computer-3SG

‘Iwan has started to work, he is in front of his computer.’

Only when the predicate is truly an “activity” (– Definite, + Progressive compatible), as in example (20), will I label the aspect conferred by *sudah* as “Ingressive”.²³ It means that from E (for instance, ‘not working’) there has been a shift to I (‘working’), which is still valid at the moment of reference. Of course, the introduction of definiteness will exclude the ingressive aspect. For instance in *Iwan sudah bekerja selama tiga jam* ‘Iwan has worked for three hours’ or *Iwan sudah bekerja dan berhenti bekerja* ‘Iwan has worked and stopped working’, the aspect of the predicate *bekerja* ‘work’ is a perfect of result.

When *sudah* marks a stative verb (“States” in Vendler’s classes), the context can shape two very different aspectual meanings. Firstly, as in example 16, nothing is said about the implicit event that made someone rich or a student. Only the present situation (at the moment of reference) is exposed. The state

in with the description of *sudah* as well: “the verbal particle *-le* indicates perfective aspect and relative past time reference [...] With stative predicates, the force of this particle *-le* is often to indicate a state resulting from some previous situation, as in *dōngxi guì-le* ‘things are expensive’ (but with the implication that once they were not, that is, they have become expensive)”.

²² This is a serious weakness in Vendler’s time schemata, that are supposedly pegged to the verbs. In reality, the context will determine whether for instance *to work* is an “Activity” or a “State”.

²³ Tadjuddin (1993: 174-175, 183) believes that *sudah* endows “nonstatif” (non-state) verbs with two aspects: *keingresifan* (ingressivity or inceptivity) and *kekomplesifan* (completion). In Tadjuddin’s terminology, *keingresifan* means “situation whose beginning and continuation forms a whole, or in other words, a situation that stresses its beginning and also its further realization.” (p. 174, our translation). Comrie (1976: 20) proposes that the ingressive aspect is produced by the perfective applied to a state: “there is some functional value in utilising the perfective forms of stative verbs to denote the event of entry into the appropriate state, since otherwise there would be little use for the perfective forms of these verbs, but such an explanation is at present speculative”.

marked by *sudah* does not appear as a resulting state, because no implicit event can be inferred as the cause of this state. We interpret that there has been a shift from E to I; this aspect can be labelled “Ingressive”, as it indicates that something has reached a property and still owns it at the moment of reference. This shift is aligned on a time axis: “before” we had E, “now” we have I. As an alternative, in the negative form, a shift from I to E is conveyed.

Secondly, there are plenty of occurrences of *sudah* + stative verb where the shift from E to I has nothing to do with the time axis:

- (21) *Padahal, [...] upah buruh Indonesia sudah murah dibandingkan*
 nevertheless salary worker Indonesia *sudah* be cheap compared
dengan upah buruh di negara lain.
 with salary workers in country other
 ‘Nevertheless, the Indonesian workers’ salaries are still cheap
 compared to those in other countries.’

In example (21), it is doubtful that, at an initial state, the worker’s salaries were “not cheap”; one could hardly see “Ingressivity” here. In fact, *sudah* does not mark any aspect here, and if *sudah* were erased, the aspect of the predicate *murah* ‘be cheap’ would be left unmodified. Here, it seems that the typical role of *sudah* in the time dimension is in some ways metaphorically transposed to another dimension, the subjectivity of the speaker, that I will further examine.

3.2 MODAL VALUE OF *SUDAH*

In contrast to *telah*, *sudah* reveals the speaker’s subjectivity. This modal feature is entangled with the aspect meanings described above, or occurs without them. *Sudah* means that the resulting state was, in some ways, expected by the speaker.²⁴ Compare:

- (22) *Om Parsikom telah jatuh dari pohon.*
 Uncle Parsikom telah fall from tree
 ‘Uncle Parsikom fell from a tree.’
- (23) *Om Parsikom sudah jatuh dari pohon.*
 Uncle Parsikom sudah fall from tree
 ‘Uncle Parsikom has already fallen from a tree.’

In sentence (22), the event is fully asserted and the speaker seems neutral (even if the falling of Om Parsikom has something final about it and may have been fatal). But (23) seems bizarre, as if the speaker had expected this accident

²⁴ We are grateful to Alan Stevens and Bernd Nothofer for this remark.

as something unavoidable, or wished for, or even premeditated. This modal feature of *sudah* is its most obvious difference from *telah*.

- (24) *Semua persyaratan yang telah ditetapkan sudah dipenuhi.*
 All conditions REL *telah* stipulated *sudah* fulfilled
 'All the conditions that were stipulated have been fulfilled.'

In example (24), the process of 'stipulating the conditions' is fully asserted (*telah ditetapkan*) with no manifestation of subjectivity, while the resulting state 'conditions fulfilled' seems expected or presumed by the speaker (*sudah dipenuhi*).

In (25), the perfect aspect does not apply to any process within the referential situation itself, because there is no evidence of an initial state where things were not yet or not truly *bagus* 'good'.

- (25) *Separuh saja sudah bagus!*
 one-half only *sudah* be good
 'One half only is already good/is good enough!'

Sudah is often used in such concessive structures, and the traces of perfect aspect, if any, pertain to the rhetoric activity of the speaker and testify to an epistemic modality. Whether a verb marked by *sudah* retains the perfect of result aspect or not is often subtle and context-dependent.

- (26) *Iwan sudah kaya, karena bekerja keras.*
 3SG *sudah* be rich because work hard
 'He is already rich (he became rich) because he worked hard.'
- (27) *Agus sudah kaya, mau apa lagi?*
 3SG *sudah* be rich want what again
 'He is already rich, what more does he want?'

In (26), *sudah kaya* implies that there was an initial state where Iwan was not rich (E), then at an unspecified moment or stretch of time, a process made a rich man of him (I). According to the speaker, a boundary (from E to I) has been crossed: the subject has reached the property 'be rich'. The drawing of this boundary is of course highly subjective. However, here *sudah* expresses an ingressive aspect. But in (27), Agus may never have been poor, because *sudah* signals only the speaker's subjectivity: Agus enjoys a certain level of wealth that should fulfil all his needs and wishes. This usage of *sudah* is very common in the argumentative register. Any argumentation has to take into account the contradictory claim. Example (27) can be paraphrased as "someone (maybe Agus himself) may believe that Agus is not rich (E), but the speaker

asserts that E is untrue, and that I is true". The opponent's belief is rejected, the speaker's opinion is asserted. In other terms, the speaker argues that E is not virtual anymore, it is ruled out, and I is not virtual anymore, it is actual²⁵. No aspect is meant by *sudah* here, because this shift from E to I is independent from the time axis, thus purely modal.

Some stative verb antonyms are supposedly non-reversible, as for *muda* 'young' (nothing can normally shift from E 'be old' to I 'be young'). However, the modal *sudah* can mark this stative verb, because the time axis is not taken into account:

- (28) *Menikah pada usia 18, sudah muda. Apalagi umur 15!*
 Marry at age 18 *sudah* be young furthermore age 15
 'To marry at 18 is already young. Not to mention at 15!'

In its purely modal usage, *sudah* often marks gradable stative verbs. For instance, with *kaya* 'be rich', the speaker draws a subjective boundary between what he considers as I 'be rich' and E 'be not rich'. Note that on a gradable notion, I is always superior to E. The speaker asserts that something has 'a higher degree than presumable / suitable' on a scale. In (28), the speaker argues that the age of 15, or/and even the age of 18, is younger than the suitable age for marrying.²⁶

Obviously, disagreements about the boundary between I and E will occur, and these different understandings will be revealed by the use of the modal *sudah*. This marker generally entails a valuation (a speaker's moral judgement). Depending on the context, it may lead to a negative valuation, see (27), or a positive one, see (25). Modality is always more or less present in the meaning of *sudah*, even with the perfect of result. We may paraphrase example (23) *sudah jatuh* 'already fell' as: "the addressee believed that uncle Parsikom would not fall, contrary to the speaker's prediction. Then the speaker asserts that the uncle in accordance with his prediction did fall." We see E 'not fall' rejected and I 'fall' actualized. This is why besides the perfect of result aspect, *sudah* always indicates that the speaker expects the event that actually happens.²⁷

In that sense, the modal use of *sudah* is a metaphor of its aspectual use, pegged to the time axis. The universal modal feature of *sudah* is the crossing of a boundary²⁸ from E to I, whenever I is asserted to be the actual property at the moment of reference and E (assumed to be the addressee's opinion) is rejected. The modality expressed by *sudah* is in fact a wealth of complex

²⁵ This structure will be reversed at the negative form: *sudah tidak kaya* 'yet not rich'. E (be not rich) is actual, and I (be rich) is ruled out.

²⁶ Another expressive example, gathered on a blog: *Dia sudah muda, sombong, bodoh pula!* 'He is yet young, arrogant, stupid on top of that!'

²⁷ This is applicable to declarative sentences, while the interrogative or negative modalities may interfere with this overstepping feature.

²⁸ In other languages too, some morphemes mean crossing a border in terms of time as well as in terms of the acquisition of properties: English *already*, *yet*, French *déjà* (*que*).

and subtle modalities. I propose a broad label for the modality conveyed by *sudah*: “expected”. Finally, we should keep in mind that when *sudah* marks stative verbs, there may be no aspect at all, but only a modality, that I will label “valuation”.

4 ASPECTUAL AND MODAL VALUE OF *TELAH*

When marking a stative verb, *telah* expresses the same ingressive aspect as *sudah* in example (26). The difference between these markers relies upon the expression or silencing of the modality. With *telah*, the speaker intends to show his objectivity, not subjectivity. He exhibits a “neutral” attitude, and does not take into account any possible objection to his assertion.²⁹ The neutral feature of *telah* can be illustrated by its weak probability of occurring along with a modal adverb like *untung* ‘fortunately’:

- (29) a. *Untung mereka telah berangkat.* b. *Untung mereka sudah berangkat.*
 Fortunately 3PL *telah* leave Fortunately 3PL *sudah* leave
 ‘Fortunately they have left.’ ‘Fortunately they have already left.’

Telah has a modal meaning of assertion³⁰ according to Alieva et al. (1991: 382). This enables us to differentiate *telah* or *sudah* marking a stative verb, for example, *telah kaya* ‘has become rich’, from *sudah kaya* ‘already rich’ or ‘rich enough, more rich than one would expect’. In short, *telah* expresses no modality, but purely aspect.

- (30) *Harimau Jawa telah punah.*
 tiger Java *telah* be extinct
 ‘The Java tiger is extinct.’
- (31) *Kadin telah mempunyai Biro Pelayanan.*
 Kadin *telah* own office service
 ‘The Chamber of Commerce has got a Services Office.’

The choice of *sudah* in example (30) would indicate that the extinction of the Java tiger was expected (predicted, wished for, or worried about) by the speaker. Instead, *telah* indicates only an ingressive aspect, from E “be not extinct” to I “be extinct”, a property that still holds at the moment of reference.

With verbs other than stative verbs, *telah* expresses a perfect aspect (not

²⁹ This speaker’s “neutral” attitude could be the reason why the aspectual marker *telah* “is almost entirely confined to writing and very formal speech” (Sneddon 1996:198). In formal speech or writing, we often touch on phenomena that happen outside our immediate experience, therefore *telah* is relatively more frequent than *sudah*.

³⁰ “makna modal kebenaran”, Alieva et al. (1991: 382).

perfective, see note 20). It is basically similar to *sudah*, but *telah* never leads to an ingressive aspect interpretation³¹ as *sudah* does in example (33).

(32) *Dewi telah tidur di kamar saya.*

Dewi *telah* sleep at room 1SG

'Dewi has slept in my bedroom.' (she is not sleeping now)

(33) *Dewi sudah tidur di kamar saya.*

Dewi *sudah* sleep at room 1SG

'Dewi is already sleeping in my bedroom.' (she is still sleeping now)

or: 'Dewi generally sleeps in my bedroom now.' (she is still used to)

In other terms, marking a dynamic verb (Activity, Accomplishment or Achievement) with *telah* always indicates a perfect aspect. This is not a perfective aspect, because *telah* constructs an uninterrupted interval between the event and the moment of reference, which cannot be embedded with other events in the meantime. The coordinative structure *telah V dan (telah) V* 'has V and has V', never shows any overlap between the events, for example *telah dikirim dan (telah) diterima* 'has been sent and received'. Even if an adverb indicates that an action occurred several times, it is seen as a whole, a single event in its entirety:

(34) *Peraturan permainan catur telah beberapa kali mengalami perubahan.*

rules play chess *telah* several times experience change

'The rules of chess have several times been subject to change.'

In (34), the "changes in the rules of chess" are considered as one single limited event. Moreover, the perfect expressed by *telah* cannot be labelled "Perfect of result". Unlike *sudah*, with *telah* the process seems disjointed from the immediate experience of the speaker, who does not present himself as a witness of the event that he narrates. This is the reason why it is unlikely to find *telah* along with a "time adjunct" linking it to a recent point in time:

(35) *Iwan telah pergi.*

Iwan *telah* leave

'Iwan has left.'

³¹ Tadjuddin (1993) proposes a sub-class of the stative verbs, namely the "verba statis". This sub-class encompasses verbs that need "energy", although they are semantically close to the "states", while remaining somehow dynamic. Verbs expressing a position, for example, *duduk* 'to sit', *tidur* 'to sleep' and verbs of perception, for example *lihat* 'to look at' are labelled by Tadjuddin as *verba statis*. Marking a *verba statis*, *sudah* indicates the ingressive aspect, and *telah* indicates the perfect aspect.

(35) ?*Iwan telah pergi lima menit yang lalu.*

Iwan telah leave five minutes REL pass

*'Iwan has left five minutes ago.'

Sentence (36) sounds strange because the resulting state of such a recent event should lead to some consequences at the moment of speech, for the subject and/or the speaker. But with *telah* the predicate describes a “stand alone” event, denying that its resulting state would be relevant as the direct cause of other events. As a substitute to *telah* in (36), the marker *sudah* would be perfectly acceptable, the speaker assuming that the “addressee” may presume that Iwan is still here.³² This feature of *telah* has a pragmatic consequence in discourse analysis: *telah* is more frequent than *sudah* when dealing with “old” events. This is a consequence, but not a cause, of the aspectual and modal difference between these two markers, see 2.1 above (*Long gone versus recent?*).

It is also unlikely to find *telah* within a verbal clause that stands for the cause of further events. This remark is consistent with the fact that *telah* does not foreground any resulting state. A query on internet³³ shows that in the structures *telah V* followed by *maka* ‘so, thus’, *sehingga* ‘so ... that’, *akibatnya* ‘in consequence’, the verb marked by *telah* is either stative or in the passive voice (*di-* or *ter-*), which supports the claim that a verb marked by *telah* is usually not causal and that any consequence clause which may follow ensues from the preceding sentence or paragraph in its entirety. Furthermore, in sentences where *telah V* is followed by *karena* ‘because’, the grammatical subject acts almost always as undergoer. These two remarks lead one to suppose that a verb marked by *telah* may stand for the consequence of the preceding process, but cannot represent the direct cause of a forthcoming process.

On the other hand, choosing the marker *sudah* will foreground the resulting state, thus possibly expressing the cause of a forthcoming process. This statement ensues from a rough “discourse analysis” approach rather than a literal examination of extended data, but it seems relevant for a better understanding of these aspectual nuances. Table 2 sums up the modal and aspectual meanings conveyed by *sudah* and *telah*.

I will now turn to two other aspect/modality markers, that are certainly not as frequent as *sudah* and *telah*, but close in meaning.

³² To analyse this example in more formal terms: with *sudah*, we have I “to leave” and E “to stay”, the speaker actualizes I and rejects E. With *telah*, only I is actualized.

³³ Through the browser Google, in May 2006, with the following criteria: language “Indonesian”, search strings (*telah * maka*), (*telah * sehingga*), (*telah * akibatnya*) and (*telah * karena*) successively. The wildcard asterisk harvests any word, not only verbs. Only the first 100 occurrences from each query were checked.

Aspectual and modal meanings of <i>sudah</i> and <i>telah</i> for verbs grouped after Vendler's time schemata		
Time schemata	<i>sudah</i>	<i>telah</i>
Achievements, Accomplishments	Perfect of result (resulting state foregrounded) + modality 'expected' <i>Indonesia sudah memilih Presidennya</i> 'Indonesia has already chosen its President' (the resulting state may lead to subsequent process)	Perfect (resulting state ignored) <i>Prancis telah memilih Presidennya</i> 'France has chosen its President' <i>telah tidur</i> 'has slept (and is awoken now)'
Activities	Ingressive aspect + modality 'expected' <i>sudah tidur</i> 'already sleeps' <i>sudah bekerja</i> 'already works'	
States	Ingressive aspect + modality 'expected' <i>sudah bekerja</i> 'already has a job' <i>sudah kaya</i> 'already rich' <i>sudah mahasiswa</i> 'already a student' or no aspect, purely modal: valuation modality <i>Dia sudah kaya, mau apa lagi?</i> 'He is already rich (enough), what more does he want?'	Ingressive (neutral, no modality) <i>Dia telah kaya</i> 'He has become rich.'

Table 2

5 MORE ASPECT MARKERS: *PERNAH* AND *SEMPAT*

These two markers, although less frequent than *sudah* and *telah*, are often heard when one has to report amazing anecdotes and personal experiences. *Pernah* and *sempat* have often been classified as synonyms, which is not the case.

5.1 ASPECTUAL AND MODAL MEANING OF *PERNAH*

Sneddon (1996: 199) notes that *pernah* "cannot be used of recent events". This is again a consequence in discourse of the aspectual meaning of this marker.

(37) *Saya pernah mendaki gunung Slamet.*

1SG *pernah* climb mount Slamet.

'I once climbed Mount Slamet.'

As with *telah*, with *pernah* the event is seen as whole, taking place within a single and homogeneous span, whatever its duration.

- (38) *Agus pernah merokok selama dua tahun.*
Agus pernah smoke for two years
 'Agus once smoked for two years.'
- (39) *Saya pernah mendaki Gunung Slamet setiap minggu selama setahun.*
1SG pernah climb mount Slamet every week for one year
 'I once climbed Mount Slamet every week for a year.'

The prepositional phrases *selama dua tahun* 'for two years' or *setiap minggu* 'every week' are transformed into a single interval of time by *pernah*, thus the experience reported is seen as a whole.

A syntactic feature of *pernah* may be worth mentioning. When *pernah* marks a transitive verb, and the object is not a proper noun, this object should be indefinite. The reason is that the experience concerns any element of a category. For instance, in reporting the experience of eating a durian, we focus on the event itself, not on which durian we ate. Thus example (41a) is hardly acceptable.³⁴

- (40) a. *Saya pernah makan durian.* b. *Saya sudah makan durian.*
1SG pernah eat durian *1SG sudah eat durian*
 'I happened to eat durian.' 'I have eaten some durian.'
- (41) a. *?Saya pernah makan durian itu.* b. *Saya sudah makan durian itu.*
1SG pernah eat durian DET *1SG sudah eat durian DET*
 '? I happened to eat that 'I have eaten that durian.'
durian.'

Pernah is compatible with non-permanent states, indicating their reversion: *Agus pernah kaya/marah* 'Agus was (once) rich/angry' implies that he is not rich/angry any more at the moment of reference, thus there is a shift from I to E. *Pernah* is obviously incompatible with permanent or non-reversible states: **Agus pernah tua* '*Agus was old once'.³⁵ It is notable that *pernah* is also not compatible with an anchoring in time,³⁶ that is, a date:

³⁴ One can always imagine contexts where this sentence is possible, for instance if a durian lover (like the author of this article) is able to differentiate varieties of durian, from Thailand, from Sumatra, etcetera. It is also possible to say *saya pernah melihat orang itu* 'I happened to see this person', in this case the indefinite feature does not concern the grammatical object (referring to the person we are talking about), but the opportunities of seeing someone.

³⁵ Except if we imagine a peculiar context where Iwan is an actor, and played once the role of an old character.

³⁶ We mean a point on the time axis, not an interval. This constraint evokes the perfect in English: "the perfect in English signals a non-specific event. Thus the perfect is incompatible with a temporal adverb that refers to a specific point in time: *I have been to Japan in 1963" (Bybee et al. 1994: 318).

- (42) **Pada tanggal 10 Agustus, saya pernah mendaki Gunung Slamet.*
 At date 10 August, 1sg pernah climb Mount Slamet
 *‘On the 10th of August, I once climbed Mount Slamet.’

It follows that *pernah* marks a subset of the perfective aspect: the semelfactive aspect. In other terms, it signals that a completed event happened once only for the subject. The modal meaning is inseparable from this aspect. By using the marker *pernah*, the speaker emphasises the experience gained by the subject more than the process itself.

- (43) *Ia pernah bekerja di Salim Group sebagai manajer keuangan.*
 3sg pernah work at Salim Group as manager financial
 ‘He/she once worked (for some time) at Salim Group as financial manager.’

I mean by experience a property not restricted to knowledge, skills or know-how:

- (44) *Semasa masih anak-anak, saya pernah tinggal di Jalan Buni.*
 When still child-RED 1sg pernah live at street Buni
 ‘When I was still a child, I lived (for some time) in Buni Street.’

In (44), the experience gained is simply to “have-lived-at-Buni-street”, and to have kept some memories from this place. When the verb is in the active voice, the experience always affects animate subjects (the only inanimate subject I found on internet³⁷ was *Indonesia*, that can reasonably be considered as a personification). I propose to label as “experiential” the modality expressed by *pernah*.³⁸

Inanimate subjects can be found with *pernah* mainly in the passive voice.³⁹

³⁷ Through Google, May 2006, query of the word *pernah*, selected language: Indonesian. The search string was (*pernah -jangan-pernah -apakah-pernah*), in order to exclude the ‘noise’ of sentences without subject (imperative *jangan pernah V* and interrogative *apakah pernah V*). Only the first 200 occurrences were checked.

³⁸ Bybee et al. (1994: 62) evoke this modality: “the experiential, in which certain qualities or knowledge are attributable to the agent due to past experiences, as in [...] *Have you ever been to London?*” although classifying “experiential” as a “mental aspect”, they give similar examples in Mandarin Chinese, where “the experiential is marked by the suffix *-guo* in the neutral tone: *ni chi-le yúchì méi-you* ‘did you eat the shark’s fin?’ versus *ni chi-guo yúchì méi-you* ‘have you ever eaten (ever had the experience of eating) shark’s fin?’, likewise *wo méi qù hen duo guójiā* ‘I did not visit many countries (during a certain trip or period of time)’ versus *wo méi qùguo hen duo guójiā* ‘I haven’t visited (have never had the experience of visiting) many countries’”.

³⁹ However, inanimate subjects are possible with some verbs marked by *pernah*, for instance *pernah merosot* ‘happen to decrease’, *pernah melonjak* ‘happened to jump’, *pernah mogok* ‘happened to fail’.

(45) *Di masa presiden Soeharto, istana ini pernah dipakai sebagai*

At period President Soeharto palace this *pernah* UV used as
tempat pertemuan kepala negara.

place meeting head state.

'At the time of President Soeharto, it happened that this palace was used as a meeting place for heads of states.'

It appears that with *pernah*, an animate subject is always considered as an "undergoer", more precisely "experiencer", who receives a new property (even if, in the case of a human subject, he/she was intending to acquire it). On the other hand, if the grammatical subject of the sentence refers to an inanimate, the speaker asserts that the events he witnessed or heard tell of are improbable, therefore providing him or his addressee with a new experience.

Pernah often occurs in association with negative or interrogative forms:

(46) *Ia tidak pernah ke luar negeri.*

3SG not *pernah* to outside country

'He has never travelled to foreign countries.'

(47) *Apakah Anda pernah melihat kasus demikian?*

interr 2SG/PL *pernah* see case such

'Have you ever seen such a case?'

This feature, linked to discourse analysis, has been noted by Dahl and Hedin (2000: 388): "another significant fact is that experientials cross-linguistically seem to occur particularly often in non-assertive contexts, that is questions, negated statements and the like". This is also the case for *pernah*. Although in 46 the event did not occur, the speaker has the mental image that it could have occurred and indeed attributes a property to the subject, that we could paraphrase as "not having had the corresponding experience". In (47) the speaker has a mental picture of the improbability of the case in question to have occurred (whether or not it occurred in reality) and asks his speech partner whether has had the experience of such a case occurring.

In sum, besides the perfective, semelfactive aspect, *pernah* signals the speaker's subjectivity, expressing an "Experiential" modality gained by the subject (if it is animate) or shared by the speaker (if the subject refers to an inanimate).

5.2 ASPECTUAL AND MODAL OF *SEMPAT*

Sempat is classified as a "modal" by Sneddon (1996: 201), and translated as "have the opportunity, have the time, be able". It is true that *sempat* expresses modality (I will come back to this point later). But in addition, *sempat* indicates an aspect; like *pernah*, it signals a perfective, semelfactive aspect.

- (48) *Saya sempat membaca sekilas Proposal.*
 1SG *sempat* read fast Proposal
 'I had the opportunity of skimming through the Proposal.'
- (49) *Iwan sempat bertemu dengan Sri Sultan.*
 Iwan *sempat* meet with (honor term) Sultan
 'Iwan had the opportunity of meeting the Sultan.'

The modal meaning of *sempat* is close to that of *pernah*, but it signals that the speaker does not focus on the property gained by the subject, but instead on the low probability that such an event happened. For instance, sentence (50) is quoted from the narration of a student's demonstration. It is forbidden, thus unlikely, to strike the Indonesian flag to show one's discontent. But the students did.

- (50) Mahasiswa juga sempat menurunkan bendera Merah Putih.
 student too *sempat* get down flag red white
 'The student also managed to strike the red-white flag [Indonesian] down.'

The speaker asserts that he had not predicted this event. Besides marking the semelfactive aspect, *sempat* indicates a modality that we could label "unexpected", as opposed to *sudah*'s "expected" modality. For this reason, *sempat* often occurs in sentences where the subject plays the role of an undergoer (51) and/or is inanimate (52):

- (51) *Anjelique sempat patah semangat sebab tidak ada yang mendukungnya.*
 Anjelique *sempat* break motivation because NEG be there REL support-3SG
 'Anjelique happened to lose her motivation because nobody was there to support her.'
- (52) *Pekan lalu rupiah sempat menguat di bawah IDR 9,000/USD.*
 week last Rupiah *sempat* strengthen under
 'Last week, the Rupiah strengthened (by chance, for a while) to under Rp 9.000 for 1 US\$.'

In support of the "unexpected" modality of *sempat*, we notice its incompatibility with modal verbs such as *bisa* 'can', *dapat* 'able to', *boleh* 'allowed to', that is, **sempat bisa/dapat/boleh*.

An occurrence query on the internet⁴⁰ generates this overall picture, see Table 3.

⁴⁰ Through Google, in May 2003; selected language: Indonesian, limited to domain '.id'. The search strings were successively (*telah bisa*), (*telah dapat*), (*telah boleh*), etcetera. The datas

modal verbs markers	<i>bisa</i> 'can/may' "abilitive"	<i>dapat</i> 'able to'	<i>boleh</i> 'can/may' "permissive"	<i>mau</i> 'want'	<i>harus</i> "must"
<i>telah</i> +	49	881	4	17	4
<i>pernah</i> +	303	208	6	160	8
<i>sempat</i> +	2	0	0	7	0

Table 3. Number of occurrences of combinations "marker + modal verb + V" (that is, *telah bisa V* etcetera).

These results have no statistic validity, and we can ignore the combinations that occur less than ten times. Not surprisingly, it appears that *sempat* is incompatible with modal verbs which indicates a Deontic modality (obligation or permission) or Dynamic modality (ability or willingness). This testifies to some expectation that the process would be validated; in other words, the "unexpected" modality of *sempat* excludes any other "expected" modal meaning. On the other hand, *telah*, which does not express any specific modality and *pernah*, which expresses only an "experiential" modality, leave room for a modal verb. *Sempat* indicates the same aspect as *pernah*, but with a different modal meaning, that I call "unexpected" as opposed to *sudah* and its "expected" broad modal meaning.

The aspectual and modal meanings of *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah* and *sempat* can be summarized as in Table 4.

	ASPECT	MODALITY
<i>sudah</i>	with "Accomplishments", "Achievements": perfect of result	expected
	with activities and some "States": ingressive	
	with some "States": Ø	valuation
<i>telah</i>	with "Accomplishments", "Achievements" and "Activities": perfect with "States": ingressive	Ø
<i>pernah</i>	perfective, semelfactive	experiential
<i>sempat</i>	perfective, semelfactive	unexpected

Table 4

6 CONCLUSION

In Indonesian, a wealth of aspectual and modal meanings can be expressed by about fourteen pre-verbal grammatical morphemes, called "markers". These aspect markers are distinct from time adjuncts, (although aspect markers can lead *in absentia* to localization in time). Modality meanings are also conveyed by most of the aspect markers. Languages such as English or

in this table correspond to the number of pages where Google founded an occurrence of the searched string ; we checked manually up to 50 occurrences of each string.

French rely mainly on verbal moods, a system that needs lexical helpers to express numerous aspectual and modal nuances.

In this paper I have examined the aspect markers *sudah*, *telah*, *pernah* and *sempat*. These morphemes indicate “perfect” aspect (*sudah*, *telah*) or “perfective” aspect (*pernah*, *sempat*), although nuances must be mentioned: *sudah* emphasizes the resulting state of a process. *Telah* is focused on the process itself, rather than on the resulting state. *Sudah* may convey a “perfect of result” or “ingressive” aspect, or even no aspect at all. *Telah* indicates a “perfect” or “ingressive” aspect. The nuance between “perfect” and “perfect of result” can be revealed through a discourse analysis approach: with *sudah*, the “resulting state” is foregrounded, and commonly stands for the cause of another event. The perfective markers *pernah* and *sempat* indicate more specifically a semelfactive aspect. A process marked with the semelfactive aspect relates an event as a single occurrence, whatever the duration and homogeneity of this event.

Modality features are essential to achieve a full description of these markers. *Sudah* and *telah* are not synonyms, as shown by their distinct syntactic constraints. Moreover, their differences cannot be described only through the analysis of their respective aspectual values. *Sudah* has a complex modal pattern, that I labelled broadly an “expected” modality. In some contexts, with stative verbs, it does not indicate aspect, but a pure modality, called “valuation” because it exhibits the speaker’s valuation (a judgement in terms of good/bad). *Telah* displays a full assertion, thus is not loaded with modality, while *pernah* bears an “experiential” modality and *sempat* reveals a modality labelled “unexpected”, as opposed to *sudah*.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, Ruth Louise. 1995. “Discourse conditions governing aspect: the use of *sudah* and *telah* in Indonesian”. Master of Arts thesis, Michigan State University.
- Alieva, Natalia Fedorovna. 2001. “Is there a grammatical category of tense in Indonesian / Malay ?”. Paper, The Fifth International Symposium on Malay Indonesian Linguistics, (non publié) source <http://monolith.eva.mpg.de/~gil/symposium2001/abstracts/alieva.html>.
- Alieva, Natalia Fedorovna, V. Arakin, A.K. Oglobin, and YU H. Sirk. 1991. *Bahasa Indonesia - deskripsi dan teori*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Alwi, Hasan. 1992. *Modalitas dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Kanisius.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar; Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Culioli, Antoine. 1999. *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation: domaine notionnel (Tome 3)*. Gap: Ophrys.
- Dahli, Osten and Eva Hedin. 2000. “Current relevance and event reference”, in: O. Dahl (ed.), *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*, pp. 385-401.

- Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gonda, J. 1973. *Sanskrit in Indonesia*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- Grangé, Philippe. 2006. *Temps et aspect en indonésien*. PhD thesis, Université de Poitiers, Poitiers.
- Harrison, Rick. 2002. *Verb aspect*, (<http://www.rick.harrison.net/langlab/aspect.html>), accessed 6 November 2004.
- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. *Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Mac Coy, Iwen Husein. 1986. *Tense and aspect: a comparative study of meaning in English and Bahasa Indonesia*. PhD thesis, University of Texas, Austin.
- Macdonald, Ross R. and Soenjono Dardjowidjojo. 1967. *A student's reference grammar of modern formal Indonesian*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Proudfoot, Ian. 2002. *Malay Concordance Project*, (<http://www.anu.edu.au/asianstudies/proudfoot/MCP/Q/info.html>), accessed 6 January 2006.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian, a comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Tadjuddin, Mohammad. 1993. *Pengungkapan makna aspektualitas Bahasa Rusia dalam Bahasa Indonesia: suatu telaah tentang aspek dan aksionalitas*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Tadjuddin, Mohammad. 2005. *Aspektualitas dalam kajian linguistik*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1967. *Linguistics in philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Verkuyl, Henk J. 1993. *A theory of aspectuality - the interaction between temporal and atemporal structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.