

4 *Observations on Lundayeh auxiliaries and the case of aru'*

BEATRICE CLAYRE

1 Introduction¹

Lundayeh² is one of the names used for a cluster of very closely related dialects spoken in Borneo. They are located in south-west Sabah, north Sarawak, Brunei and the north-east corner of Kalimantan in Indonesia. Until the 1960s the speakers of this cluster of dialects were usually referred to as Muruts, which caused much confusion with another, and neighbouring, language group in the southern part of Sabah, which was also called Murut. The Sabah Murut languages, which were studied by Jack Prentice, belong to a Sabah language family which has been called Murutic (Prentice 1971:1–4; King & King 1984:328–330). The ‘Sarawak Murut’ language, now called Lundayeh (Sabah and Kalimantan) or Lun Bawang (Sarawak and Brunei), was identified as a language isolate in the survey of Sabah languages (King & King 1984:333), but had earlier been identified by Alfred Hudson, working on data collected in Sarawak and Kalimantan, as a member of a group which he named the Apo Duat language group. This group also included Kelabit and Sa’ban (Hudson 1978:24–25). More recently, Blust (1998) has called this group the Kelabitic subgroup, and this name will be used here.

These two language groups, the Murutic and Kelabitic, have probably existed alongside each other for a few hundred years, and there are similarities between them. Lundayeh, however, is situated between the agglutinative Philippine-type languages of Sabah (including Murutic) and the more isolating type of language found in the other Kelabitic languages, and more generally throughout central Borneo. In previous studies, the Philippine-like features of

¹ Abbreviations used in this paper are: AF – actor Focus; emph – emphatic particle; IF – instrument focus; impf – imperfective; int – question particle; loc – locative particle; neg – negative; pf – perfective; pnm – personal noun marker; RED – reduplication; rel – relative; sp – anaphoric particle; ST – stative prefix; UF – undergoer focus.

² Lundayeh is the legally registered form of the name in Sabah.

I wish to record my gratitude to the many Lundayeh who have helped me over the years, in particular Semion Lalung (Sabah) and John Labo (Trusan). I also wish to thank Dr René van den Berg, for his constructive comments at different stages in the preparation of this paper. The views expressed in it, and any errors are mine. I am grateful to the British Academy for a small personal research grant in 1990–91 which enabled me to carry out some of the research reported here.

Lundayeh have been emphasised (Clayre 1991, 1996, and in press), but evidence of a movement towards a more isolating structure in the language is highlighted by a study of the auxiliaries. Auxiliaries are barely evident in the Murutic languages, their function being largely fulfilled by affixes, but in Lundayeh the following auxiliaries occur: *pengeh* 'finished, already, after'; *pian* and *sikal*, both meaning 'to want' or 'future intention', *amé* 'to go', *miek* 'can, able', *ara* 'not want' and *aru* 'to make' or 'do'. The last is of particular interest because it is used to form a periphrastic undergoer focus.

No detailed study of auxiliaries has been carried out in the field. The observations in this paper are based on text material, taped conversations,³ some elicited (or volunteered) material, examples cited in the *Kamus Lun Dayeh* by Samuel Labo Pur, a native speaker of Lundayeh (Labo Pur 1965), and the Lun Bawang folktale of Upai Kasim published by James Deegan and Robin Usad (1972). The source of each example in this paper will be given. These sources reflect different dialects of Lundayeh. The speakers of these dialects maintain that there are no significant differences between them, and certainly no differences were detected in the use of the auxiliaries. One of the main differences is a phonetic distinction between [f] found in dialects from the Kemaloh area of Kalimantan, and [p] used in other dialects, for example: *ngafung* and *ngapung* 'to hide'. In the absence of an adequate description of Lundayeh phonology, the spelling used here conforms, as far as possible, to that devised by Robert Blust for the closely related Kelabit language. This spelling differs from that in general use among Lundayeh speakers, and as used in the translation of the New Testament (*Pejani' luk mebaruh*). Thus the voiced aspirates are here written as *bh*, *dh*, and *gh*. In Lundayeh */dh/* is phonetically an affricate and usually written as *c*.

In common with Philippine-type languages, Lundayeh has a complex syntactic system called 'focus' whereby one noun phrase is marked out for special prominence, and this information is cross-referenced in the verb morphology (Clayre 1991). Lundayeh allows the actor, or the undergoer, or the instrument to be 'focussed', i.e. actor focus (AF), undergoer focus (UF) and instrument focus (IF). Unlike most Philippine-type languages there are no noun markers in Lundayeh to indicate the function of a noun phrase, and consequently word order has become important. As a general rule, the non-focussed noun phrase (actor or undergoer) immediately follows the verb, and the focussed noun phrase precedes it. This has resulted in a move in AF clauses away from a verb-first construction to an increasingly common actor-first construction. In IF clauses the focussed instrument occurs at the end of the clause. Focus is, however, signalled in the pronoun system. There are three sets of pronouns in Lundayeh (Table 1). Pronouns of Set I mark the focussed actor in the clause; those of Set II indicate the non-focussed actor and also function as possessive pronouns; Set III pronouns are used for non-focussed and non-actor participants in the clause, i.e. undergoer or benefactive.

³ I am grateful to the late Miss Jean Davies, formerly of the Borneo Evangelical Mission, for making available to me transcribed texts and conversations which she had recorded in Lawas in the 1960s and 1970s. The speakers represented a number of Lundayeh dialects, but these details were not recorded at the time.

Table 1: Pronoun sets in Lundayeh

	Set I	Set II	Set III
First person singular	<i>uih</i>	<i>ku</i>	<i>negku</i>
Second person singular	<i>iko</i>	<i>mu</i>	<i>nemu</i>
Third person singular	<i>ieh</i>	<i>neh</i>	<i>neneh</i>
First person plural inclusive	<i>tau</i>	<i>tau</i>	<i>netau</i>
First person plural exclusive	<i>kai</i>	<i>kai</i>	<i>nekai</i>
Second person plural	<i>muyuh</i>	<i>muyuh</i>	<i>nemuyuh</i>
Third person plural	<i>ideh</i>	<i>deh</i>	<i>nede</i>

The verbs are cross-referenced by affixes (Tables 2a,b) which indicate the focussed nominal.

Table 2a: Verbal marking in Lundayeh dynamic verbs

	Actor focus	Undergoer focus	Instrument focus
Imperfective	<i>N-/nge-</i>	<i>en</i>	<i>pi-N-</i>
Perfective	<i>ne-N-</i>	<i>-in-</i> or <i>-i-</i>	<i>ne-pi-N-</i>

N- indicates a nasal prefix which assimilates to the position of the initial consonant of the root. It occurs as *ng-* before vowel-initial roots and *nge-* before *l* or *r* initial roots. Intransitive verbs may have the infix *-em-*, or, in the case of the verb 'to eat' *-um-* (see (1)).

Table 2b: Verbal marking in Lundayeh stative verbs

	Actor focus	Undergoer focus	Instrument focus
Imperfective/ability	–	<i>me-</i>	–
Perfective/accidental	–	<i>ne-</i>	–

2 Auxiliaries in Lundayeh

2a *Pengeh*, *pian*, *sikal* and *amé*

Among the first affixes to be lost in the languages of central Borneo, including the Kelabit languages such as Sa'ban, are the prefix marking perfective aspect in AF, and the suffix *-en*, a UF marker which is used when imperfective applies. It is, therefore, particularly interesting to note that two of the four auxiliaries in this section have a similar area of meaning. *Pengeh* indicates perfective aspect, and it occurs predominantly in AF constructions, while *pian* indicates want or desire, and occurs frequently in UF constructions.

Pengeh as a root means 'finish' and is probably cognate with *pongo*⁴ in Timugon Murut and *pungo* in Ida'an (Sabah) which mean 'to finish', while the Banggi language (Sabah) has

⁴ The vowel /o/ in the orthographies of Sabah languages frequently represents a central vowel. For example, Rungus Dusun (Forschner 1994:7, where /o/ is described as a mid half closed central vowel); Kimaragang Dusun (Kroeger 1993:38, where the schwa [ə] is an allophone of both /o/ and /a/); Tombonuwo (King 1993:101) and Labok-Kinabatangan Kadazan (Hurlbut 1993:50, where /o/ is described as lower mid central unrounded vowel [ə]); and Timugon Murut (Prentice 1971:19, where two of the allophones of /o/ are lower mid central vowels). In Tagal, another Sabah Murut language (Harris & Chapple 1993:74), the schwa is interpreted as an allophone of /a/.

an auxiliary *punga* indicating finished action (Clayre 1996:71:fn.21). The Sarawak languages of Berawan, Melanau, Narom, Sa'ban and Kelabit all have an auxiliary which is a cognate of *pengeh*.

As a main verb, *pengeh* can occur in different focus constructions with perfective or imperfective aspect (the following forms have been recorded: *mengeh* (AF), *nemengeh* (AF/pf), *pingeh* (UF/pf), *mepengeh* (ST/impf) and *nepengeh* (ST/pf). When it functions as an auxiliary it is never affixed. It carries the sense of 'already completed', 'finished', but clause initially in dependent clauses it can mean 'after' (cf. (6)). It occurs more commonly with verbs in AF (1)–(4) but a few examples have been recorded with verbs in UF (5). It sometimes occurs redundantly with a main verb marked by the perfective prefix *ne-* as in (1) *ne-kuman* or (2) *ne-tudo*. At other times it occurs with a main verb apparently marked for imperfective aspect, as in (3) *t-em-ido* or (4) *m-bangun*.

Examples of the use of *pengeh* as an auxiliary are given in (1)–(6).

- (1) *Uih pengeh nekuman.*
I finish AF/pf-eat
'I have already eaten.' (Kamus)
- (2) *Kareb decur pengeh netudo iring se-delei ...*
when girl finish AF/pf-sit beside one-man
'After the girl has sat beside the man ...' (marriage customs)
- (3) *Idi kareb amung-amung deh pengeh temido ...*
then when RED-all they finish AF-wail
'Then when all of them have wailed/finished wailing ...' (burial customs)
- (4) *S.L. mada' isu' luk pengeh mangun kuan tetek ruma'*
S.L. AF-tells change rel finish happen to room house
bang kareb luk mon nilaad.
in time rel long ago
'S.L. tells the story of a change which happened to a family long ago.'
(*tetek* is a family room/unit in a long house) (folk story)
- (5) *Pengeh ieh pinuer ku idi uih nemaman nedawa' uko',*
finish it UF/pf-gut I then I AF/pf-feed to-they-2 dogs,
kai nuli' peh.
we AF/pf-return home yet
'After it was gutted (by me), then I fed the two dogs, and we returned home.'
or 'After I had gutted it, I fed the two dogs and we returned home.' (hunting story)
- (6) *Pengeh ini, idi ulad ineh mere neneh lemaba peh.*
finish this then worm that AF-give to-him AF-pass yet
'After this, the worm allows him to pass.' (folk story)

Pian and *sikal*. The history of *pian* or *sikal* is less clear. The final *-an* syllable of *pian*, combined with its frequent UF usage could suggest an earlier UF verb, but no roots spring to mind. Nor are any cognates known for these auxiliaries in any of the other languages of Sabah or central Borneo. Sa'ban, another Kelabitic language, for example, uses the auxiliary *la'* to indicate future intention, and Berawan uses *ka'*.

Pian can occur as a main verb (7)–(8), or as an auxiliary (9)–(10), in either case it occurs in both AF (8), (9) and UF (7), (10) constructions. No examples have been recorded of the occurrence of this verb with affixation.⁵

Examples of the use of *pian* include the following.

- (7) *“Idi peh pian mu” buri’ neh “idi berén ku tebhar mu”*
 then yet want you word his then UF/impf-give I reward you
 “‘Whatever you wish,” he said, “I will give you as a reward/ will be given as your reward.” (Upai Kasim)
- (8) *Uih pian radio ini. Tuda’-ké raga neh?*
 I want radio this how-much-int price it
 ‘I want this radio. How much is it?’ (Kamus)
- (9) *“Kudeng iko pian medhing ki-edho dei”, doo’ iko ngalap*
 if you want AF/impf-reach to-sun there, good you AF/impf-x
batang sibak uen mu ku apir” keburi neh.
 batang sibak UF/impf-make you for bridge words his
 ‘“If you want to reach the sun, you should take a *sibak* log and use it as a bridge”
 he said.’ (folkstory)
- (10) *Enun pian mu rupen? Kopi atau té?*
 what want you UF/impf-drink coffee or tea
 ‘What would you like to drink? Coffee or tea?’ (Kamus)

The chief difference noticed between *pian* and *sikal* is that *sikal* was attested only as an auxiliary verb, and only in AF constructions (11)–(13). No obvious cognates for *sikal* are known to me. Most languages of central Borneo seem to have only one auxiliary with this meaning, and the auxiliaries used in Sa’ban and Berawan, *la’* and *ka’* respectively, have already been mentioned.⁶

Examples of the use of *sikal* as an auxiliary occur in (11)–(13):

- (11) *Ieh sikal ngalap ruma’ tau amé dei’ dita’.*
 he want AF/impf-take house our go there high
 ‘He wants to take our house up into the sky.’ (folk story)
- (12) *Ideh sikal amé nier lun pupu neh luk ketedhen tungé’ liang.*
 they want AF-go AF-see people tribe his rel abandon here below
 ‘They want to come and see their relatives who remained here below.’ (folk story)
- (13) *Dat-dat niat deh ineh, sikal nangi’ ngeceku nebha mesti*
 RED-bad heart they that want cry because tomorrow must
(i)deh petayen Raca’ ku na ngalap amas.
 they UF/impf-die Rajah for not AF/impf-bring gold
 ‘They were sad, and wanted to cry because the next day they would be killed by
 the Rajah for not getting the gold.’ (Upai Kasim)

⁵ Blust noted an instance of *p-in-ian* in Kelabit (Blust 1993:203).

⁶ This statement may well be refined by further research. At the time of writing very little has been published on the languages of central Borneo.

In example (13), the initial *i* of *ideh* has elided with the final *i* of *mesti*. Note too, that *mesti* is also an auxiliary. It is not discussed here because it does not occur in other Lundayeh contexts, and it is clearly a word borrowed from Malay.

Amé is the verb 'to go'. As an intransitive verb it occurs in AF marked for imperfective (*amé*) or perfective (*iné*) aspect. Only the *amé* form is attested as an auxiliary. It occurs as an auxiliary with AF verbs to give a future meaning (14), and a similar usage has been noted in Sa'ban, another Kelabitic language.

- (14) *Ieh amé nginat ruma' tau ...*
 he AF/impf-go AF-pull-up house our
 'He is going to pull up our house ...' (folk story)

When *amé* occurs with stative verbs it indicates a process, and means 'to become' (15)–(16). This contrasts with the usage in a Dusunic language such as Kimaragang, and in Timugon Murut where process is indicated by the infix *-um-* (Kroeger 1990:§1.2.6; Brewis 1991a). In Sa'ban, *mai* 'go' occurs in a similar construction with a similar meaning to the Lundayeh form.

- (15) *Don ineh amé mesia'.*
 leaf that go ST-red
 'The leaf is becoming red.' (elicited)
- (16) *Ideh nganet padé di yok-yok amé mekara idi mebatek*
 they AF-wait rice sp RED-slow go ST-mature then ST-pregnant
idi mirat idi melaak.
 then ST-seeds emerge then ST-ripe
 'They wait for the rice to grow, swell, produce seeds and become ripe.'
 (farming customs)

2b *Miek*

A set of affixes present in Lundayeh but whose occurrence has become more restricted in other Kelabitic languages is the stative set *me-* 'present state' and *ne-* 'completed state' (17).

- (17) *Lati' ku na neseb ngeceku ieh mebaa'.⁷*
 farm my neg ST/pf-burn because it ST/impf-wet
 'My farm did not burn off (properly) because it was wet.' (elicited)

In Lundayeh the prefix *me-* can also indicate the potentiality or liability of the undergoer to experience the action of the verb root (18)–(19), while the *ne-* prefix can indicate that the action was involuntary or accidental (22b). In this respect the Lundayeh prefixes have similarities with Tagalog *ma-*, *maka-* and *na-*, *naka-* prefixes (Dell 1984:176–177); with *o-*,

⁷ Compare (17) with the following sentences in which (a) is a UF construction, (b) is an AF construction:

- (a) *Lati ku na iseb(ku) ngeceku ieh mebaa'.*
 farm my neg UF/pf-burn (I) because it ST/impf-wet
 'My farm was not burnt off (by me) because it was wet.' (i.e. I did not even start to burn off).
- (b) *Na uih nengeseb lati kidi ngeceku ieh mebaa'.*
 neg I(focus) pf/AF-burn farm my-sp because it ST/impf-wet
 'I (deliberately) did not burn off my farm because it was wet.'

oko- and *no-*, *noko-* prefixes in Kimaragang (Kroeger 1990); and with *ma-*, *maka-* and *na-*, *naka-* in Timugon (Prentice 1971:83ff., 1995:390–391; Brewis 1991b).

- (18) *Na ieh mesier⁸ ku mekilu, ken-neh.*
 neg he ST/impf-see because ST/impf-blur according to-he/she
 'He was not able to be seen (visible) because (he) was blurred, they say.'
 (folk story, Timugon)
- (19) *Na merot ku apui, meseb iko napeh.*
 neg play with fire ST/impf-burn you (focus) later
 'Don't play with fire, you'll get burnt/ you'll burn yourself.' (elicited, Kroeger 1990, example (11))

In Lundayeh, verbs with this set of prefixes are always in undergoer focus. In Kimaragang Dusun and Timugon Murut, it is possible to produce an actor focus construction by inserting *-ko-* or *-ka-*, respectively, following the stative prefix, to give *oko-* and *noko-* (Kroeger 1990) and *maka-* and *naka-* in Timugon (Prentice 1971:85–89; Brewis 1991b). A similar combination of prefixes exists in Lundayeh, *meke-*, but it has never been attested in actor focus constructions, only in undergoer focus constructions with an agent, although the agent is often not expressed. Example (20) is in undergoer focus and *ku* indicates the non-focus actor; *-k-* indicates a non-focussed agent.

- (20) *Mekeseb ku ruma' ineh.*
 ST-k-burn I house that
 'I can burn the house.' (implies certainty, e.g. the house is built of wood)

It would appear that the only way to obtain an actor focus construction with a stative verb in Lundayeh is by use of the auxiliary *miek*. Examples (21)–(24) are parallel constructions to show the way *miek* and the stative prefix *me-* are used. Examples (21), (23) are in AF and use the auxiliary *miek*, (22a), (24) are in undergoer focus and use the prefix *me-* (22a) or *meke-* (24). Example (22b) illustrates the use of *ne-*. Examples (23)–(24) were volunteered by the language helper who suggested they might be used following an accident.

- (21) *Uih miek ngekarem alud ineh.*
 I able AF-capsize boat that
 'I am able to/can capsized that boat.' (elicited)
- (22) a. *Mekarem ku alud ineh.*
 ST/impf-capsize I boat that
 'That boat is capsizable by me/I can capsized that boat.' (elicited)
- b. *Alud ineh nekarem ku.*
 boat that ST/pf capsized I
 'The boat was accidentally capsized by me/I accidentally capsized the boat.'
 (elicited)
- (23) *Miek iko ngio kukud mu?*
 able you AF-move leg your
 'Are you able to move your leg?' (elicited)

⁸ The verb root is *sier* 'to see'; the AF/impf form is *nier*.

- (24) *Mekegio mu kukud mu?*
 ST-k-move you leg your
 'Is you leg moveable by you/Are you able to move your leg?' (elicited)

Example (25) uses the same verb root in a simple stative, UF clause:

- (25) *Kayuh ineh megio.*
 tree that ST-move
 'The tree moves/sways (in the wind).' (elicited)

The parallels with Kimaragang and Timugon would suggest that at an earlier stage in the history of Lundayeh, *meke-* may have been an AF form. Certainly, all the examples collected with *meke-* do have an agent, but the agent is never in actor focus. In the Lawas-Trusan area the stative prefix seemed to be less well understood by the younger generation, and (like *pengeh*) examples of the apparent redundant use of *miek* together with *me-* were encountered (26), but further questioning about such examples would establish that *miek* was not necessary to the construction and could be omitted.

- (26) *Kayuh ineh na (miek) meluka ngeceku ieh metueh.*
 post that neg (able) ST-collapse because it ST-strong
 'That post cannot fall over, it is very sturdy.' (elicited, Kroeger 1990, example (10))

Examples were found where *miek* occurred together with a main verb marked for UF in imperfective aspect, as (*a*)*lap-en* in (27). The language helper spontaneously provided examples of two clauses, where the use of the stative prefix *me-* and the use of *miek* plus a verb marked for undergoer focus in imperfective aspect gave different meanings (28)–(29). It would appear that the construction in (29) indicates that the undergoer, the fish, is in an inedible state (compare with (26) where the post is in an uncollapsible state), whereas in (27), (28) the implication seems to be that the actor is able, (or permitted, see (30)–(31)) to carry out the action of the main verb. Such subtle distinctions have already been lost in Sa'ban where *am parap naan* 'not able to be eaten' would occur in both examples.

- (27) *Idi terur luk mesia' ineh miek lapen ku awan mu.*
 then egg rel ST-red that able UF/impf-take for wife you
 'Then (you) can/may take the red egg for a wife.' (folk story)
- (28) *Lawid ini na miek kanen [kan-en] ngeceku ieh melu.*
 fish this neg able UF/impf-eat because it ST-rotten
 'This fish should not be eaten (by you) because it is rotten.' (Kroeger 1990, example (9))
- (29) *Lawid ini na mekan [me-kan] ngeceku ieh metueh.*
 fish this neg ST-eat because it ST-strong
 'This fish is inedible because it is tough.' (elicited)

Other examples with *miek* (30)–(32), all in AF, see also (47):

- (30) *Kareb deléi ineh telubid, na miek telubid pa-sium neh.*
 when man that AF/lie-down neg able AF/lie-down loc-face her
 'When the man lies down he cannot/should not face her.' (marriage customs)

- (31) *Idé-idé na miek améi ngedengan awan neh tanem neneh.*
 RED-who neg able AF-go AF-help husband her bury her
 'No-one can/may go with the husband to help to bury her.' (burial customs)
- (32) *Miek iko nulung negku teh?*
 able you AF-help me also
 'Can you help me too?' (*Upai Kasim*)

No cognates for *miek* are known in Sabah or Sarawak, and the origin of the word is unknown. Sa'ban, for example, has *parap*, Kayan *deng* (Southwell 1990), Iban *tau* (Richards 1981) and Bidayuh *bisaa* (Nais 1988). A glance through Asmah Haji Omar (1983) suggests that many languages of Sabah and Sarawak use a cognate of Malay *boleh* to convey the meaning of 'can' or 'able'.

The *ne-* prefix can imply that the action was accidental. Affixes, similar in form and function, are known in Kimaragang (*no-* and actor focus *noko-*; Kroeger 1990) and in Timugon (*na-* and *naka-*; Prentice 1971:84ff.; 1995:390–391). This prefix does not occur in Sa'ban, whereas in a related Kelabit language it could have been expected. Neither *me-* nor *ne-* occurs in Sa'ban with the meaning of ability or of non-volitional action. To convey the notion of ability, Sa'ban employs the auxiliary *parap*, but there is no auxiliary to convey the notion of non-volitional action. This statement seems to reflect the situation in other languages of central Borneo too.

2c Ara'

Ara' means 'not want'. This auxiliary was not noted in the text data, but it occurred in a very few elicited examples. Too few data are available on which to base constructive comments. The following examples illustrate its use.

- (33) *Bulan nemepet rua' nidi(neh-di), ngeceku ieh ara'*
 Bulan AF/pf-throw container her-sp because she not-want
duken ...
 UF/impf-order
 'Bulan threw down the bamboo container because she did not want to be ordered ... (to fetch water).' (Kroeger 1989, example (11)).
- (34) *Berén ku ieh neneh em ara' ieh.*
 UF/impf-give I it to-him but not-want it
 'I give it to him but he does not want it.' (elicited)

3 The case of aru'

The particular interest of *aru'* is that, unlike the auxiliaries described earlier, it can be used to form a periphrastic undergoer focus construction. Such constructions appear to be rare in Sabah languages. Boutin reports a 'periphrastic passive' in Bonggi which he traces to a development via grammaticalisation of the indefinite and generic substitute word *anu* meaning 'something/somebody' (Boutin 1996). He also notes that in Timugon Murut when *anu* 'what's it' replaces a verb, it takes all the inflectional affixes which would be borne by

the missing verb (Prentice 1981:198),⁹ although there is no suggestion that it forms a periphrastic passive in Timugon.

In Lundayeh, the periphrastic undergoer focus is constructed with the auxiliary verb *aru'* which means 'make' or 'do'. As such, it does not fall into any of the three categories of periphrastic passives listed by Keenan (1985:257–261). When the construction with *aru'* occurs with some intransitive verbs (see (44)–(45)), it can carry a causative or permissive meaning. With other intransitives and with transitive verbs, however, it is clearly an undergoer focus construction.

The verb *aru'* may occur as the head verb of a clause. It then displays the normal range of verb affixation (Table 2). There are dialectal variations in the forms of this verb.¹⁰ Examples of *aru'* used as a main verb are given in (35)–(40). In (35) the verb is affixed for actor focus and imperfective aspect. In (36)–(37) it signals undergoer focus and perfective aspect, in (38)–(40) undergoer focus and imperfective aspect. The undergoer focus, imperfective aspect form of the verb is often used as a polite imperative, as in (39).

- (35) *Idi ideh ngenau' eceh kukud dawan ...*
 then they AF-make one foot tripod
 'Then they make a cooking tripod ...' (burial customs)
- (36) *Awan nidi inau' neh pe-kebing.*
 wife his-sp UF/make he loc-left
 'He placed his wife on his left.' (folk story)
- (37) *Idi ideh nutud edteh ngapak ilu' luun dawan luk inau'*
 then they light one bundle resin on tripod rel UF/pf-make
ratnan bulu' ineh.
 from bamboo that
 'Then they light a bundle of resin on the tripod which was made from
 that bamboo.' (burial customs)

⁹ In this respect Timugon Murut *anu* seems to echo the behaviour of the Lundayeh interrogative *ngudé* 'why', which has been recorded with the following affixation: (AF) *ngudé, nengudé*, (UF) *kinudé, kudén*, (IF) *pingudé, nepingudé*, and (ST) *mekudé, nekudé*.

¹⁰ Phonological processes at work on Kelabitic languages have produced many different forms of this verb. These processes typically affect the first syllable of a disyllabic word, resulting eventually in the loss of that syllable (in three syllable words it is typically the middle syllable that is lost). The original root of the verb 'to make or do' was probably *taru'*, this is shown by the UF/pf forms which occur in some Kelabit dialects as *t-in-aru'* or *s-in-aru'* (*t* alternates with *s* before a high front vowel in some Kelabit dialects). The initial consonant seems to have been generally lost in Lundayeh. The development of the UF/pf form seems to have been: *t-in-aru' > tiaru' > iaru' > yaru' > aru'* (all forms attested, except *iaru'*).

The development of the UF/impf forms is: *rueu > uen > en* [ən] (all forms attested).

The development of the AF/impf forms is more complex. Most Kelabitic dialects simply add the AF/impf prefix *nge-* to the root producing *ng-aru'*. Some Kelabitic dialects have *naru'* suggesting that the *t* of root (*taru'*) has been replaced by the nasal AF prefix which assimilates to the point of articulation of the initial consonant of the root. In some Lundayeh dialects (Kemaloh) the forms *nau'* or *nge-nau'* appear. It looks as though the final vowel has been lengthened and the *r* has been lost, but the UF/impf form (*rueu*), retains *r*. The UF/pf may be *i-nau'* or *t-in-au'* according to the dialect. There is no evidence of *inau'* developing to **iau'* or **yau'*. The stative forms in the Kemaloh dialect are *metau'* and *netau'* which show retention of the initial *t*, but loss of the medial *r*.

- (38) *Kai perigai nekap war idi kayuh the ruen ku babeh.*
 we each AF-look-for rattan and wood also UF/impf-make for carrier
 'We each look for rattan and wood, too, to be made into a carrier [for carrying
 on the back].' (hunting story)
- (39) *Doo' iko ngalap batang sibak uen mu ku apir.*
 good you AF/impf-take log sibak UF/impf-make you for bridge
 'Take a sibak log to use as a bridge.' (folkstory)
- (40) *Irau luk ruen kai bang bulan epat anid-anid laak.*
 gathering rel UF/impf-make we in month four RED-every year
 'The gathering which we hold in April every year.' (story)

In Lundayeh, when this verb is used to form a periphrastic undergoer focus construction, only the imperfective undergoer focus form (*ruen* or *uen*), the perfective undergoer focus form (*inau'* or *tinau'*), and the imperative form (*rua'*) are used. The typical construction in which they occur may be diagrammed as:

inau' /tinau'} + non-focus actor + main verb
ruen/uen}
rua'}

In this construction the auxiliary verb signals the focus of the clause and the main verb, though it still retains its actor focus prefix, is now the unmarked form. Equivalent clauses with a morphological undergoer focus may occur. Examples (41a,b) and (42a,b) illustrate this. In each example (a) is a periphrastic undergoer focus construction and (b) is a morphological undergoer focus.

- (41) a. *Idé ruen mu nier?*
 who UF/make you AF-see
 'Who are you meeting?' (elicited)
- b. *Idé sieren mu?*
 who UF/impf-see you
 'Who are you meeting?' (elicited)
- (42) a. *Uih uen neh mabeh.*
 I UF/make he AF-carry
 'I was carried by him/he carried me.' (elicited)
- b. *Uih binabeh neh.*
 I UF/pf-carry he
 'I was carried by him/he carried me.' (elicited)

The periphrastic undergoer focus was constructed most commonly with *ruen* or *uen* in my data, whereas examples with *inau'* or *tinau'* were comparatively rare. *Ruen* or *uen* were often used in 'impersonal passives', which occurred frequently in texts describing Lundayeh customs. Further research is required to establish when the periphrastic undergoer focus is used in preference to the morphological undergoer focus. One possibility is that it developed in relation to stative (or unaccusative) verbs, such as *anud* 'float'; *tot* 'fear', *bila* 'shatter', *ebheh* 'fall', *karem* 'capsize', *isu* 'change' or *lamuh* 'fat'. These verbs normally take the stative prefix *me-*, they can be made dynamic and transitive by adding *nge-* to the root, but it is often impossible to get the undergoer focus forms (*-in-* or *-en*) with these verbs. In these cases *ruen* or *uen* is used (as in (48)). In Sa'ban, a similar periphrastic undergoer construction

with *aru'* is widely used. The verb forms in Sa'ban are *aru'* and *uen* (*uen* or *an*).¹¹ The periphrastic undergoer focus also occurs in other languages of central Borneo, particularly Kayan, where the morphological undergoer focus survives in only a handful of verbs (Clayre, in press).

Examples of periphrastic undergoer focus constructions with *ruen* or *uen* are given in examples (43)–(50). In (43) the agent is indicated by a pronoun of Set II (*neh*). Examples (44)–(45) are examples with intransitive main verbs; *tudo'* and *rudap* belong to a category of verbs which are unmarked in AF, (indicated by brackets in the examples). Their combination with *ruen* in (44)–(45) produces a causative sense. In examples (46)–(48) the agent ('they' or 'one') has been omitted, and (49)–(50) are examples with *uen*.

- (43) *Kareb ieh amé munu, kudeng inan peh lemulun iput*
 when he go head-hunting if exist still person UF/pf-shoot
neh, ruen neh nguk edheh bau delé ... maya' kiula lemulun
 he make he thread one bead corn follow number person
luk pinaté neh.
 rel UF/pf-kill he
 'When he went head-hunting, if he shot someone with a blowpipe, he would thread a corn bead ... according to the number of people he had killed.'
 (headhunting customs)
- (44) *Rebhu-rebhu demulun ruen tudo' luun burung ineh.*
 RED-sometimes slave UF/impf-make (AF)-sit on heap that
 'Sometimes a slave will be made to sit on the pile (of bridewealth).' (marriage customs)
- (45) *Idi didueh ruen rudap iring taman idi tinan.*
 then they-two UF/impf-make (AF)-sleep beside father and mother
 'Then the two of them [engaged couple] will be made/allowed to sleep beside [her] parents.' (marriage customs).
- (46) *Kareb peneh kuman na ngelepi' kelinan, iamo ruen*
 when finish AF-eat not AF-fold leaves but UF/impf-make
mipin doo'-doo' rangen luun téeng.
 arrange RED-good UF/impf-place on eating mat
 'When (they) have eaten, (they must) not fold the leaves but must arrange (them) carefully and place (them) on the mat used for eating.' (marriage customs)
- (47) *Bang kareb pebunu' na miek nalan se-buleng ngeceku*
 In time head-hunting not able AF-walk alone because
metot ruen ngelalem.
 ST-fear UF/impf-make (AF)-surprise
 'In head-hunting times one could not walk alone for fear of being surprised.' (story)
- (48) *Idi akang ineh ruen ngebheh pekak edho ngeramat.*
 then image that UF/impf-make AF-drop early day gather
 'Then the image will be dropped (through floor of house) early in the morning of the day when everyone gathers together.' (burial customs)

¹¹ The choice of *uen* or *en* [ɛn] seems to depend on dialect.

- (49) *Kareb iko melalid uen neh nedhat iko ne?*
 when you ST-naughty UF/impf-make he AF-beat you emph
 'When you are naughty, will he beat you/will you be beaten(by him)?' (*Kamus*)
- (50) *Uen neh ngerawé peburi' i-Raca di amas ...*
 make he think words the Rajah sp gold
 'He thought of the words of the Rajah about the gold ...' (*Upai Kasim*)

Examples (51)–(52) illustrate the use of *inau'* in a periphrastic undergoer construction.

- (51) *Inau' deh ngisu' ngadan deh ku lun museh*
 UF/pf-make they AF-change name they because people ST-angry
nedeh di.
 to-them sp
 'They changed their name because people were angry with them.' (elicited)
- (52) *Tinau'*¹² *ku ngegher tarub di iamo na kelabil di buro.*
 UF/pf-make I AF-shake blanket sp but not cockroach sp.run-away
 'I shook the blanket but that cockroach did not go away.' (Dell 1984,
 example (27))

The imperative *rua'* is also used to form a periphrastic undergoer focus clause. There are three undergoer focus imperative suffixes known in Lundayeh (-a', -u', and -i), but they are rarely used today. When -a' is suffixed to *aru'* the resulting form is *rua'*. It implies that the action is to be carried out at a distance from the speaker (Clayre 1991). The two examples (53)–(54) were elicited.

- (53) *Rua' ngetot ideh!*
 UF/imp-make AF-fear them
 'Go and frighten them!'
- (54) *Rua' muyuh nganud batang neh!*
 UF/imp-make you-pl AF-float log that
 'Go and float that log away!'

Another verb which appears to behave in a rather similar way to *aru'* is *edhuk* 'to order'.¹³ It has been recorded as a main verb in both Actor focus (imperfective and perfective) and Undergoer focus (imperfective and perfective) constructions. These forms are shown below:

	Actor focus	Undergoer focus
Imperfective	<i>ngedhuk</i> ¹⁴	<i>duken</i>
Perfective	<i>nengedhuk</i>	<i>idhuk</i>

Of the three examples which follow, the first two (55)–(56) were elicited, the third (57) occurs in a text and should be compared with the use of *aru'* in (45). Example (55) illustrates the use of *eduk* as a main verb. Examples (56)–(57) illustrate its use as an auxiliary to form a periphrastic undergoer focus structure.

¹² *Tinau'* is a dialectal variant of *inau'* (see footnote 10).

¹³ Unfortunately, this use of *edhuk* was only noted on the last day of fieldwork, and could not be followed up.

¹⁴ Plain and voiced stops alternate morphophonemically, see Blust (1993:147–148).

- (55) *Uih ngecuk anak kidih amé ruen i-dresser nusok.*
 I AF-order child my-sp AF-go UF/impf-make pnm-dresser AF-inject
 'I told my child to go and get an injection from the dresser.' (Kroeger 1989, example 9a)
- (56) *Duken ku dresser nusok anak kidih.*
 UF/impf-order I dresser AF-inject child my-sp
 'I tell the dresser to give my child an injection/The dresser is instructed by me to inject my child.' (see Kroeger 1989, example 9b)
- (57) *Anak dedhur ineh duken rudap iring taman-tinan neh.*
 child girl that UF/impf-order sleep beside father-mother her
 'A young girl will be told to sleep beside her parents.' (marriage customs)

4 Conclusion

Lundayeh appears to be the most conservative of the Kelabitic languages. It has many features, particularly 'focus', in common with the Philippine-type languages of Sabah, such as Sabah Murut. This study of auxiliaries, however, shows that, as with all the other Kelabitic languages, the overall affixational morphology of Lundayeh is being reduced in the direction of a morphology like that of Malay. In 1991, a study of the use of stative affixes in the Lawas and Trusan area, suggested that the younger generation was less familiar with the subtleties of the system than their elders, and used the auxiliary *miek* more frequently. The periphrastic undergoer focus construction with *aru*' is in use in Lundayeh alongside the morphological undergoer focus construction, but in Sa'ban, another Kelabitic language, the periphrastic structure with *aru*' is more commonly used than the morphological undergoer focus.

A comparative study of the Kelabitic languages is made more difficult by the fact that they cross several political boundaries. Nevertheless, it seems clear that Lundayeh is moving in the same direction as the other Kelabitic languages towards a more isolating type of language structure, and will in time lose more of its Philippine-type features.

References

- Asmah Haji Omar, 1983, *The Malay peoples of Malaysia and their languages*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Blust, Robert, 1993, Kelabit-English vocabulary. *Sarawak Museum Journal* 65:141–226.
- 1997, Ablaut in western Borneo. *Diachronica* 14:1–30.
- 1998, The position of the languages of Sabah. In M.A. Lourdes Bautista, ed. *Pagtanaw: essays in honor of Teodoro A. Llamzon*, 29–52. Manilla: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Boutin, Michael E., 1996, A tale of two passives in Bonggi. Paper presented at the Fourth Borneo Research Council Conference, Brunei, June 1996.
- Boutin, M.E. and I. Pekkanen, eds, 1993, *Phonological descriptions of Sabah languages*. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum.
- Brewis, Richard, 1991a, Timugon Murut verbal semantics. (Unpublished MS.)
- 1991b, Timugon Murut verb morphology. (Unpublished MS.)

- Clayre, Beatrice, 1991, Focus in Lundayeh. *Sarawak Museum Journal* 42:413–434.
- 1996, The changing face of focus in the languages of Borneo. In H. Steinhauer, ed. *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics* No.3:51–88. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- in press, A preliminary typology of the languages of middle Borneo. Paper presented at the Fourth Borneo Research Council Conference, Brunei, June 1996.
- Deegan, James and Robin Usad, 1972, Upai Kasim: a Lun Bawang folktale. *Sarawak Museum Journal* 40–1:107–144.
- Dell, François, 1984, An aspectual distinction in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 22–23: 175–206.
- Forschner, T.A., 1994, *Hoturan di boros Momogun (Rungus): Outline of a Momogun grammar (Rungus dialect)*. Kudat: privately published.
- Harris, A.S. and K. Chapple, 1993, Tagal phonemics. In M.E. Boutin and I. Pekkanen, eds *Phonological descriptions of Sabah languages*, 71–80. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum.
- Hudson, Alfred B., 1978, Linguistic relations among Borneo peoples with special reference to Sarawak: an interim report. In M.D. Zamora, V.H. Sutlive and N. Altsculer, eds *Sarawak: linguistics and development problems. Studies in Third World Societies* 3:1–44. Williamsburg, Virginia: Boswell printing and publishing company.
- Hurlbut, Hope, 1993, Labuk-Kinabatangan Kadazan Phonemics. In M.E. Boutin and I. Pekkanen, eds *Phonological descriptions of Sabah languages*, 47–58. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum.
- Keenan, Edward L., 1985, Passives in the world's languages. In T. Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*, 243–245. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- King Julie K. and John Wayne King, eds, 1984, *Languages of Sabah: a survey report*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- King, John Wayne, 1993, Tombonuwo Phonemics. In M.E. Boutin and I. Pekkanen, eds *Phonological descriptions of Sabah languages*, 97–106. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum.
- Kroeger, Paul R., 1989, Subjecthood in Kimaragang Dusun. (Unpublished MS.)
- 1990, Stative aspect and unaccusativity in Kimaragang Dusun. *Oceanic Linguistics* 29/2:110–131.
- 1993, Kimaragang Phonemics. In M.E. Boutin and I. Pekkanen, eds *Phonological descriptions of Sabah languages*, 31–45. Kota Kinabalu: Sabah Museum.
- Labo Pur, Samuel, 1965, *Kamus Lun Dayeh*. Kuching: Borneo Literature Bureau.
- Nais, William, 1988, *Daya Bidayuh-English dictionary*. Kuching: Persatuan Kesusasteraan Sarawak.
- Pejani' luk mebaruh*, 1962, The Bible Societies in Malaya.
- Prentice, D.J., 1971, *The Murut languages of Sabah*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- 1981, 'Beneficiary' and other semantic functions in Murut. In Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst and Michael Moortgat, eds *Perspectives on functional grammar*, 191–202. Dordrecht: Foris.
- 1995, Timugon Murut. In Darrell T. Tryon, ed. *Comparative Austronesian dictionary: an introduction to Austronesian studies. Part I: fascicle I*: 381–91. New York – Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Richards, Anthony, 1981, *An Iban-English dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Southwell, C. Hudson, 1990, *Kayan-English dictionary*. Kuching: Sarawak Literary Society.

