Negative irrealis clauses in Malay/Indonesian and Sri Lankan Malay infinitives

Peter Slomanson

Abstract

This article concerns establishing a plausible connection between the word *jang*(*an*) in colloquial Malay varieties and *jang-*, a form which negates infinitives, in the diasporic contact variety Sri Lankan Malay. The principal claim is that *jang*(*an*) marks irrealis modality in Southeast Asian Malay varieties, in which it is frequently (optionally) deployed in negative subjunctive-like embedded clauses. A related claim, dependent on the first of the two, is that the irrealis interpretation conveyed by *jang*(*an*) makes it a semantically plausible bridge from a Malay grammar with clausal symmetry to the grammar of Sri Lankan Malay. In Sri Lankan Malay, embedded clauses are frequently non-finite, with infinitives similarly conveying irrealis meaning. Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* is in complementary distribution with the affirmative infinitival prefix *me-*, which is also derived from a marker of irrealis modality (*mau*) in colloquial Southeast Asian Malay varieties.

Keywords

Morphosyntax; language contact; negation; infinitive; modality.

1. Introduction

The goal of this article is to establish a plausible connection between the negator *jang*(*an*) in Southeast Asian Malay varieties and the analogous form

---

Peter Slomanson holds a PhD in theoretical and applied linguistics from the Graduate School of the City University of New York. He has conducted extensive fieldwork on Malay and Portuguese in Sri Lanka, and taught linguistics in the United States, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Finland, where he is a senior lecturer/associate professor in the Faculty of Information Technology and Communication Sciences at Tampere University. His research interests and publications deal with the effects of collective second language acquisition and information structure accommodation on the morphosyntax of contact language varieties in bilingual speech communities, with a frequent focus on the development of Sri Lankan Malay. He has also published on historical Malay influence on Afrikaans, the revitalization of Irish, the history of contact linguistics, and sociophonetic variation in New York Latino English. Peter Slomanson can be contacted at: peter.slomanson@tuni.fi.

jang- in the diasporic contact variety Sri Lankan Malay,[1] in which it negates infinitives.[2] The principal claim is that *jang*(*an*) marks irrealis modality in Southeast Asian Malay varieties, in which it is frequently (optionally) deployed in negative subjunctive-like embedded clauses. The second claim is that the irrealis interpretation conveyed by *jang*(*an*) makes it a semantically plausible bridge from a Malay grammar with clausal symmetry to a Sri Lankan Malay grammar in which embedded clauses are frequently non-finite, with infinitives similarly conveying irrealis meaning. Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* is in complementary distribution with the affirmative infinitival prefix *me-*, which is also derived from a marker of irrealis modality (*mau*) in colloquial Malay. The fact that the infinitival prefix and a negative marker cannot co-occur in Sri Lankan Malay is the generalization of a Dravidian morphosyntactic constraint affecting the form of main verbs in Sri Lankan Muslim Tamil.

In Section 2, I introduce Sri Lankan Malay as a contact language, with a long history of communal bilingualism, particularly with Sri Lankan Muslim Tamil. In Section 3, I open the theme of developing an infinitival construction in a grammar that previously lacked one. In Section 4, I discuss the optimal semantic analysis of the *me-* prefix as a potential bridge from positive irrealis contexts without infinitives to positive infinitival clauses. In Section 5, I introduce Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* as the negative counterpart of *me-*. In Section 6, I discuss how a more nuanced view of the function of *jang*(*an*) in Southeast Asian Malay varieties will help us identify a logical path to the morphological marking of negative infinitival clauses. In Section 7, I discuss the complementary distribution between the two infinitival prefixes in Sri Lankan Malay. In Section 8, I briefly refer to a parallel with Old English, which substituted subjunctives for what appear to be prepositional infinitives. In Section 9, I describe the function of the postposition *nang* in Sri Lankan Malay infinitives, and in Section 10, I summarize the significance of the research presented.

2. Sri Lankan Malay as a contact language

The history of Sri Lankan Malay as an overseas variety spoken among unrelated languages dates back to the mid-seventeenth century, and possibly earlier. It has been characterized as a mixed or converted contact language (Peter Bakker 2000). It differs from creoles in that the majority of the ethnic population continues to speak its original language as its first language, with no documented collective language shift or historical break in transmission. Nevertheless, the language is spoken in a profoundly altered form, whose connections with the grammatical system of the ancestral language,

particularly with respect to syntax and morphosyntax, as well as with respect to discourse pragmatics, are no longer immediately apparent. The language draws the bulk of its lexical inventory, including its inventory of functional items, primarily from Malay (Scott H. Paauw 2004), whereas its syntax and morphosyntax are, in most respects, modelled on the grammars of the ambient languages its speakers have also spoken to varying degrees for nearly four centuries. Those languages are Sri Lankan Muslim Tamil or Shonam (the historical language of Sri Lankan Islam and the first language of most Sri Lankan Muslims), colloquial Sinhala (the language of the island's majority and at present the most widely-used lingua franca in many urban areas), and possibly also Sri Lankan Portuguese (Peter Slomanson 2018b), another local contact variety which was once much more widely-spoken than it is today. This has made Sri Lankan Malay into a divergent Malay variety characterized by object-verb order in unmarked declarative clauses, postpositions rather than prepositions, accusative and dative case marking of noun phrases including dativized subjects, contrastive marking of tense on verbs, agglutination with aspect markers, adjunct clauses headed by participial verbs forms (converbs), and other features that are characteristic of southern South Asian languages generally.

3. The development of an infinitive in a Malay variety

Among all of the above-mentioned changes to the grammar of the Sri Lankan variety of Malay,[3] arguably one of the most remarkable from the perspective of Malay linguistics, is the development of an infinitival construction. The characterization of this process as remarkable follows not just from an obvious contrast with other Malay varieties, but from the relative difficulty of identifying precursors of these infinitives in other Malay varieties. (By contrast, object marking in certain contact varieties such as Manado Malay, to the extent that they were spoken by Indonesian migrants to Sri Lanka, can map to case marking in Sri Lankan Malay, if not in form, then at least in function.) We can treat the development of the infinitive as an example of structural diffusion from the ambient languages in Sri Lanka, each of which features a finiteness contrast, involving tense-marked verbs in opposition to participial adjunct clauses containing converbs and infinitival clauses. We see the converb construction in (1) and (2), with the adjunct clauses containing the converb preceding the main clause containing a (past) tense-marked verb. In those examples, the participial forms (converbs) are in bold, whereas the tense-marked main clause verb is underlined.

---

[3] There is certainly dialect variation across (and often within) Sri Lankan Malay-speaking communities, a fact which is strengthened by the absence in the present period of a diglossic relationship to literary Malay. These communities are spread around the island, many at great distances from each other. Their dialects nevertheless display high levels of mutual intelligibility, whereas their mutual intelligibility with Southeast Asian Malay dialects is very limited. With the exception of a tiny urban elite, present-day Sri Lankan Malay people have had no exposure to standard Malay or Indonesian.

Sri Lankan Muslim Tamil

(1) *Iskul-ukku* **pee-thu**, *tamil* **paad-icci**, *Miflal* *paath-ondu* <u>elludinaan</u>.
     school-ALL   go-PRT   Tamil learn-PRT   Miflal   song-DET   write-PST

     'Having gone to school, (and then) having learned Tamil, Miflal wrote a song (in it).'

Sri Lankan Malay

(2) *Iskul-nang* **as-pi**, *Mulbar* **as-belajar**, *Miflal* *nyanyi-atu* <u>su-tulis</u>.
     school-ALL   PRT-go Tamil PRT-study   Miflal   song-DET   PST-write

     'Having gone to school, (and then) having learned Tamil, Miflal wrote a song (in it).'

It is a reasonable speculation that the mapping of "new" morphosyntactic functions to "old" Malay grammatical morphemes would favour those morphemes that maximize transparency for the speakers, with high semantic correspondence between the old and new forms, when their phonological shapes are identical. Examples of the new constructions are found in (3), which contains an affirmative infinitival complement clause (in square brackets), and (4), which contains a negative infinitival complement clause (in square brackets).

Sri Lankan Malay

(3) *Miflal* [*mera nasi* **me**-*makan*=**nang**] *si-liyat.* AFFIRMATIVE INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION
     Miflal red   rice INF-eat=DAT/ALL PST-try

     'Miflal tried to eat red rice.'

Sri Lankan Malay

(4) *Miflal* [*mera nasi* **jang**-*makan*=**nang**] *si-liyat.* NEGATIVE INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTION
     Miflal red   rice INF-eat=DAT/ALL   PST-try

     'Miflal tried not to eat red rice.'

In (4), the infinitival prefix *me-* found in (3) is replaced by *jang-*. The two forms, *me-* and *jang-*, are in complementary distribution. It is this complementarity, along with the interpretive similarity of the two forms, which makes it helpful to discuss *me-* in the context of analysing *jang-*. They are each other's counterpart in Sri Lankan Malay infinitives, differing only by the feature plus/minus negation.

The diachronic path and the use of Malay resources to instantiate a South Asian construction must still be proposed, in order to provide a plausible picture of what took place in the process of language contact development. Such a reconstruction involves using items and structures in the original vernacular Malay varieties to explain the development of a related, but grammatically divergent construction in a contact language. This might seem to be a self-evident strategy in diachronic modelling, however there is a tendency in the language contact literature to presume that a structure

or linguistic feature found in a model language (that is, Muslim Tamil, or possibly Sinhala) is necessarily drawn directly from that language, and this is particularly characteristic of recent literature on Sri Lankan Malay. It would be preferable to explain why a construction that is morphosyntactically differentiated from what is found in that model language came to be selected by speakers of the contact language (Sri Lankan Malay) in the first place. This is also the case when a change may have competing motivations. In the case we are considering here, it is reasonable to ask whether it was semantically optimal and therefore most plausible for Sri Lankan Malay speakers to select *jang* as a negative infinitive marker because it marks negative imperatives in Southeast Asian Malay varieties or because it marks negative irrealis[4] meaning in Malay complement and adjunct clauses. We will return to the discussion of *jang* in Sections 5 and 6.

4. The *me-* prefix and semantic bridges to the infinitive

The fact that Sri Lankan Malay has a lexical inventory, both open and closed class, drawn from Malay, in contrast with its South Asian morphosyntax, has been the thrust of virtually everything that has been written about the language by linguists over the past three decades, beginning with Adelaar (1991). However, it is worth considering how much of this characterization might be overstated with respect to the grammatical Malayness of Sri Lankan Malay. This entails investigating which features in the language could be treated as grammatically vestigial. It also entails investigating which "new" features could have had "old" features as their functional-semantic bridge to the contact language grammar. With respect to the existence of such a bridge, there have been various claims in the literature on Sri Lankan Malay, in which functional morphology in Sri Lankan Malay is linked with apparent etymological equivalents in Indonesian Malay varieties in ways which are not clearly motivated by the actual semantics of the proposed equivalents. We find this, for example, in the morphology of infinitives. *Me-* in (3) is an example of what has been implausibly analysed by other authors who have attributed the nasal prefix *me-* (whose form is invariable in Sri Lankan Malay) to its phonotactically-conditioned counterpart in Indonesian, under one traditional analysis of what that morpheme's function is, namely: to be a transitivizer in sentences with agentive subjects. This is found, for example, in Ian R. Smith and Scott H. Paauw (2006: 173), according to whom Sri Lankan Malay *me-* "appears to derive formally from the Malay verbal prefix *mĕN-*".[5]

[4] The term irrealis refers to an as yet unrealized, hypothetical future-oriented interpretation of the type typically triggered by subjunctive mood in languages with grammatical devices that trigger this type of interpretation.

[5] Alexander K. Adelaar (1991: 31), in an early preliminary sketch of the characteristics of Sri Lankan Malay, does not comment on the infinitival construction, however he glosses a token of infinitival *me* (transcribed [mə]) as "will", which I consider to be an accurate view of the etymology, as opposed to the *meN-* view. Irrealis modality is future-oriented, referring as it does to unrealized events. However, the English modal "will" is generally emphatic about the realization of a future event and not hypothetical.

These authors also analyse the form as a reduction of the Malay debitive marker *mesti*. That is surprising, given the fact that they include several data examples containing sequences such as *ma-kaasi maau* ('want to give').

(5) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *sini-ka* | *jo* | *me-* | *duuduk* | *maau* | *lorampada* | *sama* | *masi-pii* |
| *Inge* | *taan* | *iru* | *-kk.a oonum* | *niinga* | *ellaar .um* | *poo-g.a* |
| here-LOC | FOC | INF | live- INF | VOL | 2PL | all | DEB go- INF |

maau kata ...[6]   SRI LANKAN MALAY
oonum endu ...   SRI LANKAN MUSLIM TAMIL
DEB   QUT

'Saying "we want to live right here; you all must go" ...' (Smith and Paauw 2006: 173).

The Sri Lankan Malay verbal complex containing an infinitive usually involves the sequence *me*-V_{inf} V_{fin}. The sequence Smith and Paauw cite occurs frequently in natural discourse, with *maau* (*mau*) alternating with the predicate noun *kemauan*, in the same area (Kirinda, Hambantota province, southeastern Sri Lanka) from which my own examples are drawn. The reason why the debitive etymology is unlikely is that *mesti* still exists as a preverbal marker in the dialect area (though the /t/ is usually elided). In that case, *mesti-kaasi maau* is not a possible sequence, because *mesti-kaasi* is a finite main verb and clause-final *mau* and *kemauan* similarly co-occur with infinitives as predicates. The presence in (5) of *masi-pii* rather than *me-pii* is ungrammatical in Sri Lankan Malay, and was apparently mistranscribed. This is suggested by the presence of *me-duuduk maau* earlier in the same sentence, which corresponds with actual native speaker usage. I would argue that pre-verbal *mau*, the irrealis marker derived from a volitive marker, already existed in colloquial Malay varieties and Sri Lankan Malay infinitives are *syntactic* infinitives which co-occur with a finite verb, however semantically they are frequently irrealis in interpretation. In this sense, convergence on the grammars of the Sri Lankan linguistic area is syntactic, because its languages have infinitives, but the interpretation of those infinitives is frequently irrealis.

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(6) *Setidaknya aku minta dia mau menunggu sampai aku kembali.*
at least   1S   ask   3S   IRR   wait   until   1S   return

'At least I ask that s/he wait until I come back.'

(i) *de attu pɔhɔŋ   mɔ   jadi-kiŋ arə   pi*
she one vegetation will grow   going   to

'She's going to grow plants.'

[6] I have only included the grammatically pertinent part of a long example. The omitted part happens to testify to a sad incident in the social history of the community.

From the idiomatic translation in (6), we see a parallel with an (American) English subjunctive sentence, in which the uninflected form of the verb is an indication of its irrealis interpretation. However, the range of predicates which allow for some type of irrealis marking in their complements is not similarly constrained in Malay/Indonesian (7).

Malay/Indonesian

(7) *Setidaknya aku harap dia mau menunggu sampai aku kembali.*
at least   1s   hope 3s IRR wait   until 1s   return

'At least I ask that s/he waits until I come back.'

*'At least I hope that s/he wait until I come back.'

Slomanson (2007) argues, contra Smith and Paauw (2007), that there is no basis for attributing the infinitival prefix in Sri Lankan Malay to the Malay/Indonesian prefix. This argument is based on the actual functional semantics of the Sri Lankan Malay prefix. It occurs most consistently and predictably in irrealis complements, often with purposive meaning, which could be interpreted as subjunctives if they were finite.[7] The presence of *me-* and its allomorphs in Southeast Asian Malay varieties has been linked with telicity. Sri Lankan Malay *me-* is most commonly associated with not yet completed events that may or may not be realized, and that *me-* may not have been an active voice marker at all for early speakers of Sri Lankan Malay. Sri Lankan Malay has features associated with Jakarta Indonesian and Java Malay varieties, as well as (especially phonological) features associated with eastern varieties. The eastern varieties have no morphological voice marking at all. What they do have, in common with Jakarta Indonesian and other Western varieties, is an irrealis marker *mo* from *mau*, which is easily weakened to *me-*. This, I have claimed, is the etymological source for Sri Lankan Malay *me-*. Thomas Conners and Claudia Brugman (2014) demonstrate an aspectual function of the nasal prefix in Jakarta Indonesian, which is entirely distinct from the standard Malay/Indonesian function, in which *me-* is the active or transitivizing counterpart of the passive prefix *di-*. Based on their findings, the nasal prefix is an aspect marker for contrasts such as progressiveness and habituality, as in the contrasting examples in (8) through (10).

Jakarta Indonesian

(8) *Mak cuci piring.* TELIC
Mom wash plate

'Mom washed the dishes.'

---

[7] Haspelmath (1989) treats the allative to purposive to irrealis path as a universal tendency in the development of infinitives. Irrealis semantics will not necessarily be the final stage in the development of an infinitival construction in a given language. In Haspelmath's account of the semantic grammaticization of the infinitive, the final stage is described as realis-factive, the modality of verbs of cognition such as "know".

JAKARTA INDONESIAN

(9) *Mak   nyuci   piring.* HABITUAL
     Mom ASP-wash   plate

     'Mom does dishes.'

JAKARTA INDONESIAN

(10) *Piring-nya di-cuci   mak-nye.* ASPECTUALLY-UNMARKED
     plate- DET PSV-wash mom-DET

     'The dishes were washed by mom.'

The red thread in Conners and Brugman is that all of these interpretations are atelic and the prefix is not present when the interpretation is telic, as in the contrast between (8) and (9). The analogue of *me-* is realized as a palatalized nasal when the first segment of the verb is the affricate [tʃ]. This telicity contrast demonstrates a contrast with standard Malay/Indonesian (contra Smith and Paauw 2007) for a variety, Jakarta Indonesian, more likely to have been spoken in an earlier form by the ancestors of the Sri Lankan Malays than a variety resembling the modern standard language. However the (weak) discernable link between a form of *me-* as an aspect marker and aspect marking in Sri Lankan Malay is only that stative verbs are the one class of verbs that resist both temporal marking and infinitival marking, as stative verbs in (but not limited to) Jakarta Indonesian resist *me-* prefixation. Verbs in this class would be ungrammatical in Sri Lankan Malay were they to bear tense morphology (12) or infinitival morphology (13).

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(11) *Itu   gulputi   Java   tau.*
     DET white person Sri Lankan Malay know

     'That white person knows Sri Lankan Malay.'

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(12) * *Itu   gulputi   Java   a-tau.*
       DET white person Sri Lankan Malay PRS-know

     'That white person knows Sri Lankan Malay.'

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(13) * *Itu   gulputi   nang mulbar me-tau   nang   kemauan.*
       DET white person DAT Tamil INF-know DAT/ALL know

     'That white person wants to know Tamil.'

Ultimately the irrealis feature attributable to *mau* and its phonologically reduced variants in colloquial Malay varieties (*mo*, *me*) corresponds best to the way Sri Lankan Malay infinitives are interpreted by their speakers. Malay *meN-*, the active counterpart of passive *di-* in Malay varieties that have that morphology, does not correspond in a similar manner.

5. Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* as the negation of *me-*

Tense-marked finite Sri Lankan Malay verbs are negated by *tara*, a negator also used in several Southeast Asian Malay varieties. Negative non-finite verbs, as we have seen, are specifically marked by *jang-*. In previous accounts, Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* has been treated as a functional extension of *jang(an)*, the element commonly described as a negative imperative marker, which is found in Malay varieties generally. Its new function in Sri Lankan Malay is perhaps surprising, however its development is nevertheless a logical innovation in a new grammar which has begun to require the differentiation of finite and non-finite clauses.

The presence of explicitly-marked infinitival complements in Sri Lankan Malay is a striking innovation, given the absence of infinitives from Malay in Southeast Asia. The interaction of negation with infinitival complementation is a part of the diachronic puzzle. Sri Lankan Malay negation markers are all derived from Malay forms, but their functions with respect to tense and finiteness patterns follow from clausal contrasts in Sri Lankan languages. In those languages, verbs are finite or non-finite, however, the fact that contrasting finite and non-finite negators are used is a language-specific innovation in Sri Lankan Malay. Paauw (2004) shows that, although the choice of primary negator varies considerably across eastern Malay contact varieties, *jang(an)* is consistently available as a "prohibitive negator" across the varieties he investigated, including Manado Malay, North Moluccan Malay, Kupang Malay, Larantuka Malay, and Ambonese Malay. Moro (2016: 68-69) also treats the Ambonese Malay form simply as a negator of imperatives, but adds that "the negator *jang* can also negate purpose clauses introduced by *supaya* 'so that'", as illustrated in (14). This sentence is in fact an example of non-imperative irrealis *jangan* in an embedded clause.

Ambonese Malay

(14)   *Tikus   ika talinga supaya   jang   dapa dengar gaja   pukol   poro.*
         mouse tie ear   so.that PROH get hear   elephant hit   belly

         'The mouse ties his ears so that it doesn't get to hear the elephant hitting its belly.'

Slomanson (2011) discusses negation morphology in Sri Lankan Malay, comparing it with Sinhala (Indo-Aryan), Shonam/Tamil, and other Dravidian languages. Colloquial Sinhala, for example, has a negation prefix *no-*, which would seem to correspond with *jang-* in Sri Lankan Malay. However, although it is used with infinitives, the feature determining its selection is not non-finite status as such, but non-matrix status. We see this in (15) and (16). In Sinhala, negation is ordinarily post-verbal and triggers the instantiation of focus morphology on the verb. The negated verb is obligatorily in focus. Whereas the Sri Lankan Malay contrast is strictly a finiteness/non-finiteness contrast, the Sinhala contrast strictly reflects matrix/non-matrix status. This is because non-matrix clauses are frequently tense-marked and finite, although they do not and cannot bear conventional negation morphology (the free-standing post-verbal negator *næ*).

Sinhala

(15) *Miflal porondu unaa   [mas   no-ka-nnə].* NEGATION OF NON-MATRIX INFINITIVE
      Miflal promise AUX.PST   meat NEG.NMX-eat-INF

      'Miflal promised not to eat meat.'

Sinhala

(16) [*oyaa   no-ya-nəwa   nam*] *honda-yi.* NEGATION OF NON-MATRIX TENSED VERB
       2s   NEG.NMX-go-PRS if   good-PRD

      '(It's) good if you don't go.'

6. Malay *jang(an)* as a modal

Sri Lankan Malay has three negators for different functions, all of which are present in other varieties. *Tara* is also used in several Southeast Asian Malay varieties, including *inter alia* North Moluccan Malay, and alternating with *seng* and *sondor*, in Ambonese Malay and in Banda Malay (Paauw 2004). Constituent negation (Paauw uses the term contrastive negator) requires *bukan(g)*, also cross-dialectally available, however, in Sri Lankan Malay, this element appears obligatorily to the right of the constituent which it negates.

The claim that non-finite Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* involves the functional expansion of the Malay *jang(an)*, almost invariably described as a negative imperative marker, involves overlooking the question of whether semantically closer potential precursors to the negative infinitive construction might be found in *non-*imperative negation constructions in Southeast Asian Malay varieties.[8]

The non-imperative use of *jang(an)* in complementation in informal varieties is plausibly viewed as a semantic/functional bridge between Southeast Asian Malay and the grammar of Sri Lankan Malay. The relevant negated Malay clauses are not non-finite, but irrealis. The use of *jangan* in non-root irrealis contexts in Malay varieties maps to the Sri Lankan Malay infinitive. Without prosodic evidence, in some predicates it can be difficult to determine whether their apparent complements are actual instances of subordination or quotatives. Object control verbs such as 'tell' (*suruh*), for example, are ambiguous in that sense (17). This is because *jangan lupa bahagia* could be a quoted command or an object control clause in which *mereka* in the matrix clause is the controller. However, the example with *harap* in (18) is unambiguous, because hoping is not a speech act. The third person status of the subject in the embedded clause makes it clear that the interpretation of *jangan* is not imperative, whereas a second person subject without the prosody would be problematic for this analysis. Accordingly, the example

---

[8] Although at present it is not possible to determine the chronology of shifts in speaker evaluation of competing items in the lexicon, a negative imperative function for *jang-* is dispreferred by many speakers, for whom that *jang-* is in competition with *tussa* (from Malay *tak usah,* literally, 'no need', don't). *Tussa*, as is the case in other Malay varieties, can be uttered in sequence with a lexical verb or as a free form. Sebastian Nordhoff (2009: 242) states that his informants preferred the negative imperative construction with *tussa*, regarding the construction with *jang-* as disrespectful.

clearly illustrates the hypothetical original Malay model for the *jang-* infinitive in Sri Lankan Malay.

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(17) *Aku suruh mereka jangan lupa bahagia*. GRAMMATICALLY AMBIGUOUS IN MALAY
1S tell 3PL NEG forget (be) happy
'I tell them they should not forget to be happy.'
'I tell them don't forget to be happy.'

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(18) *Aku harap mereka jangan mengulang cerita itu*. IDIOMATIC AND UNAMBIGUOUS
1S hope 3PL NEG repeat story DET IN MALAY
'I hope they should not repeat that story.' NON-IDIOMATIC IN ENGLISH

The presence of the first person subject *aku* shows that *harap* in the sentence in (18) is a verb with a complement rather than a hortative particle. Sentences of the type exemplified in (18) suggest a bridge to negative infinitival subordination in Sri Lankan Malay. The token of *jangan* in (18) performs a discourse-pragmatic function syntactically and semantically unrelated to the function performed by a negative imperative marker. What if this were simply a negative modal in Malay that yielded negative subjunctive-like predicates? The fact that there is no formal subjunctive in Malay does not preclude the existence of devices conveying subjunctive (that is, irrealis) meaning. In an ethnolectal variety of English, it is possible to say for example:

(19) I want you should not repeat that story.

In that variety, the embedded modal in (19) takes the place of the standard English infinitive in (20), or more colloquially with negation shift (21).

(20) I want you not to repeat that story.

The contrast is not semantic, but syntactic, since the verb "want" does not happen to take finite indicative clausal complements in standard English. The reason this path reconstruction is preferable to one in which *jang(an)*, as a simple negative imperative marker, is claimed to have found a new function is straightforward. The mapping is more plausible when the semantics maps from the older construction to the newer construction. Changes in the functional semantics in addition to the syntactic status of the constituent will have been less economical for speakers. At the same time, hypothesizing that Sri Lankan Malay *jang-* is derived from Malay *jang(an)* is not to say that the negative imperative marker as such is unnecessary and or solely an artefact of a descriptive tradition. In that tradition, an apparent prohibitive/negative imperative marker has no other function, but this need not necessarily

preclude additional functions.[9] Nevertheless, if the meaning of *jang(an)* in all contexts is negative irrealis, as in "may the following not happen", this would enable us to cover the range of utterance types in which *jang(an)* is found in a wide range of colloquial Malay varieties in Southeast Asia. These types are certainly not limited to embedded clause contexts and simple imperatives. One example is a phrase uttered to children as a stern admonition, without actually commanding them not to do something (21).[10]

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(21) *Jangan sampai.*
      NEG   arrive

      'It should not happen.'

The Sri Lankan Malay equivalent of the Indonesian Malay sentence in (22) is as in (23) and (24).

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(22) *Aku harap mereka jangan mengulang cerita itu.*
      1S hope   3PL   NEG   repeat   story DET

      'I hope they don't repeat that story.'

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(23) *Go a-suka   dempada Itu cerita yang tuma-bilang   kata.*
      1S PRS-like 3PL   DET story ACC   NEG.NONPST-say QUT

      'I would like them not to tell the story.' (literally, 'I like that they will not tell the story.')

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(24) *Go a-suka   dempada Itu cerita yang jam-bilang.*[11]
      1S PRS-like 3PL   DET story ACC NEG.NONFIN-say

      'I would like them not to tell the story.'

There is some optionality, but the second construction (24) is the one on which this claim is based. Variation in the selection of *tidak* (and other non-irrealis negators) and *jang(an)* was and is already present in colloquial Southeast Asian Malay varieties.

---

[9] It is actually difficult to find descriptive material in which the irrealis/subjunctive use of *jangan* is described, in spite of how frequent the usage is in the spoken language. There is, however, one reference in James N. Sneddon (1996: 299): "If the verb of the *supaya/agar* clause is negated, either *jangan* or *tidak* can occur. Although use of *tidak* is historically the newer form, it is preferred by many people: *Saya minta supaya saudara tidak/jangan pergi* 'I request that you don't go/I ask you not to go'".

[10] I am grateful to Dominik Besier for this example from usage in his own family.

[11] *Jang-* appears as *jam-* in this example because in the Kirinda dialect, the nasal coda is subject to regressive assimilation from the first segment in the verb stem.

In Sri Lankan Malay, infinitival complementation with *jang* is relatively frequent with subject control predicates, as in (25).

    Sri Lankan Malay

(25)   *Miflal sigaret-pada   jang-minung-nang   a-liyat.*
      Miflal cigarettes-PLU NEG.INF-smoke-INF   PRS-try

      'Miflal tries not to smoke cigarettes.'

A comparable example from colloquial Indonesian is found in (26).

    Malay/Indonesian

(26)   *Aku sama Ariel berusaha jangan kerja   untuk kami sendiri saja.*
      1s   with Ariel try   NEG.EMB work for   1PL self   just

      'Ariel and I try not to just work for ourselves.'

These examples support the claim that *jangan* is more than a negative imperative marker in Malay/Indonesian.

7. The complementarity of *jang-* and *me-*

There is a constraint in Tamil/Shonam which blocks the co-occurrence of negation and tense morphology in finite verbs, a variation of which is found in Sri Lankan Malay as well. However, Sri Lankan Malay has extended the constraint in a number of ways. Most significant for the present discussion is the fact that functional modification of predicates precedes the predicate in Sri Lankan Malay, as is the case in Malay varieties in general. The exception to this is (completive) aspect-marking involving (*h*)*abis*. Post-verbal (*h*)*abis* is also found in Southeast Asian Malay varieties (in Ambonese Malay, for example), however, in Sri Lankan Malay, the post-verbal distribution is limited to finite tense-marked verbs. The process of pre-verbal functional marking in Sri Lankan Malay is delimited by the constraint blocking co-occurrence of *me-* and "*jang-*" in negated infinitives. The generalization is that functional morphemes cannot co-occur in pre-verbal position (Slomanson 2008). I have referred to this as the functional stacking constraint, a language-specific constraint in the grammar of Sri Lankan Malay.[12] Negation of main verbs in Tamil involves the

---

[12] An apparent exception to this is when a finite negation-modal structure (*tara-bole*) appears to the left of a lexical verb. However the lexical verb is itself non-finite then, so that the pre-verbal distribution is due to a syntactic alternation between pre- and post-infinitival positions for that structure.

    Sri Lankan Malay

(i)   *Ince ayang-yang   tara-bole   me-makang (nang).*
     3s   chicken-ACC NEG.FIN-can INF-eat   =DAT/ALL

     'S/he was not able to eat the chicken.'

negation of morphological infinitives, so negation morphology and infinitival morphology do co-occur in Tamil, whereas they do not in Sri Lankan Malay.

Sʀɪ Lᴀɴᴋᴀɴ Mᴜsʟɪᴍ Tᴀᴍɪʟ/Sʜᴏɴᴀᴍ

(27) *Miflal   Kulumbu-kku   poo-ka-v-ille.*
     Miflal   Colombo-ᴅᴀᴛ/ᴀʟʟ   go-ɪɴꜰ-0-ɴᴇɢ

     'Miflal did not go to Colombo.'

Sʀɪ Lᴀɴᴋᴀɴ Mᴀʟᴀʏ

(28) *Miflal   Kulumbu-nang   tara-pi.*
     Miflal   Colombo-ᴅᴀᴛ/ᴀʟʟ   ɴᴇɢ.ꜰɪɴ-go

     'Miflal did not go to Colombo.'

In a potential challenge to the preceding generalization on pre-verbal complementary distribution in Sri Lankan Malay, Nordhoff (2009: 241) speculates that the complementary distribution of *me-* and *jang-* might not necessarily be as it appears. This is based on the observation that the phonological shape that *jang-* takes in the highland ('upcountry') variety of Sri Lankan Malay that he investigated is *jamà-*, which could be a fused form, incorporating *jang-* and *mà-* in that sequence. According to Nordhoff, this is the negation of *asà-* (Slomanson 2006: 147, 2008). As such it is used in subordinate clauses to state that a certain action was not completed before another action took place. *Jamà-* can also be used as a negative imperative. He states that *jang* (the variant form he found) cannot co-occur with the affirmative infinitive *mà-*. This is also true in the Upcountry for *jamà-*, but it might be the case that the second syllable of *jamà-* is actually a reflex of a former infinitive being fused, while the first is the historical form *jangang* (*jangang mà-*V > *jamà-*V).

Nordhoff's analysis is certainly not implausible, given the fact that the coda in *jang-* tends to assimilate to the first segment in the verb stem in rapid speech so that, through co-articulation, the sequence *jang me* could yield the form *jamà-*, likely with gemination of the /m/. This analysis would however not hold for the other regional varieties in which *jamà-* is not an available form. At the same time, with other bound pre-verbal morphology in the same highland variety, we find an epenthetic schwa at the morpheme boundary with the verb. For example, *as-* is a frequent reduced pre-verbal form of *abis-* (from Malay *habis*), a bound participial marker on converbs in Colombo-area Malay. The form *as-* is realized in Nordhoff's data as *asà-*, in which the second vowel is a schwa. At the same time, *jang* is also in complementary distribution with *as-*/*asà-*/*e-* (regional forms of the 'same' participial morpheme), however for

───────────

Sʀɪ Lᴀɴᴋᴀɴ Mᴀʟᴀʏ

(ii) *Ince ayang-yang   me-makang (nang)   tara-bole*
     3s   chicken-ᴀᴄᴄ   ɪɴꜰ-eat   =ᴅᴀᴛ/ᴀʟʟ   ɴᴇɢ.ꜰɪɴ-can

     'S/he was not able to eat the chicken.'

the functional juxtaposition of negation and participial status (*jang-* and *asà-*), there is no fused or compound form available.

In Malay/Indonesian, it is worth considering additional evidence for the negative irrealis-marking function from items which are not verbs. These are examples of *jangan* clauses whose semantics is conditioned by non-verbs functioning as irrealis triggers. In the first two Malay/Indonesian examples, *seharusnya* (29) and *sebaiknya* (30) favour the semantics of *jangan* (and also reinforce it). *Yang penting* (31) is similarly an irrealis trigger.

> Malay/Indonesian
>
> (29) *Jadi seharusnya mereka jangan datang meskipun di-undang.*
>   so   properly   3PL   NEG   come   although   PSV-invite
>   'So they ought not to come even if invited.'

> Malay/Indonesian
>
> (30) *Sebaiknya mereka jangan datang meng-ganggu-nya.*
>   ideally   3PL   NEG   come   act.trans-bother-3S
>   'They should not come and bother him.' ('It would be best if they were to not ...')

> Malay/Indonesian
>
> (31) *Yang penting   mereka jangan lengah   dan fokus di lapangan.*
>   rel   important 3PL   NEG   careless and focus in field
>   'The important thing is they should not be careless and just focus on the field.'

The selection of *jangan* for these examples is not obligatory, but might be favoured. This is a matter for future cross-dialectal quantitative research. The status of these expressions as irrealis triggers is demonstrated by the fact that *jangan* in all of the above examples can straightforwardly be replaced by *mau* with a comparable though non-negative interpretation.

Verbs such as *berusaha* 'try' in (32) and (33) are also irrealis triggers, because the outcome of the proposition in the complement clause cannot be presupposed. For this reason, *liyat* (from Malay *lihat* 'see', meaning 'try') always takes an infinitival complement in Sri Lankan Malay.

> Malay/Indonesian
>
> (32) *Aku sama Ariel berusaha [jangan kerja untuk kami sendiri saja].*
>   1S with Ariel try   NEG   work for 1PL self   just
>   'Ariel and I try not to just work for ourselves.'

> Malay/Indonesian
>
> (33) *Kita selalu berusaha jangan pernah menyerah walau   gagal berkali-kali.*
>   3PL always try   NEG   ever   give up although fail repeatedly
>   'We always try never to give up even if we fail repeatedly.'

Examples such as (34) with *supaya*, *agar,* and *biar* ('so that') also appear with relatively high frequency.

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(34) *Jadi contoh   buat anak-ku juga ya,*   [*biar mereka jangan mengeluh*].
       be   example for   child-1s also okay   CMP 3PL   NEG   complain

'Be an example for my child too then, so that they do not complain.'

That is useful because adjunct clauses are not limited by the syntactic or semantic features of a matrix predicate. A configuration such as *biar mereka jangan* should be completely productive. For example, a predicate such as *tahu* ('know') is unlikely to accept a complement with irrealis *jangan*, because the realization of the content of the *jangan* clause would not be hypothetical or indeterminate in the same way it would necessarily be if the verb were *minta* ('request'), since the speaker has no control over how the addressee will respond to what is being requested.

In practice, there is considerable variation in the extent to which *jangan* is used in the syntactic contexts in which it can occur, at least with respect to semantically and pragmatically suitable embedded clauses (35). However, according to Sneddon (1996) (see footnote 9), the ordinary declarative negator *tidak* and its variants are the newer form in the relevant sentence type. This would suggest that the sentence variant with *jangan* rather than *tidak* could have been the higher frequency construction when Malay-speaking communities were first introduced to Sri Lanka from Batavia.

MALAY/INDONESIAN

(35) *Aku perintahkan mereka untuk tidak/jangan menarik kami ke atas.*
       1s   command 3PL   CMP   NEG   pull   1PL   upward

'I command them not to pull us up.'

8. A SIGNIFICANT CROSS-LINGUISTIC PARALLEL

Slomanson (2018a) hypothesizes that the lexical diffusion of the infinitival construction in Sri Lankan Malay resembles the progression of the same occurrence in late Old English (as in Bettelou Los 2005), in which the subjunctive complements of a greater and greater range of verbs were replaced. This shift resulted in the tendency towards irrealis interpretation of English infinitives which has been described in the syntactic literature (for example, Tim Stowell 1982). It makes sense then to look at the behaviour not just of complement clauses, but also what happens in adjunct clauses headed by complementizers that semantically favour subjunctive-type interpretation (irrealis, hypothetical) without requiring matrix subcategorization. In that case, these would not be dependent on the properties of a particular matrix predicate. When we do this in colloquial Indonesian, using *supaya*, *agar,* or *biar* (or another complementizer meaning 'so that'), we find that *jangan* is a highly frequent negator of embedded verbs.

The embedded clause in (34) does not contain an infinitive, but rather what would likely be a subjunctive in a language with morphological subjunctives. The significance of this is the semantic parallels between subjunctives and infinitives with an irrealis interpretation. Just as Old English went from being a language with morphological infinitives, to a language favouring subjunctives, to a language favoring the new dative-like *to*-infinitive to replace subjunctives, so Sri Lankan Malay has gone from a colloquial Indonesian-like grammar to an areal grammatical model which favours infinitives. This means that the morphosyntactic properties of embedded clauses, to the extent that asymmetries with matrix clauses could be found, were reinterpreted as not just non-root but also potentially non-finite within a linguistic area whose discourse cultures strongly favors finiteness asymmetries.

9. THE FUNCTION OF *NANG* IN *jang*- AND *me*- CLAUSES

There is another respect in which a parallel can be drawn between the development of infinitival complementation in Old English and the apparent infinitival complementation in Sri Lankan Malay, whose lexifier unambiguously lacks a finite/non-finite distinction. The late Old English and Sri Lankan Malay constructions both involve *to*-infinitives seemingly based on adpositional phrases, specifically infinitival to + lexical verb in Old English and lexical verb + infinitival *nang* in Sri Lankan Malay, in which *nang* is also a dative and allative marker (meaning 'to' or 'towards'). However, there is no evidence that these verbs were ever nominalized in Sri Lankan Malay. Los (2005) argues that the apparently dativized forms found in Old English obscure the fact that their actual syntactic status was verbal and that the constituents containing them were clausal. While *nang* is post-verbal, Sri Lankan Malay infinitives simultaneously bear a prefix (*me*-), which only marks infinitival status. Etymologically, as we have seen, this element is irrealis, and is replaced by *jang*- when it is negative. Its interpretation parallels the interpretation of the subjunctives which the English *to*-infinitive progressively replaced. Cross-linguistic comparisons with early stages of well-attested languages can help us to reconstruct the development of under-attested contact languages which lack diachronic corpora and, more specifically, in this particular case, to understand pathways to the development of new complementation strategies in these languages. As it happens, the *nang* form, which is a clitic, is not infrequently deleted.[13] However, it may have played a significant role in the history of the Sri Lankan Malay infinitive. It is used with the positive infinitives with *me*-, as well as with the infinitives negated with *jang*-.

---

[13] With respect to the etymological source, *nang* is used as a preposition in varieties of Javanese, which had considerable numbers of native speakers among the settler from Indonesia. See Daniel Krauße (2017: 39), which includes the following example:

JAVANESE

(42) *Budhal langsóng arèk-'é* **nang** *saf ngarep dhéwé, Mèg.*
    depart directly child-DEF **to** row front SUP Meg

    'She will immediately go to the front row, Meg.'

SRI LANKAN MALAY

(36) *Miflal* [*mera nasi-yang **me**-makan=**nang***] *si-liyat.*
      Miflal   red   rice-ACC   INF-eat=DAT/ALL   PST-try
      'Miflal tried to eat the red rice.'

10. CONCLUSION

The contact language Sri Lankan Malay is often regarded as a complexified language compared with colloquial Malay varieties and also as apparently having little in common with those varieties from the perspective of syntax and morphosyntax. Nevertheless, it can be shown to instantiate properties already present in the older and "simpler" grammar(s), but in different ways. Those ways need to be identified, as does an optimal path from the Southeast Asian grammar(s) to the South Asian contact grammar. In this article, we have examined one feature, infinitival complement and adjunct clauses, with an emphasis on those which are negated by the non-finite negator *jang-*.

These are constructions previously regarded as maximally unrelated to structures in the ancestral Malay grammar(s). By identifying what a sub-type of embedded clause in Malay has in common with the new and "radical" type of embedded clause in the Sri Lankan contact variety, it has been possible to show the unconscious logic and parsimony in the mapping from one complementation (and adjunction) strategy and a more recent one which aligns with structures in other Sri Lankan languages.

This approach has involved not just rethinking potential mappings between the two grammatical systems, but questioning common descriptive assumptions about the function of a negator which is used across a broad range of Malay varieties in Southeast Asia. By describing *jang*(*an*) as simply a prohibitive or negative imperative marker without further elaboration, the syntactic and semantic functions of this marker in these varieties had been obscured. Elaborated description can in fact cover a range of uses, including those in main clause contexts that are non-imperative, in which an addressee need not be present. From this perspective, 'may it not happen that ...' is a more accurate translation than 'don't'. 'Don't' has the disadvantage of masking the subjunctive interpretation of VPs which it modifies. My claim is not that the interpretation or function in Southeast Asian Malay has changed, but that the translation 'don't' and the definition "negative imperative marker" presuppose an analysis based on Western languages which is not accurate. The syntactic contexts in which no imperative function is possible are the evidence for the modal status of the form. Evidence of the diachronic stability of this status, or at least of its antiquity, can be seen in an Old Malay example appearing in Waruno Mahdi (2005: 192).

(37)   *ya **jāṅan** ya ni-knā-i   ni-knā-i   sa=vañak=ña   yaṃ upasargga*
       oh **don't** 3s PASS-hit-APP PASS-hit-APP one=many=3s.GEN ART calamity

       'and **may** he **not** be afflicted by all kinds of calamities'

In spite of the gloss, Mahdi's idiomatic translation makes clear that *jāṅan* is to be interpreted as a negative modal. No other interpretation is possible, given the use of the third person pronoun.

We have seen that colloquial Malay/Indonesian varieties do provide formal means by which to distinguish between declarative and subjunctive-irrealis interpretations of embedded clauses and that, in these formal means, the use of positive *mau/mo/me* and negative *jang*(*an*) has provided the basis for a type of syntactic reorientation which has ultimately brought the variety spoken by the Malays of Sri Lanka closer (though by no means identical to) the grammars of the other languages heard and spoken by them on a daily basis.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC	accusative
ALL	allative
APP	applicative
ART	article
ASP	aspect
AUX	auxiliary
CMP	complementizer
DAT	dative
DET	determiner
FIN	finite
FOC	focus
GEN	genitive
INF	infinitive
IRR	irrealis
LOC	locative
NEG	negative
NMX	non-matrix
NONPST	non-past
P	preposition/postposition
PASS	passive
PRD	predicate
PROH	prohibitive
PRT	participle
PST	past
PSV	passive
QUT	quotative
SUP	superlative
VOL	volitive

1S	first person singular
1PL	first person plural
2S	second person singular
3S	third person singular
3PL	third person plural

REFERENCES

Adelaar, K. Alexander. 1991. "Some notes on the origin of Sri Lanka Malay", in: Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* 1, pp. 23-37. Canberra: Australian National University.

Bakker, Peter. 2000. "Convergence intertwining; An alternative way towards the genesis of mixed languages", in: D.G. Gilbers, J. Nerbonne, and J. Schaeken (eds), *Languages in contact*, pp. 29-35. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Conners, Thomas and Claudia Brugman. 2014. "The event semantic role of the nasal prefix in Jakarta Indonesian", in: I Wayan Arka and N.L.K. Mas Indrawati (eds), *Argument realisations and related constructions in Austronesian languages*, pp. 213-225. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics. [Papers from 12-ICAL, Vol. 2.]

Haspelmath, Martin. 1989. "From purposive to infinitive; A universal path of grammaticization", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 10(1-2): 287-310.

Krauße, Daniel. 2017. "A description of Surabayan Javanese with special reference to its linguistic etiquette". MA thesis, Goethe Universität.

Los, Bettelou. 2005. *The rise of the to-infinitive*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mahdi, Waruno. 2005. "Old Malay", in: Adelaar K. Alexander and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, pp. 182-201. London/New York, NY: Routledge.

Moro, Francesca. 2016. *Dynamics of Ambon Malay; Comparing Ambon and the Netherlands*. PhD thesis, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Moro, Francesca and Peter Slomanson. Forthcoming. "Heritage languages and the study of Malayo-Polynesian diasporas", in: Alexander Adelaar and Antoinette Schapper (eds), *The Oxford guide to the Malayo-Polynesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nordhoff, Sebastian. 2009. *A grammar of upcountry Sri Lanka Malay*. PhD thesis, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

Paauw, Scott H. 2004. "A historical analysis of the lexicon of Sri Lanka Malay". MA thesis, York University, Toronto.

Slomanson, Peter. 2008. "The perfect construction and complexity drift in Sri Lankan Malay", *Lingua* 118: 1640-1655.

Slomanson, Peter. 2011. "Dravidian features in the Sri Lankan Malay verb", in: Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *Creoles, their substrates, and language typology*, pp. 383-409. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Slomanson, Peter. 2018a. "The development of infinitival complementation, with or without language contact", in: Mark Kaunisto and Paul Rickman (eds), *Changing structures; Studies in constructions and complementation,* pp. 197-213. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Slomanson, Peter. 2018b. "Cross-linguistic negation contrasts in co-convergent contact languages, in: Viviane Déprez and Fabiola Henri (eds), *Negation and negative concord; The view from Creoles*, pp. 289-311. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Smith, Ian R. and Scott H. Paauw. 2006. "Sri Lanka Malay; Creole or convert", in: Ana Deumert and Stéphanie Durrleman (eds), *Structure and variation in language contact*, pp. 159-181. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian; A comprehensive grammar*. London/ New York, PA: Routledge.

Stowell, Tim. 1982. "The tense of infinitives", *Linguistic Inquiry* 13 (3): 561-570.