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Introduction

• Jakarta Indonesian (JI) has several preverbal, periphrastic markers that encode temporal and/or aspectual information.
• The focal point of this talk is one such marker – *(u)*dah – which occurs frequently in colloquial speech.

(1) Pok Ati *udah* lama tinggal di sini? [BTJ-20070513.001]

older.sister PN UDAH long.time stay LOC here

‘(Ati) Have you been living here for a long time?’
Introduction

• What is interesting about this particular marker is that it can occur in multiple different linear positions in an utterance.

(2) Bapak.. bapak.. udah meninggal semua.  
father father UDAH pass.away all  
‘All of my husbands have passed away.’

(3) Sayang ya masuk-nya udah dulu-dulu.  
compassion yes go.in-NYA UDAH before-RED  
‘It’s too bad that we went to the faculty years ago.’

(4) Ya, abis e Lebaran gitu aja udah.  
yes finished FILL PN like.that just UDAH  
‘Yeah, it was done after the Lebaran feast.’
Introduction

- Of the three examples given in (2-4), discussion and analyses of \((u)\text{dah}\)'s function has been limited to the distribution seen in (2). Even then, there lacks a current consensus.

- In previous work, it has been variously glossed as:
  - *already* (Sneddon 2003, 2006; Wouk 1999);
  - the perfect aspect (Connors, Bowden, & Gil 2013; Cole et al 2006);
  - the perfective aspect (Hidajat 2011);
  - the perfect aspect but described as *already* in the text (Tjung 2006);
  - an iamitive (Olsson 2013, Dahl & Wälchli 2016; Dahl 2022).
Introduction

- In this talk, I hope to offer a clearer picture of \((u)\text{dah}\)'s role by examining its function relative to its position in the utterance. Is \((u)\text{dah}\) polyfunctional, like iamitives in other languages?
  - How is this potential polyfunctionality reflected in the syntax?
  - What are these varied functions?
- I discuss three different surface positions – which I refer to as \textit{preverbal}, \textit{postverbal / sentence-medial}, and \textit{sentence-final} – utilizing both conversational data as well as some syntactic diagnostics to explore this.
Introduction

• I utilize two different sources of data in this talk:
  • the Jakarta Field Station Corpus of conversational Jakarta Indonesian (found at https://jakarta.shh.mpg.de/) (Gil and Tadmor 2015)
  • elicitation with native speakers

• A few comments on the glossing conventions used in this talk:
  • Context or speaker comments are often important, so I include this when relevant
  • I provide the reference ID from the written transcription (for corpus work) and of the speaker and date (for elicitation data)
  • I utilize glosses used in the corpus transcription (except for (u)dah)

---

1 Many, many thanks to my speakers Yoel Prokhorus and Memmy Yamin. Any mistakes in interpretation are my own.
Roadmap

1. Introduction
2. Some known basics of (u)dah
   • Its distribution
   • As an iamitive (Olsson 2013)
3. The function of preverbal (u)dah
   • Extending Olsson’s analysis
   • A summary
4. Polyfunctionality of (u)dah
   • u(dah) > NEG =/= NEG > (u)dah
   • Co-occurrence restrictions with downward-entailing quantifiers
   • A restriction of postverbal u(dah)
   • Discourse/interactional functionality of sentence-final (u)dah
   • A summary
5. Concluding thoughts
Some known basics of (u)dah

- JI (u)dah occurs most frequently in a preverbal position, where it either occurs adjacent to the verb (in active or the di-passive), in (9-10), or preceding the agent (in the so-called ‘object voice’, or bare passive (Chung 1976)), as in (11).

(9) Eh udah dilepasin kok.
   EXCL UDAH DI-come.off-IN KOK
   ‘He was released, you know.’

(10) Dia kalo dah jalan-jalan tuh di rumah sodara-nya.
   3SG TOP UDAH walk-RED that LOC house sibling-NYA
   ‘You know, when she walks around in her relative’s house…’

(11) Dina Dagul dah gue umpet-in.
   PN PN UDAH 1SG hide-IN
   ‘Dina, I’ve hidden Dagul.’
Some known basics of \((u)\text{dah}\)

- JI \((u)\text{dah}\) can co-occur with other preverbal auxiliary or modal-like markers, such as \textit{bisa} ‘can’, and negation.

(12) \textbf{Udah} nggak ngerokok lu? [BTJ-080807.0741]

UDAH NEG N-cigarette 2
‘You don’t smoke anymore?’

(13) \textbf{Sampe} kira-kira \textbf{udah} bisa ditinggal ya? [BTJ-20070513.712]

arrive reckon-RED UDAH can DI-leave yes
‘Until it can be left, right?’
(\textit{until the mother of the baby is fit enough to take care of the child by herself})
Some known basics of *(u)dah*

- Note that *(u)dah* can only precede these markers, not follow them:

(14) **Udah** nggak (*udah) ujan.  
UDAH NEG UDAH rain  
‘It’s not raining anymore.’

(15) **Bokap gue udah bisa** (*udah) **pergi ke** Kalimantan.  
father 1SG UDAH can UDAH go LOC PN  
‘My father was able to go to Kalimantan (and he wasn’t able to before).’
Some known basics of \((u)dah\)

- The only work to posit a semantic analysis for \((u)dah\) specifically in JI is Olsson (2013).
- In a 2013 survey study, Olsson posits that \((u)dah\) in JI is an *iamitive*, which he defines a marker that combines features of *already* and the English perfect.

**Figure 1.** Semantic map of Olsson’s proposed iamitive meaning (Krajinović et al 2023)
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Some known basics of (u)dah

- Olsson’s analysis is predominantly based on two features of (u)dah. First, (u)dah contributes a change-of-state meaning when combined with stative predicates, and the result state of the event holds at the time of the utterance.

  Context: Speaker is telling a story about a woman who went crazy after a curse was put on her. Her son comes home to find the housemaid who says…

  (16) ‘Wah, mak lu dah gilak.’
      EXCL mother 2 UDAH crazy
      ‘Oh dear, your mom has become crazy.’

  (17) Temen dia uadh gendut.
      friend 3SG UDAH fat
      ‘Her friend is fat.’
      (speaker comment: she wasn’t fat before but now she is)
Some known basics of \((u)\)dah

- Second, there is a implicature of ‘expectedness’ when using preverbal \((u)\)dah. The following example in (18) is infelicitous as it would require the speaker to expect that they would lose their wallet.

\[
\text{(18) Dompet gue \textbf{(*udah)} ilang. Lu bisa bantu cariin nggak? [YP-051023]}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{wallet} & \text{1SG} & \text{UDAH} & \text{lose} & \text{2} & \text{can help look.for-IN NEG}
\end{array}
\]

‘I lost my wallet! Can you help me look for it?’

\textit{(speaker comment: if you use ‘udah’ here, it means you expected to lose your wallet)}
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The function of preverbal *(u)dah*

- Olsson (2013) uses these facts to identify preverbal *(u)dah* as an iamitive. However, work developed later by Vander Klok and Matthewson (2015) introduced some additional diagnostics (originally developed for Javanese *wis*, which is often connected to *(u)dah*).

- I discuss two of these to eliminate the perfective aspect as a potential analysis for *(u)dah*: compatibility with a habitual interpretation, and the unmarked preferentially interpreted as non-past.
The function of preverbal *(u)*dah

- Markers of the perfective aspect should be incompatible with any imperfective readings (Comrie 1976), including a habitual interpretation. Preverbal *(u)*dah in JI can co-occur with the habitual adverbs *kebiasaan* and *biasanya* ‘usually’. This is unexpected if *(u)*dah were a perfective marker.

(19) **Udah** ke-biasa-an kerja.  
UDAH KE-usual-AN work  
‘She’s just used to working.’  
*(intending to say that working has become her habit)*

(20) **Gue** biasa-nya **udah** sampe rumah jam empat.  
1SG usual-NYA UDAH arrive house hour four  
‘I usually arrive home at 4.’
The function of preverbal \((u)dah\)

- Further, if \((u)dah\) marked the perfective, we might expect that predicates without \((u)dah\) would preferentially be interpreted as non-past reference time. This is not true of JI, where \((u)dah\) is not a prerequisite for a past time interpretation.

  \((21)\) Bikin jacket-nya Teh.  
  make jacket-NYA older.sister  
  ‘I made the coat.’  
  \textit{(referring to when she worked in the garment industry)}

- Similarly to other languages of Indonesia, sentences like (22), when there are no overt temporal or aspectual adverbs, can be interpreted as past, present, or future tense dependent upon the context.
The function of preverbal \((u)\text{dah}\)

- In both the features outlined by Olsson (2013) and the diagnostics laid out by Vander Klok and Matthewson (2015), JI \((u)\text{dah}\) patterns like Javanese \textit{wis}.
- Additionally, Nomoto & Mohd. Farez Syinon (2019) utilized VK&M’s diagnostics with preverbal \textit{sudah/dah} in Standard Malay, and found the same.
Summary of preverbal (u)dah

- VK&M analyze wis as having the semantics of English already following Krifka (2000) (a focus operator that presupposes that the focus is a maximal element among a set of ordered alternatives). N&MFS posit this analysis for SM sudah/dah as well.
- I propose that JI (u)dah in its preverbal position additionally follows this analysis.
### Summary of preverbal (u)dah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Postverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Sentence-final (u)dah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics of <em>already</em> / <em>iamitive</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; neg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; modals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. Concluding thoughts
Polyfunctionality of \((u)dah\)

- At this point, I have summarized:
  - the function of preverbal \((u)dah\), largely based upon previous work;
  - some syntactic constraints on \((u)dah\), based on its interaction with other preverbal markers.
Polyfunctionality of (u)dah

- The question now is whether or not these facts hold for (u)dah when it occurs in other positions: namely, when it occurs either postverbally or sentence-finally.
- I argue that (u)dah does show polyfunctionality, with its function dependent upon its position. I demonstrate this through:
  - Interaction with negation;
  - Co-occurrence restrictions with downward-entailing quantifiers;
  - Certain functionality only being available for preverbal (u)dah;
  - Restrictive discourse functionality of sentence-final (u)dah.
I first turn to (u)dah’s behavior when it co-occurs with negation. I noted earlier that preverbal (u)dah must precede negation, not follow it:

\[(22) \textbf{Udah nggak (}^{*}\text{udah}) ujan.\]

UDAH NEG UDAH rain

‘It’s not raining anymore.’
Negation

- It is possible for *(u)dah* to follow negation, however, when it occurs postverbally. Note that the negator still occurs preverbally in both of these examples.

(23) A: Nah yang pas Dagul ini terakhir. [BTJ-20041101.0639]
NAH REL precise PN this TER-end
‘And Dagul was the last person.’

B: Nggak ketemu *udah*.
NEG KE-meet UDAH
‘We don’t meet him.’
Negation

• It is possible for (u)dah to follow negation, however, when it occurs postverbally. Note that the negator still occurs preverbally in both of these examples.

(24) A: Nggak, saya ga kaya gitu.  
NEG 1SG NEG like like.that
‘I am not like that.’
(telling that he’s not a kind of person who likes to make a fixed price for the customer.)

A: Kecuali orang-orang, saya gak tau dah. 
except person-RED 1SG NEG know UDAH
‘I don’t care if other people do so.’
Negation

• If *(u)dah* occupied the same syntactic position both preverbally and postverbally, we would expect that they would be semantically equivalent, i.e. in both cases, *(u)dah* would scope over negation, like seen in below.

(25) **Udah** nggak ngerokok lu?  
UDAH NEG N-cigarette 2  
“You don’t smoke anymore?”

(26) **Udah** nggak makek se-ragam dia?  
UDAH NEG N-use SE-manner 3  
“He doesn’t wear a uniform anymore.”

• The previous examples, with *(u)dah* postverbally, do not have the interpretation of ‘no longer’ or ‘anymore’ as (25-26) above do. This suggests they occupy different syntactic positions – and negation scopes above postverbal *(u)dah*. 
• I now turn to *(u)dah*'s behavior when it co-occurs with both downward-entailing and non-downward entailing quantifiers.

• This is relevant to the question at hand -
  • Soh & Gao (2008) show that the English *already* may not appear in a sentence with a downward-entailing quantifier. If JI *(u)dah* is to be analyzed as *already*, it therefore should not be able to co-occur with a downward-entailing quantifier.
  • Soh (to appear) demonstrates how CM *dah* can only co-occur with downward-entailing quantifiers in its preverbal position, not its postverbal or sentence-final position.
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- When *(u)dah occurs in its preverbal position in JI, it can co-occur with both downward-entailing quantifiers and non-downward-entailing quantifiers. This is shown below with the DE quantifier *kurang dari* ‘less than’ in (23) and the non-DE quantifier *lebih dari* ‘more than’ in (24).

\[(27)\] Mereka *udah* sampe *kurang dari* tiga jam yang lalu.  
3PL UDAH arrive less than three hour C ago  
‘They arrived less than three hours ago.’

\[(28)\] Mereka *udah* sampe *lebih dari* tiga jam yang lalu.  
3PL UDAH arrive more than three hour C ago  
‘They arrived more than three hours ago.’
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- This is in contrast with the postverbal *(u)dah*, which can only occur with non-downward-entailing quantifiers. This follows CM *dah* (Soh to appear).

(29) *Mereka sampe udah kurang dari tiga jam yang lalu.*

3PL arrive UDAH less than three hour C ago

‘They arrived less than three hours ago.’

(30) Mereka sampe udah lebih dari tiga jam yang lalu.

3PL arrive UDAH more than three hour C ago

‘They arrived more than three hours ago.’
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- Sentence-final \((u)\text{dah}\), however, is deemed unacceptable with both types of quantifiers.

(31) *Mereka sampe kurang dari tiga jam yang lalu udah.  
3PL arrive less than three hour C ago UDAH

‘They arrived less than three hours ago.’

(32) *Mereka sampe lebih dari tiga jam yang lalu udah.  
3PL arrive more than three hour C ago UDAH

‘They arrived more than three hours ago.’
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- This pattern can be seen below with the DE quantifier *aja* ‘only’ as well.
- For Colloquial Malay, Soh (2011, to appear) notes that postverbal *dah* is felicitous with DE quantifiers if there is a prosodic break. This is not true of JI, however; (29) is not possible with or without a prosodic break.

(33) *Dia minum **dah** // dua pil aja.*
3 drink **UDAH** two pill just
‘She’s already taken two of those pills.’

(34) *Dia minum dua pil aja **dah**.*
3 drink two pill just **UDAH**
‘She’s already taken two of those pills.’
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- These facts look similar to the French *déjà*, which can occur postverbally to act as a focus particle (Mosegaard Hansen & Strudsholm 2008):

  (35) Je l’attends [déjà depuis deux heures].

  1 3-wait DEJA since two hour

  ‘I’ve been waiting for him/her for two hours already.’
Downward-entailing quantifiers

- These facts look similar to the French *déjà*, which can occur postverbally to act as a focus particle (Mosegaard Hansen & Strudsholm 2008):

  (35) **Je l’attends [déjà depuis deux heures].**
  1 3-wait DEJA since two hour
  ‘I’ve been waiting for him/her for two hours already.’

  (36) **Mereka sampe [udah lebih dari tiga jam yang lalu].**
  3PL arrive UDAH more than three hour C ago
  ‘They arrived more than three hours ago.’

(Mosegaard Hansen & Strudsholm 2008: 22)
Downward-entailing quantifiers

• But contra French, JI *(u)dah* is restricted in its distribution: its only possible with *(u)dah* preceding the temporal adverbial, not after.

(37) *Mereka sampe lebih dari tiga jam yang lalu udah.*  
3PL arrive more than three hour ago UDAH

‘They arrived more than three hours ago.’
A quick summary

• Both the negation and downward-entailing quantifier facts suggest that preverbal and postverbal *(u)dah* occupy multiple different positions in the syntax.

• JI postverbal *(u)dah* differs from Javanese *wis* – Vander Klok & Matthewson argue that *wis*, on the basis of negation, scopes over negation even when it occurs in a sentence-final position.

• Both preverbal and postverbal JI *(u)dah* function similarly to CM in regards to downward-entailing quantifiers as described by Soh (to appear).
### A quick summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverbal *(u)*dah</th>
<th>Postverbal *(u)*dah</th>
<th>Sentence-final *(u)*dah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics of <em>already</em> / iamitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; NEG</td>
<td>NEG &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; modals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A quick summary

• This further suggests that (u)dah’s function can vary dependent upon its position, and that it can potentially modify more than just the verb or predicate.
• Now, I present some data that show that postverbal (u)dah is more restricted in its interpretation than preverbal (u)dah.
A restriction of postverbal *(u)dah

- One function of preverbal *(u)dah is that it can be used to refute a wrong assumption.

  Context: Someone accuses you of napping all afternoon.

  (38) Gue *(udah) baca tiga buku kok!

  1SG UDAH read three book KOK

  ‘I have read three books!’
  (speaker comment: you need to use ‘udah’ if you want to refute them)
A restriction of postverbal \((u)\)dah

- Postverbal \((u)\)dah in this same context, however, cannot be used to correct a wrong assumption. Instead, it is used in the context of tracking some progress, as in (40).

  Context: Someone accuses you of napping all afternoon.  
  (39) #Gue baca udah tiga buku.  
  1SG read UDAH three book  
  ‘I have read three books’!  
  *(speaker comment: this doesn’t work if you want to refute)*

  Context: Someone asks you how the reading is going for your thesis.  
  (40) Gue \((udah)\) baca \((udah)\) tiga buku.  
  1SG UDAH read UDAH three book  
  ‘I’ve read three books (so far).’
A quick summary

• One of these functions associated with (u)dah – refuting an incorrect assumption – is only available if (u)dah occurs in the preverbal position.

• This does not hold for all functions, however, as both the preverbal and postverbal (u)dah can be used to track progress, as in (40). The interpretation in this example does not vary dependent upon position.

• This could suggest that postverbal (u)dah has a subset of functions of preverbal (u)dah – but this is a very preliminary analysis.
## A quick summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Postverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Sentence-final (u)dah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics of <em>already</em> / <em>iamitive</em></td>
<td>a subset of functions of <em>already</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; NEG &gt; modals</td>
<td>NEG &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing *non-downward-entailing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discourse functionality of sentence-final *(u)dah*

- I have largely avoided the sentence-final *(u)dah* up until this point.
- There is a reason for this – one interesting feature of sentence-final *(u)dah* is that it seems to be quite limited to conversations. Attempts to elicit *(u)dah* in this position were nearly always deemed unacceptable, regardless of context.
Discourse functionality of sentence-final *(u)dah

- In conversations, it occurs frequently. This seems to suggest that sentence-final *(u)dah is discourse-dependent.
- I now turn to a preliminary discussion of the usage of this *(u)dah and its function in discourse.
Discourse functionality of sentence-final (u)dah

- One instance where (u)dah was accepted in elicitation was the following. Importantly, however, it had to be accompanied by rising intonation. Note that there is no difference in interpretation between (41) and (42).

(41) Dia udah tau rincana ini.  
1SG UDAH know plan this
‘S/he already knows the plan.’

(42) Dia tau rincana ini udah.  
1SG know plan this this
‘S/he already knows the plan.’
I argue that sentence-final (u)dah has at least one discourse function: to reiterate, or emphasize, what is being said. Consider the following conversation:
Discourse functionality of sentence-final *(u)* dah

La trus Nenek sehari-hari ngapain di rumah?

*What do you do everyday at home?*

(43) Ya, ya diem-diem aja begini.

yes yes reside-RED just like this

‘Well, I just stay at home doing nothing.’

Kerja apa aja dah.

work what just UDAH

‘Just do anything I can do.’

Iya, iya ngapain aja dah.

yes yes N-what-IN just UDAH

‘Yeah, yeah…I just do anything I can do.’

Bebenah-benah aja dah.

BE-clear.away-RED just UDAH

‘I just put things in order.’

Ngapain gitu.

*I think maybe you have something to do.*

[BTJ-040808.0055]
Discourse functionality of sentence-final *(u)dah*

- In this conversation, *(u)dah* occurs in the sentence-final position and has significant emphasis and rising intonation in the two utterances indicated.
- In each instance, it co-occurs with *aja* ‘just’, which occurs without *(u)dah* in the first utterance, and reiterates the main idea that the speaker doesn’t really do anything at home.
Discourse functionality of sentence-final \textit{(u)dah}

- There is more evidence of sentence-final \textit{(u)dah} used when reiterating or confirming previously mentioned information.

(44) A: Yang merah malah \textit{udah} dijual.

\texttt{REL red even UDAH DI-sell}

‘The red [car] was already sold.’

B: Yang merah jual.

\texttt{REL red sell}

‘You sold the red one.’

A: Merah jual \textit{udah}.

\texttt{red sell UDAH}

‘I sold the red one.’
Discourse functionality of sentence-final (u)dah

• Sentence-final (u)dah can additionally be used in commands.

(45) Beres-beres aja udah.
clean-RED just UDAH
‘Just clean it up.’

(46) Ini aja dah.
this just UDAH
‘Just take this one.’

• It has been noted for some Papuan languages that relevant iamitives can be used to soften commands. It’s not clear if this is possible for (u)dah, perhaps somewhat in part to its co-occurrence with aja in both (45-46).
Discourse functionality of sentence-final \((u)\text{dah}\)

- In fact, sentence-final \((u)\text{dah}\) co-occurs frequently with \textit{aja}.

(47) Kerja apa aja dah.
work what just UDAH
‘Just do anything that I can do.’

(48) Udah, saya makan aja udah.
UDAH 1 eat just UDAH
‘Then I just ate it.’

(49) Nerimakin aja udah.
N-receive-IN just UDAH
‘I just accept it.’
\textit{(referring to accepting her destiny)}
I have outlined a few features of sentence-final \((u)dah\) here but this discussion has been largely preliminary and speculative.

More fine-grained discourse analysis needs to be done to determine what other potential features \((u)dah\) can have when occurring sentence-finally.
One final summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Postverbal (u)dah</th>
<th>Sentence-final (u)dah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>semantics of <em>already</em> / iamitive</td>
<td>a subset of functions of <em>already</em></td>
<td>discourse particle reiteration / emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; NEG &gt; modsals</td>
<td>NEG &gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing non-downward-entailing</td>
<td>*downward-entailing *non-downward-entailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>often accompanied by: rising intonation / aja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Concluding thoughts

- There is still a significant amount to be done here. This work is really only a starting point to determining out the function and analysis of postverbal and sentence-final *(u)dah*.
- What I have determined is that one analysis of *(u)dah* as having the semantics of *already* is not enough to explain the polyfunctionalilty of this marker in JI.
- This work continues in a line of investigating these preverbal markers in languages of Indonesia.
**sudah in Indonesia**

- JI (u)dah is a cotate of *sudah* in Standard Indonesian, and further cognates of it exist in multiple varieties of Indonesian and Malay, as well as other Malayic languages spoken in Indonesia.

  (37) Aku **dah** sampai kat KLCC.
    1sg DAH arrive at PN
    ‘I have arrived at the KLCC.’ (Soh 2011: 1)

  (38) Lia, anto **su** makang.
    look 3SG TMA eat
    ‘Look, he’s already eating.’ (van Minde & Tjia 2002: 297)
"sudah" in Indonesia

- JI (u)dados a cognate of "sudah" in Standard Indonesian, and further cognates of it exist in multiple varieties of Indonesian and Malay, as well as other Malayic languages spoken in Indonesia.

(39) **Sudah** diangkat barang sama orang.  
PFCT already thing accompany person  
‘The things may have already been taken by someone.’  
(Gil 2002: 249)

(40) Inya **udah** mali baju semare’.  
3SG already buy shirt yesterday  
‘I bought a shirt yesterday.’  
(Sommerlot 2020: 93)
sudah in Indonesia

- There has been some discussion of the role and function of this marker in related languages in which some cognate exists:
  - Standard Indonesian (Kaswanti Purwo 1984; Alieva et al 1991; Grangé 2010; Olsson 2013)
  - Standard Malay (Nomoto & Mohd. Farez Syinon 2019)
  - Colloquial Malay (Koh 1990; Soh 2011, to appear)
  - Betawi Malay (Samaniri 2001)
  - Ambonese Malay (van Minde & Tjia 2002)
  - Javanese [wis] (Vander Klok & Matthewson 2015)
Concluding thoughts

- I’ve noted throughout this presentation that some of these findings are compatible with what has been discussed for some of these languages: namely, Javanese (Vander Klok & Matthewson 2015), Standard Malay (Nomoto & Mohd. Farez Syinon 2019), and Colloquial Malay (Soh 2011, to appear).

- However, there does seem to exist some variation among these findings –
  - Javanese notably has a preverbal and sentence-final *wis* but VK&M argue that it functions the same in either position (contra CM and JI).
  - CM postverbal *dah* and sentence-final *dah* occupy the same syntactic position; it is unclear if this is the case in JI, given that sentence-final *(u)dah* is very discourse-dependent.

- Looking at related languages with similar markers allows us to elucidate variation among languages, building towards a more complete analysis of these markers in general.
Iamitives Workshop

What is the role of (su)dah? Insights from JI
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