Voice and focus system in Penan and Kenyah languages of East Kalimantan

Antonia Soriente
University of Naples "L'Orientale"
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology-Jakarta
antonial@attglobal.net

1. Introduction

This paper describes the morphosyntactic features of some Borneo languages spoken in East Kalimantan belonging to different branches of the North Borneo phylum, mainly Penan Benalui, Punan Tubu’, Punan Malinau and Kenyah. I present a description of the morphosyntax of Penan Benalui, Punan Tubu’, Punan Malinau and Kenyah languages from naturalistic and elicited data and also use some secondary source data from Kayan and Kayanic languages to shed light on the typological morphosyntactic features of the area for the expression of focus and voice comparing the way grammatical relations are marked and the way actor focus and undergoer focus contrast is expressed.

2. The North Borneo languages

In the following table a classification of these languages according to the most recent version of the Ethnologue is provided to give an idea of the extent of this group and at the same time to discuss the problem of the different subgroupings these languages are considered to belong to and the shortcomings of this classification.

Genealogical classification of North Borneo languages according to the Ethnologue

North Borneo (99)
(1) Melanau-Kajang (11)
   Kajang (6)
   Bukitan [bkn] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Kajaman
   Lahanan
   Sekapan
   Sian
   Ukit
   Melanau (5)
(2) North Sarawakan (53)
   Berawan-Lower Baram (8)
   Bintulu (1)
   Dayic (18)
   Kelabitic
      Kelabit
      Lengilu
      Lun Bawang
      Putoh
      Saʔban
      Tring
   Kayan-Kenyah (25)
   Kayanic (17)
Kayan Proper (8)
Modang (2)
Müller-Schwaner Punan (6)
   Aoheng [pni] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Hovongan [hov] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Kereho [xke] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Punan Aput [pud] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Punan Merah [puf] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Bukat [bvk] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
Murik Kayan (1)
Kenyah (6):
   Kayanic Kenyah (3)
      Kenyah, Wahau
      Long Wat
      Sebop
   Upper Pujungan (2)
      Kenyah, Mainstream
Penan (2)
   Penan, Eastern [pez] (Malaysia (Sarawak))
   Penan, Western [pne] (Malaysia (Sarawak))
Punan Tubu (1) [puj] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
   Rejang-Sajau (5)
      Basap [bdb] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
      Burusu [bgr] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
      Penan, Bah-Biau [pna] (Malaysia (Sarawak))
      Punan Merap [puc] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
      Sajau Basap [sjb] (Indonesia (Kalimantan))
         Punan Sajau
         Punan Basap
      Punan Batu 2
   Sabahan (29)
   Punan Batu 1 [pnm] (Malaysia (Sarawak))

3. Focus in Borneo languages

According to Clayre (1996, 2002) with the exception of some languages, a focus system is present in the languages of Borneo although in a much reduced form and less overtly marked than in the Philippine languages.

Sabah languages are closer to the Philippine type languages with 3 sets of pronouns and nominative, genitive and accusative distinction of nouns to mark the focused and the non focused actors. In other languages of Northern Borneo actor and undergoer focus are marked morphologically and through a difference only in pronoun sets.

Focus marking (only on verbs and occasionally on pronouns) is interrelated with the syntactic and morphological features: the relation between focus and aspect, the role played by verbal semantics and the question of transitivity.

4. Penan Benalui - Western Penan (Sarawak and East Kalimantan)

Penan Benalui is the language of a semi settled group of hunter gatherers living in two main villages of the Pujungan Regency in East Kalimantan (Long Belaka, Long Bena)
counting about 450 people. It is a member of Western Penan and is spread in many villages in Sarawak without contact with each other.

- **Morphology**
  Morphologically Penan Benalui does not have suffixes nor nominal marking.

  It has a set of prefixes sharing almost the same features as in Kenyah and Kayan:
  - MEN- ME- (actor oriented transitive and intransitive verbs)
  - PE- (reciprocal, causative/benefactive, intransitive verbs) (examples 10-11)
  - KE- (future, willingness/modality)
  - ME- (iterative/modality);
  - -IN-/ -EN- infix for passive/resultative (absent in Kenyah and Kayan).

  Completed action in actor focus is marked by the marker *pengah* ‘finished’.

  Penan Benalui has two voices: actor and undergoer voice.
  The affixes that signal voice are ME/-MEN- and –EN-.
  The prefix (ME)N- symbolizes homorganic substitution and is a marker for transitive verbs or actor focus verbs.
  The prefix ME- probably a reflex of the PAN *-*um- whose most evident realization is the verb
  k-um-an ‘eat < kan’ occurs mostly with monosyllables and words starting with vowel. With a number of bases the prefix ME- gives the meaning of an action performed very often so to become an habit. The base has the prefix KE- like mekegen iah ‘he likes to sleep a lot’; mekesep alé koq ‘you like to drink’; mekangéh ‘he keeps on crying’.
  (Examples 1-9)

  The prefix PE- is polyfunctional and marks benefactive and or causative, reciprocal and intransitive. Intransitive verbs can be transitivized by adding nge- or pe- to the root. Sometimes both can apply without a clear distinction between the two like in lubin ‘roll’ ngelubin ‘make roll’, pelubin ‘make roll’.
  Undergoer voice is marked by the –EN- after the initial consonant of the word. If the word starts in vowel or nasal the –EN- is realized in n-.
  There is no marking on nominal arguments but several sets of pronouns mark the difference in voice. The relationships in the clause are signaled by the verb affix and by word order: the non focused core nominal immediately follows the verb.

- **Personal pronouns**
  Penan Benalui has two sets of pronouns. Set I contains free pronouns that mark the pivot of the clause whether it is the actor, the undergoer or the instrument. Set II pronouns tend to occur immediately following a verb, a noun or a function word. They also mark the undergoer in some undergoer voice sentences. The difference between the two sets of pronouns is reduced to the first three persons (and the 3 PL). Pronouns have a dual and a paucal form (from 3 to ten) expressed by the numeral *teleug* following the plural.
  In Penan Benalui few words like kinship terms and body parts have a cliticized element –n similar to set II of other languages and are probably the remnant of an earlier set of genitive and non-focused actor pronouns. Another possible explanation for these fossilized pronouns is that they were borrowed from Kayan languages where the process is still productive. This cliticized element is employed to mark possessive nouns and some verbs in undergoer focus construction.
### Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set I (focused actor)</th>
<th>Set II (non focused actor)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>akeuq</td>
<td>kiq/kéq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>kaau</td>
<td>koq/kuq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>iah, éh</td>
<td>nah, neh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>ami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL.DUA</td>
<td>amuh</td>
<td>amuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL.PAU</td>
<td>mételeu</td>
<td>mételeu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>uleuq</td>
<td>uleuq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL.DUA</td>
<td>tuah</td>
<td>tuah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL.PAU</td>
<td>keteleu</td>
<td>keteleu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kah</td>
<td>kah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL.DUA</td>
<td>kawah</td>
<td>kawah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>ireh</td>
<td>doh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.DUA</td>
<td>rawah</td>
<td>rawah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.PAU</td>
<td>rételeu</td>
<td>rételeu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **pengah akeuq moru**
   PFCT 1SG N-bathe
   ‘I have bathed’

2. **tei ngelanee ireh**
   tei N-lanee ireh
go N-peep 3PL
   ‘they went to peep…’

3. **kuyat kuman parai kég**
   kuyat -um-kan parai kég
   longtail.macaque eat rice.plant 1SG
   ‘the macaque eats my rice plants’

4. **anak kiq menyolu jah batun napun**
   anak kiq MEN-solu jah batu napun
   child 1SG MEN-swallow one seed sand
   ‘my child swallowed a grain of sand’

5. **iah menawai banen**
   iah MEN-tawai banen
   3SG MEN-remember husband
   ‘she remembrs her husband’

6. **koriq koq memodee éh?**
   koriq koq MEN-podee éh?
   why 2SG step.on 3SG
   ‘why do you step on it?’

7. **tamen kiq mematai kaan**
   tamen kiq MEN-patai kaan
   ather 1SG MEN-dead wildboar
   ‘my father killed the wildboar’
Intransitive verbs can be transitivized by adding nge- or pe- to the root. Sometimes both can apply without a clear distinction between the two.

Undergoer voice is marked by the –infix –EN- after the initial consonant of the word. If the word starts in vowel or nasal the –EN- is realized in n-. No marker is required for the agent but if the agent is a singular pronoun, then a member of Set II pronouns is employed. (Examples 12-17).
In few cases, when no –EN- infix is employed but the verb remains in the actor voice, the word order is the only way to distinguish an actor voice from an undergoer voice sentence:

16 bee tenoli koq tong lepek
    water -EN-pour 2SG LOC bamboo
    ‘water was poured inside the bamboo by you’

17 buee noluu jin bawai
    fruit -EN-separate from high
    ‘fruits are taken (separated from the tree) from above’

In few cases, when no –EN- infix is employed but the verb remains in the actor voice, the word order is the only way to distinguish an actor voice from an undergoer voice sentence:

18 padikéq tinen/nen moru
    padi= kéq t-inan N-poru
    younger.sibling=1SG mother-3SG ACT-bathe
    ‘the younger brother was bathed by mother’

An undergoer focus construction with the use of the verb ‘make’ together with a verb in actor voice occurs sometimes. No marker for the agent is expressed but if this is a pronoun, then a member of set II will be employed (Examples: 19-22). This construction occurs in Berawan and in Kelabitic languages.

19 bukui molim tong tilung neuq padi kiq
    bukui N-polim tong tilung neuq padi kiq
    rattan.bag N-hid LOC room -EN-do sibling 1SG
    ‘my bag was hidden by my brother in the room’

20 gelas bilaq neuq kiq
    gelas bilaq -EN-maneq 1SG
    gelas shattered -EN-do kiq
    ‘the glass was shattered by me’

21 kulit kiq melokak neuq péti
    kulit kiq ME-lokak neuq péti
    skin 1SG ME-peel -EN-do heat
    ‘my skin got peeled by the heat’

22 akeuq gaten neuq kinan nyamok
    akeu gaten neuq -EN-kan nyamok
    1SG itchy do -EN-eat mosquito
    ‘I am itchy because I was bitten by a mosquito’

5. Punan Tubu’ - Tubu’ Malinau Mentarang – East Kalimantan

Punan Tubu’ language is spoken by as many as 4000 (former) hunter gatherers in East Kalimantan and include the Punan Tubu’, the Punan Malinau, the Punan Mentarang and the Punan Sekatak or Punan Berusu’, most of them living in a resettlement camp (Respen Sembuak) and some of them on the upper part of the Tubu’ river in the Malinau Regency.

Morphologically Punan Tubu’ does not have suffixes nor nominal marking. It has a set of prefixes sharing the same features as in Penan Benalui and other Borneo languages:
N- ME-(actor oriented verbs transitive and intransitive)
PE (reciprocal, causative/benefactive, intransitive)
KE-(future, willingness/modality)
ME-(iterative/modality)

N- symbolizes homorganic substitution and it signals actor voice.

The prefix ME- probably a reflex of the PAN *-um- whose most evident realization is the verb k-em-an ‘eat’ < kan, occurs in few other verbs like lukau ‘hit’ > lemukau or melukau ‘to hit somebody’ but mostly with monosyllables (me-cak ‘to stab’, me-kan ‘to feed’, me-cik ‘to squeeze lice’) and words starting with vowel.

• NE- indicates perfective aspect or is the realization of-EN- passive
• NYE- signals stative verbs (abun ‘cloud’ -> nyabun ‘be cloudy’) or progressive aspect

PE has the allomorph PÉ- with monosyllables and has multiple the functions of causative, benefactive and reciprocal. Causative can be also obtained in a periphrastic way with the verb menaq ‘do’. (Examples 23-25)

TE- denotes an unintentional or uncontrolled movement, it is not completely productive but a number of verbs occur with this prefix:
tekajing being suddenly taken by shock< kajing ‘shocked’
tekécét ‘suddenly becoming frightened’< kecé’t ‘frightened’
teb’a’ang ‘run one’s head into stone walls by accident’ < *ba’ang

-IN/- -EN- infixs for passive/resultative (absent in Kenyah and Kayan). The infix –EN- is infixed after the first consonant. It is realized as n- in words starting with vowels or nasals
It is very productive and is employed all the time. (Examples 26-30)

Punan Tubu’ has two voices: actor and undergoer voice.
The affixes that signal voice are ME-/N- and –EN-

There is no marking on nominal arguments but presence of several sets of pronouns and relationships in the clause are signaled by the verb affix and by word order: the non focused core nominal immediately follows the verb.

**Personal pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set I</th>
<th>Set II</th>
<th>Set III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>hok</td>
<td>ku</td>
<td>-q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>kou</td>
<td>nhu</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>héén</td>
<td>riin</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL</td>
<td>katou</td>
<td>katou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL.DUA</td>
<td>karoo</td>
<td>karoo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>teroo</td>
<td>teroo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL.DUA</td>
<td>tou</td>
<td>tou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>ketou</td>
<td>ketou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL.DUA</td>
<td>kevo</td>
<td>kevo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>detou</td>
<td>detou/doh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.DUA</td>
<td>iroo</td>
<td>iroo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also Punan Tubu’ has three sets of pronouns displaying more or less the same characteristics as the Penan Benalui, though the difference is only marked in the singular. Set I comprises free pronouns in actor focus. Pronouns in Set II occur in non focus position and function as possessives. This set provides the pronouns that function as agents of undergoer sentences although pronouns from set I also occur. Set III includes possessive pronouns that
are cliticized to the word and appear also as agent of passive verbs like *kinam* -EN-kan=2sg eaten by you, *ayam* possessed by you.

The difference with Penan Benalui is that Punan Tubu’ has set III which includes pronoun cliticization that in Penan Benalui occurs only for few body parts and kinship terms for 3SG. Here it is definitely more productive and applies also to most inalienable possession (body parts and also other belongings like machete, dog and knife) some verbs in undergoer voice: *kina-q* ‘eaten by me’ *kina-m* ‘eaten by you’; *ayeq* ‘possessed by me’ *ayam* ‘possessed by you’.

23 **nak inah leruh tat pu’un kayuh**
   child that fall from tree wood
   ‘the child fell from the tree’

24 **hok peleruh nak inah tat pu’un kayuh**
   1SG PE-fall child that from tree wood
   ‘I made the child fall from the tree’

25 **hok menaq nak inah leruh tat pu’un kayuh**
   1SG N-make child that fall from tree wood
   ‘I made the child fall from the tree’

26 **putiq awoq teniuq unih tubit kinan**
   banana REL -EN-buy earlier already.happened.once -EN-eat
   ‘the banana that was bought earlier has been eaten’

27 **hok seneluh aq**
   1SG -EN-cheat person
   ‘I was cheated by people’

28 **hok nerok keloviq**
   1SG -EN-kiss child
   ‘I was kissed by the child’

29 **bayang ku néngang maléh inéq**
   shirt 1SG -EN-bring yesterday mother
   ‘my shirt was brought by my mother yesterday’

30 **nak-keloviq tenelekan telaq**
   child’ -EN-chase muntjak deer
   ‘the child was chased by the deer’

There is no marking on the agent except if this is a singular pronoun. In this case a pronoun from set 2 is employed except for 3SG. Sometimes the lexeme *inéh* (because) is employed. Unknown agent is simply omitted. (Examples 31-39).

31 **nak inah teniciq héén**
   child that -EN-hit 3SG
   ‘that child was hit by him’

32 **Dollop laq kun woq narung doh**
   Dollop laq kun woq -EN-arung doh
   Dollop get food REL -EN-serve 3PL
   ‘Dollop got the food that had been served’
33 hōk teniciq nūh
   1SG -EN-hit 2SG
   ‘I am hit by you’

34 héēn awoq teniciq inēh ku
   3SG like -EN-hit because 1SG
   ‘he was hit by me’

35 bāvui-bāvui inah awoq teniciq detou
   RED-wildboar that REL -EN-hit 3PL
   ‘those wildboars were hit by them’

36 bāvui inah awoq tenepeluh héēn
   wildboar that REL -EN-spear 3SG
   ‘the wildboar was killed by spear by him’

37 tās inah tenayang ku
   bag that -EN-bring 1SG
   ‘that bag was brought along by me’

38 Dollop tenelekan Mariam
   Dollop -EN-run Mariam
   ‘Dollop was chased by Mariam’

39 Dollop necak aan nuan
   Dollop -EN-stab at road
   ‘Dollop was stabbed in the street’

   Adversative passive can be expressed by the –EN- infix but can also be marked by the
   word bōk ‘affected’ followed by the verb in undergoer voice, but examples with bare verb are
   found as well. (Examples 40-42).

40 hōk tenecun ovoq kāyuḥ
   1SG -EN-heavy trunk wood
   ‘I was fallen over by a tree’

41 nāk inah bōk teniciq Dollop
   1SG that affected -EN-hit Dollop
   ‘the child got hit by Dollop’

42 Petrus bōk cat tat malom aan nuan
   Petrus affected stab from night at road
   ‘Petrus got stabbed in the street last night’

   In some cases the word order signals that it is an undergoer action sentence. (Examples:
   43-45).

43 tās ku luq ku aan tilung
   bag 1SG leave 1SG at room
   ‘my bag I left (was left) in the room’
44 nak inah kan nuh
    child that eat 2SG
‘the child was fed by you’

45 nekan nuh héén unih
    NE-food 2SG 3SG earlier
‘he was given food by you earlier’

Some possibly ambiguous sentences are disambiguated by the use of pronoun set I for the
actor focus and by pronoun set II/III for the non actor/undergoer focus. (Examples 46-48).

46 nekan nuh you nih unih?
    NE-food 2SG chicken here earlier
‘has the chicken been given food by you earlier?’

47 nak inah lukau nuh
    child that hit 2SG
‘that child was hit by you’

48 kun unih kinam
    food earlier -EN-food=2SG
‘the food was given by you earlier’

    In ditransitive constructions the indirect objects are marked by a preposition like nyan
    ‘towards:

49 Dollop ngatuh surat nyan inéq héén (riin)
    Dollop N-send letter towards mother 3SG 3SG.POSS
‘Dollop sent a letter to his mother’

    The correspondent passive sentence can have the two options (50-51) showing that both
direct and indirect object can be promoted to the subject position.

50 surat inah kenatuh Dollop nyan inan riin
    letter that -EN-send Dollop to mother.ref 3SG.POSS
‘that letter was sent by Dollop to his mother’

51 inan héén laq katuh surat inah tat Dollop
    mother.ref 3SG obtain send letter that part Dollop
‘his mother got sent the letter by Dollop’

    Punan Tubu’ marks aspect morphologically in actor voice with the prefix NE- though
sometimes a lexeme belum ‘already’ or tubit ‘already happened once’ can be employed. On
the other hand, Penan Benalui does not express aspect morphologically but only lexically.

6. Kenyah –East Kalimantan and Sarawak

Kenyah is the language used by one of the ethnic groups originally inhabiting the
highlands on either sides of the border between Sarawak and East Kalimantan. This ethnonym
‘Kenyah’ refers to several groups, which ethnically and culturally, as well as according to
their origin stories, are quite different. Several subgroups including Kenyah, Kayan and Punan
are often mixed together because of residential mixing and intermarriage which in turn yields
ethnic and linguistic mixing because of the obvious contacts between groups. According to
Rousseau (1990:17) there are forty Kenyah groups with a total of about 40,000 speakers, spread throughout four Regencies in Kalimantan (Malinau, Bulungan, Kutai and Berau) and also two districts of Sarawak (Baram and Balui). This estimate should probably be revised downwards because it is quite common to include groups whose languages are not directly or closely related to Kenyah within the ethnonym Kenyah. They live at present along a number of rivers in today’s Sarawak (Malaysia) and Kalimantan (Indonesia) in the island of Borneo in particular the Kayan, the Kelai, the Mahakam and their tributaries in East Kalimantan and the Baram and Balui in Sarawak.

- The Kayan-Kenyah subgroup

Based on a previous research (Soriente 2004) and on a series of innovations shared by the languages under investigation Kayan, Kenyah and Penan languages are considered to belong to a subgrouping called Kayan-Kenyah.

- Morphology of Kenyah

The verbal morphology of Kenyah languages is very similar to that of Kayan, Penan and other languages in Borneo in terms of morphotactics (only prefixes) and paradigmatic structure. Kenyah, Kayan and Penan share the same prefixes: (ME)N- for actor orientation, ME- for stative (in a few cases also for iterative), PE- for reciprocal, causative/benefactive and intransitive (and as nominalizer), and lastly KE- for future and irrealis.
Kenyah languages have a similar morphological structure as Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’ with prefixation and no suffixation. They have two sets of pronouns one used as free pronouns that signal the focused actor and the second set has short form pronouns that are used as possessives and occur as clitics after verbs and function forms. Follow pronouns from the Òma Lóngh and Lebu’ Kulit languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Òma Lóngh</th>
<th>Lebu’ Kulit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>aghi</td>
<td>akiq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you SG</td>
<td>ighu</td>
<td>ikuq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>zõ/jõ/nyõ</td>
<td>iê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (excl)</td>
<td>ami</td>
<td>ami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (excl.dual)</td>
<td>mõvõ</td>
<td>mé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (excl.trial)</td>
<td>ami tele</td>
<td>mé teleu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (incl.)</td>
<td>têle</td>
<td>ileu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (incl.dual)</td>
<td>tô</td>
<td>tua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (incl.trial)</td>
<td>êgham tele</td>
<td>televu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you PL</td>
<td>êgham</td>
<td>kam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you (dual)</td>
<td>kavó</td>
<td>kam ué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you (trial)</td>
<td>êgham tele</td>
<td>kam teleu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>éqó</td>
<td>iré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they (dual)</td>
<td>évó</td>
<td>dué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they (trial)</td>
<td>êqó tele</td>
<td>ratelevu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main difference is the lack of an undergoer focus construction marked by affixation such as in the case of Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’ nor the type with ‘make’ construction as in Penan Benalui and other languages. Every time a kind of passive construction was being elicited the main result was the change of word order or sentences where the agent is preceded by the lexeme uben (in Badeng or uban in Lepo’ Tau, obeny in Òma Lóngh, uvan in Lebu’ Kulit) that means ‘trace’ and indicate the perfective action, or the use of the lexeme ko’ on or kè’en that means ‘by, because’. (Examples 52-57).

In general in Kenyah there is no specific passive morphology, but thematic roles are expressed pragmatically or analytically through the word order or the use of words like kè’en ‘by’, in the Òma Lóngh Kenyah.

52 sadin (uben) uvéq ndo
   s-adi-n uben uvéq ndo
   younger.sibling=3SG trace mother bathe
   ‘the younger brother is bathed by mother’   Badeng Kenyah

53 sapai uben amai meli makéq
   sapai uben ama-l N-beli kuma= kéq
   dress trace father N-buy for=1SG
   ‘the dress was bough by father for me’   Badeng Kenyah

54 udoq kayeu daruq íé dulü ka pedeng neng jumé ti o
   mask wood long 3SG people KA PE-stand towards in.front that O
   the statue made of a long piece of wood will be built in front of it   Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

55 un na sang yaq uvan méq neké i’uk kanen méq ti o
   be NA k.o.palm REL UVAN 1PL tied wrap rice 1PLINCL that O
   daun silat yang digunakan untuk membungkus nasi   Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah
56 dulu menesun ta uleu yaq uvan dulu alaq ti iti
people MEN-stab TA head REL UVAN people take that that
people stack the heads that had been cut                        Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

57 ini uvan aseu maat éq
this UVAN dog N-bite 1SG
here I have been bit by a dog                                   Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

58 buaq iti iré tai koq dalem buan
fruit this 3PL go LOC inside container
that fruit was put inside the pocket.                          Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

59 kelunan iti mpei a nai luq pu’un uvan a sakit
person that NEG 3SG come LUQ never UVAN 3SG sick
that person did not come because he was sick                   Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

60 sarik sinak di ntuq íé
y.sibling=1SG mother=1SG DI bathe 3SG
my brother is bathed by my mother                              Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

61 iti aseu uman a
that dog eat 3SG
that was eaten by the dog                                       Lebu’ Kulit Kenyah

62 énó rae òbèny kam negheneke mè’è bo’è re
be voice òbèny 2PL N-tell a story-3SG at that time in the past RE
you told me the story once                                      Òma Lóngh Kenyah

63 engne isi le ngkiny jòteq le, kè’en le mejep te sòngè,
be-NE apparently 1PL bring rice LE by 1PL N-dip LOC water
apparently we brought the rice and we dipped in the water       Òma Lóngh Kenyah

64 kè’en le òmény kajény le meghala ntu ki’i te
by 1PL eat long.time 1PL ME-play bathe there TE
that was eaten by us while we were playing and bathing there    Òma Lóngh Kenyah

65 malèj ncam òbèny é’ó mètó tóq ti’i eng,
iron can òbèny 3PL N-look.for exactly there be
iron could be looked for by them exactly where it was           Òma Lóngh Kenyah

66 be òbèny nyelapangh babé rè’è
if òbèny N-rifle wild.boar that
if the boar was shot at                                           Òma Lóngh Kenyah

67 engne òbèny ómó te zi’i òbèny e nyòrèj
be-NE òbèny dry.field TE that òbèny 3SG N-letter
‘about) our former ricefield was written by her’                 Òma Lóngh Kenyah

68 felanóq òbèny matè kè’en kólé
mousedeer trace N-dead by clouded.leopard
‘the mousedeer was killed by the clouded leopard’            Òma Lóngh Kenyah
69 udek jé kè’en kelònèny nyé metóngh
‘that dog was hit by those people’
Ôma Lóngh Kenyah

70 tele zaq de ngelasij kelighek laminy
three chicken people N-steal LOC-back house
Ôma Lóngh Kenyah

TEN-
This prefix denotes an unintentional or uncontrolled movement. Derived verbs with the
prefix TEN- are the only examples of passive constructions in Ôma Lóngh. The order of the
constituents in the sentence is the only way to stress whether the focus is on the agent or the

tenepè ‘called’ < tepè ‘call’ (but here it could also be interpreted as -EN-tepè
tenaòngh ‘left behind’ (unintentionally) < aòngh ‘place to put things’
tenedengh ‘constituted by’ < dengh ‘standing pole’
tenesèj ‘cut by accident’ < sèj ‘chop’

It is yet to be understood whether this is the relic of the PAN *-in- infix.

71 tenafíengh ki kè’en bazé
TEN-fan 1SG by wind
Ôma Lóngh Kenyah

72 tè.. tè tengkiny ne le méé ce?
go go TEN-bring NE 1PL.EXCL like.that CE
Ôma Lóngh Kenyah

‘we were taken by people like that?’

As for the distribution of structures it is interesting to note that in Kenyah Lebu’ Kulit the
tendency of naturalistic data is for zero focus marking but the order of the constituents plays a
role and therefore the patient has to be located before the agent. On the other hand in elicited
data uvan followed by the agent occurs more often. In Ôma Lóngh the use of òbèny and kè’en
seems more pervasive. It might be interesting to observe the distribution of these two lexemes
and their correspondences in other Kenyah languages and see whether this is the reflex of an
internal subgrouping.

7. Kayan - East Kalimantan and Sarawak

Kayan dialects display three sets of pronouns: free pronouns, short form pronouns that
function as possessives or occur after verbs and function forms to signal non focus actors. The
third set includes pronouns that are cliticized to certain nouns and passive verbs.

What is called in the literature as undergoer construction is basically the use of a particle EN
preceding the pronouns of set II and the verb in the active form. Sometimes the agent is
preceded by the lexeme kenan (by action of).

Clayre, (1974, 1996) interpreted this EN as a cognate of the verb an ‘make, do’. Another
possible interpretation is that is related to the Kenyah form uben that seems to mark the so
called undergoer sentences in Kenyah. The preposition kenan (by action of) is definitely
related to Kenyah ko’on, but is there any other interpretation?

Can it be considered related to the Kenyah form uben, uvan that seems to mark the so
called undergoer focus in Kenyah? If the claim that EN in Kayan is related to uban
/uvan/òbèny in Kenyah then it is clear that the agent marker function of uban is slowly
changing towards that of a preposition to introduce causal sentences. The same thing, but in
less measure seems to occur in Ôma Lóngh for which a larger amount of data was collected.
73 en naq nasaq uma anan
    EN 3SG N-destroy house that
    ‘the house was destroyed by him’    Kayan

74 en naq ngaham haruk anan
    EN 3SG N-capsize boat that
    ‘the boat was capsized by him’    Kayan

75 en naq uk basung men ihaq
    EN 3SG give shirt to 3SG
    he gave the shirt to him        Kayan

76 ihaq uh en dahaq geri di
    3SG PFCT EN 3PL bring DI
    he was brought by them          Kayan

77 kayuq atih en naq lek
    wood that EN 3SG leave
    the wood was left by him        Kayan

78 hiap atih en Anyiq ngaput men’a dih
    chicken that EN Anyiq N-tie a.little.ago DIH
    the chicken was tied up by Anyi a little ago    Kayan

79 ihaq em en kelunan masi
    3SG NEG EN people N-pity
    he is not pitied by man            Kayan

80 en ameq duan nah ihaq
    EN 1PLINCL speak NAh 3SG
    we spoke to him                      Kayan

81 en dahaq ngaput pah ihaq
    EN 3PL N-tie also 3SG
    he too  was tied up by them        Kayan

82 uvaat kiiq an naay mejoot
    clothes 1SG AN mother ME-sew
    my clothes were sawn by my mother   Hwang Tring (Kayanic)

83 uvaat kui an iné ngepat
    clothes 1SG AN mother N-sew
    my clothes were sawn by my mother   Busang/Kayan-Bahau (Kayanic)

84 abeyn kei mé ngepaat
    clothes 1SG mother N-sew
    my clothes were sawn by my mother   Long Gleaat (Kayanic)
8. Punan Malinau

The Punan Malinau (or Segah) count 80 individuals on the Segah River in Berau Regency are related to the Kayanic languages (Segai).

Punan Malinau does not display undergoer focus whatsoever and seems to align more with Kayan, Kayanic and Kenyah languages.

85. *diq koi nhut bupet neh*

   mother 1SG N-sew dress that
   'my mother sewed that dress’

86. *bupet neh diq koi in hut*

   dress that mother 1SG IN sew
   ‘The dress was sewed by my mother’

87. *koi mbop asau*

   1SG N-hit dog
   ‘I hit the dog’

88. *asau in bop ulin co koi*

   dog IN hit sibling little 1SG
   ‘the dog was hit by my brother’

89. *asau ulin co koi bop*

   dog sibling little 1SG hit
   ‘the dog was hit by my brother’

90. *lun tai ngkau tlau lieng jip*

   orang pergi N-steal three CLASS chicken
   ’a thief stole three chickens’

91. *tlau lieng jip in ngkau*

   three CLASS chicken IN N-steal
   ’three chicken were stolen’

92. *lun ngkau in lamwas*

   person N-steal IN die
   ’the thief was killed’

9. Preliminary conclusions

As a conclusion I will try to answer questions on how these languages relate to each other and to other languages in the area in the reflex of the Proto-Austronesian infix -IN- marking simultaneously voice and aspect, how we interpret the lack of the undergoer voice markers in Kenyah and Kayan and whether it is possible to use morphosyntactic features to define subgroupings.

Through the study of these voice systems I am trying to give an answer to some problems related to the classification of these languages, mainly is there any relationship between the languages of hunter gatherers like Penan Benalui, Punan Tubu’ and Punan Malinau?
Although Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’ are clearly Austronesian languages there are many linguistic elements which disprove the hypothesis that both Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’ are Kenyah languages.

Based on morphosyntactic evidence, I argue against such a classification, and demonstrate that Penan and Punan clearly fall outside of the Kenyah Subgroup. In terms of their lexicons, Penan Benalui and Kenyah variants show a closer affinity with each other than either does with Punan Tubu’, however, in terms of morphosyntax, it is Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’ which have a more similar structure. Is there any possibility of unity of hunter-gatherers groups? On the other side, Punan Segah does not display undergoer focus whatsoever and seems to align more with Kayan (and Kenyah) languages. Except for lexical items the relationship to other Punan languages seems more ambiguous. Was the –IN- PAN infixation lost or was it never developed? Is this Punan group just the proof that indeed hunter-gatherers were diverse groups of Austronesians which entered Borneo in different waves or did they totally replace their language with that of the Kayanic agriculturalists?

To return to the initial assumption made by Clayre (1996), the voice system in Bornean languages is much reduced in comparison to the Philippine-type languages. Indeed the languages studied display different systems, a simpler one like Kayan and Kenyah where a very simple morphological process is employed and only personal pronouns and word order play a role, and more complex like Penan Benalui and Punan Tubu’s. Here the use of the –EN- infix to mark the undergoer voice, seem to fall in the middle of this range of voice systems, whereas in contrast Kayan and Kenyah (together with Punan Segah) seem to have lost the system or probably never developed it.

In PAN *–in- marked perfectivity in undergoer voice marking simultaneously voice and aspect (Blust 2002). Punan Tubu’ and Penan Benalui fall in the two term languages but the double function of –in- in the patient focus has retained only voice. Aspect has to be marked by a lexeme (pengah in Penan Benalui and belum in Punan Tubu’).

In conclusion despite the fact that Penan (Benalui and other Penan variants in Sarawak) and Punan Tubu’ is classified within the Kenyah subgroup, from a morphosyntactic point of view seems to share more with languages of lower Baram like Berawan, Kiput and Kelabit than with Kayan and Kenyah.

On the other hand the behavior of focus in Kayan and Kenyah seems much more similar. The uban construction in Kenyah seems to be the counterpart of the en construction of Kayan and use of the lexeme ko’on/kè’en in Kenyah to mark the agent of an undergoer focus construction corresponds to kenan of Kayan.

So what happened to the -EN- infix in Kayan and Kenyah? This original PAN infix seems to have left very scattered traces in few verbal forms in a relatively low number of verbs especially in Òma Lóngh. In the other Kenyah variants and in Kayan there seems to be no trace of it except if we want to consider Kayan lexeme en and Kenyah uban a realization of that infix. Nevertheless in Kenyah word order and pronouns of set II seem to be the preferred way of marking focus in undergoer focus construction. Collection of naturalistic data on Kayan might prove that in Kayan the en construction is only one construction but word order also has a role. This might be another proof of the fact that Kayan and Kenyah language relationship is not based on mere contact.
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