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1. Introduction

The Sasak language is spoken on the island of Lombok (immediately east of Bali, Indonesia) by around 2.7 million speakers, roughly 85% of the population of Lombok, which was recorded as 3,169,050 in 2010. Sasak shows great internal variation, both geographical and social. Its complex linguistic ecology (Austin 2003) includes five ethnolinguistically named ‘dialects’ recognized by native speakers and named for the shibboleth terms for ‘like that-like this’ (i.e. Ngenó-ngené, Nggetó-nggeté, Menó-mené, Kutó-kuté, Meriaq-meriku). These labels do not however reflect fully the extensive geographical variation in phonology, lexicon and morpho-syntax found within Sasak, especially in the areas of clitic pronouns (Austin 1996, 2006), valence-changing processes (Austin 1996, 2000, 2001), and verbal morphology, including the contrast between nasal-prefix verbs and non-nasal-prefix verbs (Austin 2012). There is also a system of speech levels (Austin 2010, Nothofar 2000) where selection among lexical alternatives marks low-mid-high status level of the addressee in relation to the speaker (and a second humble-
Verbs in Sasak are not inflected for tense, aspect or mood categories. All Sasak varieties have pre-verbal auxiliary particles that encode polarity, aspect and mood semantics, and can serve as the host for pronominal enclitics. The lexical forms of these particles differ between varieties but it appears that the semantics of each category is similar. This paper explores the forms and functions of pre-verbal auxiliary particles in Sasak using data from elicitation and an extensive text corpus or narratives and conversations, as well as ‘pear story’ and ‘frog story’ prompted texts.

Another characteristic of Sasak is the occurrence of both nouns in copular-like constructions to express quotative and evidential meanings. Reports of such constructions have not appeared in print for other Indonesian languages; their forms and meanings in Sasak are explored in Section 5 below.

2. Verb forms

The basic unmarked verb form in Sasak occurs as a citation form (e.g., in vocabulary elicitation and dictionaries) and in non-finite contexts where tense/aspect/mood and person cannot be expressed, e.g., as the complement of verbs of wanting.3

(1)  

\[
\text{Aku mélé laló jòk peken} \\
1\text{sg want go to market} \\
\text{‘I want to go to the market’ (Mn, Puyung)}
\]

3 Sasak examples are transcribed following usual Indonesianist practices, except that \(q\) represents glottal stop. Note that \(é\) is a close-mid front vowel, \(è\) an open-mid front vowel, \(ó\) a close-mid back vowel and \(ò\) an open-mid back vowel. References following the English free translation give the dialect and the village name of the speaker – Kt Kutó-kuté, Mn Menó-mené, Mr Meriaq-Meriku, Mu Menu-meni, Ng Ngenó-ngéné. In the examples clitics are separated from their hosts by equals (=) signs, segmentable suffixes or prefixes are separated by hyphens (-), and non-segmentable prefixes are indicated with a period (.) in the glosses. Abbreviations in the glosses are: 1sg – first person singular, 1pl – first person plural, 1ple – first person plural exclusive, 2 – second person, 2a – second person agent, 3 – third person, 3p – third person patient, appl – applicative, art – article, aux – auxiliary, cont – continuous aspect, detr – detransitiviser, imper – imperative, link – linking suffix, loc – locative preposition, neg – negative, nomin – nominaliser, pl – plural, redup – reduplication, rel – relativiser, pass – passive, perf – perfective aspect, proj – projective mood.
Note that unmarked verbs do not express tense distinctions and so can co-occur with adverbs or adjunct prepositional phrases with a range of temporal semantics, such as ônèq ‘earlier today’, baruq ‘just now’, uiq ‘yesterday’, nani ‘now’, bares ‘later’, lèmaq ‘tomorrow’, jam telu ‘three o’clock’, rebó ‘Wednesday’ etc., as in:

(2)  \[\text{Baruq}=k \text{ gati bedait kance nie} \]
    just.now=1sg very meet with 3
    ‘I just met him (a couple of minutes ago)’ (Mn, Puyung)

(3)  \[\text{Aku laló jòk peken lèmaq aru} \]
    1sg go to market tomorrow
    ‘I will go to the market tomorrow’ (Mn, Puyung)

The unmarked verb form is also used to express commands in Sasak; note that the addressee subject of such commands is not normally expressed overtly:

(4)  \[\text{Laló jòk peken} \]
    go to market
    ‘Go to the market!’ (Mn, Puyung)

Unmarked verb forms are also used in hortative sentences where the addressee is normally first person plural (and polite particles like tèh ‘please’ can be included):

(5)  \[\text{Tèh ta laló baq bangket} \]
    please 1pl go allat wet.rice.field
    ‘Let’s go to the rice field’ (Kt, Gangga)

A negative command uses the invariant particle déndéq (néndéq in Mu, néndèq in Kt) plus the unmarked verb form (in that order), as in:

(6)  \[\text{Ah amaq teganang déndéq bélén}=k \text{ uni}=n \]
    ah father name don’t leave.behind=1sg say=3
    \[\text{inaq tegining-ganang, nangis.} \]
    mother name cry
    ‘ “Amaq Teganang, don’t leave me!” said Inaq Tegining-Ganang, crying’ (Mr, Penujaq)
(7) Néndèq laló anak=kò laun te-mpuk=ò tó=ng te-siliq=ò
don’t go child=1sg later pass-hit=2 there=3 pass-scold =2
‘Don’t go my child you will be hurt there, you will be scolded!’
(Mu, Ganti)

(8) Néndèq buang dedóró ónó
don’t throw rubbish that
‘Don’t throw that rubbish!’ (Kt, Gangga)

These particles can be used with a first person plural subject to express negative hortative mood:

(9) Mu=ng meni jaq néndèq=te bait òngkòs ayòh riski ni
then=3 like.this top don’t=1pl take cost let’s wealth this

uni=ng pade
say=3 plural
“If it’s like that let’s not take the fare, this is good luck” they all said.’ (Mu, Ganti)

In Menu-meni there is a polite negative imperative particle kendéq, as in:

(10) Mah cóbaq tegen-ang=kò mah, laguq kendéq
please try hold-appl=1sg please but please.don’t

baé lepas=è
only set.free=3p
‘Here hold it for me but please don’t let it go.’ (Mu, Ganti)

3. Pronouns

In order to continue with investigating the expression of polarity, aspect and mood in Sasak, it is necessary to make a short detour and look at the expression of pronominal categories and functions.

All varieties of Sasak have both free and clitic pronouns, however this is one of the areas of morphosyntax which shows the greatest diversity across varieties (Austin 2003a, 2003b, 2006). Table 1 sets out the pronominal forms
in the main Sasak varieties. Note that in all varieties enclitic pronouns attach to nouns to encode inalienable possession (primarily with lexical items for body parts and kinship), e.g., inaq ‘mother’ inaqk(u) ‘my mother’ inaqmèq ~ inaqdiq ~ inaqbì ~ inaqò ~ inaqm ‘your mother’. Clitic pronouns may also attach to other parts of speech to express pronominal arguments of predicates, and here there are striking differences in the functions of such pronominal clitics between the different regional forms of Sasak.

Table 1: Sasak pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kutó-kuté</th>
<th>Ngenó-ngené</th>
<th>Menu-meni</th>
<th>Menó-mené</th>
<th>Meriaq-meriku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>kó</td>
<td>aku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1plincl</td>
<td>kami</td>
<td>ite</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>ite</td>
<td>ite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1plexcl</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>te</td>
<td></td>
<td>ite</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2masc</td>
<td>kamu</td>
<td>diq</td>
<td>ante</td>
<td>mèq</td>
<td>kamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fem</td>
<td>kamu</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pol</td>
<td>épé</td>
<td>pé</td>
<td>épé</td>
<td>pé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the absence of any other potential host (see Section 3 below), in Ngenó-ngené a pronominal clitic may occur with a verb to express the highest semantic argument in its predicate-argument frame (typically the agent or experiencer if there is one, otherwise the theme). For one-place verbs the pronoun will occur as a proclitic, as in:

(11)  
Ku=laló jòk peken

1sg=go to market

‘I am going to the market’ (Ng, Selong)

If the verb is two-place then the highest argument can appear as a proclitic or an enclitic on the verb. Occurrence as an enclitic expresses a realis situation while occurrence as a proclitic expresses an irrealis situation, as in:

---

4 These are the low speech level forms. The high, honorific and humble forms are identical in all dialects and are discussed in Austin (2010).

5 The element glossed ‘link’ here is a homorganic nasal linker that occurs between roots ending in a vowel and clitics that begin with a stop.
(12)  \textit{Balé} beli-ng\text{=}ku  \\
house       buy-link\text{=}1sg  \\
‘I buy/bought a house’ (Ng, Selong)

(13)  \textit{Balé}  ku\text{=}beli  \\
house       1sg\text{=}buy  \\
‘I will/want to/should buy a house’ (Ng, Selong)

Note that there is a similar correlation between pronominal proclitic and enclitic and a realis/irrealis interpretation of the clause reported for some South Sulwesi languages.

In other Sasak dialects the highest semantic argument of a one-place verb can occur as an enclitic on the verb if there is no other possible host, as in:

(14)  \textit{Laló\text{=}k} jòk peken  \\
go\text{=}1sg to market  \\
‘I am going to the market’ (Mn, Puyung)

In Menó-mené and Meriaq-meriku for two-place predicates the highest pronominal argument (typically an Agent or Experiencer) is expressed as an enclitic on a dummy particle placed in clause-initial position while the second highest pronominal argument (typically a Patient or a Stimulus) appears as an enclitic on the verb, as in:

(15)  \textit{Mu\text{=}k} gitaq\text{=}m  \\
part\text{=}1sg see\text{=}2  \\
‘I saw you’ (Mn, Puyung)

(16)  \textit{Cemòh} lalòq\text{=}n macan cerite\text{=}n, bi\text{=}n kaken anak gagak  \\
pleased very\text{=}3 tiger story\text{=}3 part\text{=}3 eat child crow  \\
\textit{étó} terus  \\
that then  \\
‘The tiger was very pleased, according to the story, and he ate the baby crow then.’ (Mr, Penujaq)
In Menu-meni two-place verbs, in the absence of any other possible host, can bear an enclitic complex that expresses the person-number of the two arguments:6

(17) $\text{Gitag}=\text{kem}$
    $\text{see}=1a\text{>}2p$
    ‘I/we saw you’ (Mu, Ganti)

We are now in a position to further examine the expression of polarity, aspectual and modal categories in Sasak.

4. Auxiliary particles

Sasak has a set of uninflecting elements that precede the predicate and have semantic scope over it, expressing a range of clause level meanings in the areas of polarity (negative), aspect and mood. As Adelaar and Himmelmann (2004:159) point out:

Elements termed auxiliaries are widely attested in descriptions of Western Austronesian languages. Such elements usually convey notions of tense, aspect, mood, negation or manner. Some of them are clearly clitics and hence do not qualify as phonologically independent predicates in multi-predicate constructions. But others are phonologically independent and also often have some other characteristics of independent predicates.

In Sasak these auxiliary particles are phonologically independent words but they have the distribution of clause-level clitics (as argued in Austin 2006). They must precede the predicate and can be in clause-initial position if nothing precedes them, as in:

(18) $\text{Iaq}=k\text{ lalö }\text{jök }\text{peken}$
    $\text{proj}=1sg\text{ go to market}$
    ‘I will go to the market’ (Mn, Puyung)

---

6 For further details see Austin (2003a, 2012) – note that when both first person and second person are involved the singular/plural contrast in the first person is collapsed.
However, if there is material that must occur before the auxiliary particle
(such as a clausal adverb or a fronted topic or wh-phrase) then the auxiliary
particle will occur in second position in the clause (in so-called Wackernagel
position) following the first phrasal constituent, as in:

(21) \textit{Kance} guru=m iaq=k bedait lèmaq aru
with teacher=2 fut=1sg meet tomorrow
‘It’s with your teacher that I will meet tomorrow’
(Mn, Puyung)

If the object of a preposition is questioned then the whole PP is fronted and
the order of preposition and object NP is ‘flipped’ to give [wh-NP–P]pp. The
auxiliary particle may then follow the larger PP constituent or else the initial
NP constituent, as in:

(22) Sai kance=m iaq bedait léq peken?
who with=2 fut meet loc market
‘Who will you meet at the market?’ (Mn,Puyungu)

(23) Sai iaq=m kance bedait léq peken?
who fut=2 with meet loc market
‘Who will you meet at the market?’ (Mn, Puyung)

As mentioned above in Section 2, Sasak varieties have pronominal clitics. In
all dialects auxiliary particles serve as hosts for pronominal clitics that express
the highest semantic argument of a predicate, as in examples (18)-(23) above.
Subordinating conjunctions, adverbial phrases and prepositions can also host
these clitics and if one of these potential hosts precedes the auxiliary particle
then it will carry the pronominal clitic instead, as in (cf. also example (21)):
Subordinate Conjunction

(24) Guru iaq=n tulak malik sèngaq=m mpuk=k
teacher fut=3 return again because=2 hit=1
‘The teacher will come back again because you hit me’
(Mn, Puyung)

Adverbial phrase

(25) Terus=k iaq bedait kance guru nó
then=1sg fut meet with teacher that
‘Then I will meet that teacher’ (Mn, Puyung)

(26) Telu jam=k uah antih=m
three hour=1 prfc wait=2
‘I have waited for you for three hours’ (Mn, Puyung)

Prepositional phrase

(27) Mbé éléq=m tulak
where from=2 return
‘Where did you come back from? (Mn, Puyung)

(28) Mbé kòn=diq ngetóan
where loc=2 N1.ask
‘Where did you ask? (Kt, Gangga)

In the following sections I discuss the forms and semantics of these auxiliary particles.

4.1 Negative polarity

In all dialects of Sasak, except Kutó-kuté, clausal and verbal predicate negation is indicated by the auxiliary particle ndéq (Kt dèq) which occurs before the predicate (recall from Section 2 that negative commands such as example (6) take déndéq). This particle hosts pronominal enclitics, as in:

7 Examples (26) and (27) show fronted and flipped prepositional phrases (cf. (22) and (23) above) with the preposition hosting the pronominal clitic.

8 There is also a negative copula ndaraq ‘not exist’ which occurs clause initially.
The negative can precede and have scope over other auxiliary particles (see 4.2, 4.3), as in:

(31) \( \text{Ndéq} = k \ uah \ gitaq = n \)
    neg=1sg prfc see=3
    ‘I have not seen him yet’ (Mn, Puyung)

(32) \( \text{Ndéq} = k \ taó \ gitaq = ó \)
    neg=1sg can see=3
    ‘I cannot see you’ (Mu, Ganti)

4.2 Aspect

Sasak has two main auxiliary particles with aspectual semantics (Dahl 1985, Chung and Timberlake 1985, Comrie 1976, Frawley 1992) namely \textit{uah} (high level \textit{sampun}) which I propose marks perfect aspect, and \textit{kenyakaq} ~ \textit{kenyengke} ~ \textit{kenyeke} ~ \textit{nyekaq} ~ \textit{nyengke} ~ \textit{nyeke} ~ \textit{nyingke} ~ \textit{nyeke} ~ \textit{jangke} (with forms varying for dialect) which marks continuous aspect (for a similar contrast in Bahasa Indonesia see Sneddon 1996).

The core prototypical meaning of a perfect as laid out in Dahl (1985:133) is expression of some state of affairs in relation to another state of affairs that has relevance to a reference point, typically the present. As Frawley (1992:347) points out, the perfect is: ‘a complex event frame. . . judged as prior to, or temporally up to, a projected reference point’.

According to Dahl, the perfect in English is said to have a very wide range of uses, typically the following (Dahl 1985:132):

- (i) perfect of result (also called ‘stative perfect’)
- (ii) experiential (or ‘existential’)
- (iii) perfect of persistent situation
- (iv) perfect of recent past (also called ‘hot news’ perfect)
Jordan 1998 shows in detail that Sasak *uah* expresses a sub-set of these meanings, namely:

1. *perfect of result*, as in:

\[(33)\quad \text{Uah}=n \quad \text{bace} \quad \text{buku} \quad \text{ni} \quad \text{pfct}=3 \quad \text{read} \quad \text{book} \quad \text{this} \]

‘He has read this book’ (Mn, Puyung)

\[(34)\quad \text{Raje} \quad \text{uah}=n \quad \text{matē} \quad \text{king} \quad \text{pfct}=3 \quad \text{die} \]

‘The king has died’ (Mn, Puyung)

Notice that Sasak does not distinguish what in English would be perfect from pluperfect, in line with the lack of any tense contrast. Thus, *uah* is used in past contexts such as the following:

\[(35)\quad \text{Kenyeye}=k \quad \text{dateng} \quad \text{uiq} \quad \text{uah}=n \quad \text{tulis} \quad \text{due} \quad \text{surat} \quad \text{pfct}=3 \quad \text{write} \quad \text{two} \quad \text{letter} \]

‘When I came home yesterday, he had written two letters.’ (Mn, Puyung)

2. *experience of some situation*, as in:

\[(36)\quad \text{Uah}=m \quad \text{bedait} \quad \text{kance} \quad \text{semetōn}=k. \quad \text{pfct}=2 \quad \text{meet} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{brother}=1\text{sg} \]

‘Have you (ever) met my brother?’ (Mn, Puyung)

As Jordan (1998) points out:

Sasak differs from the Western Austronesian systems described by Dahl, as it does not mark the ‘experiential’ category as independent of Perfect tense [sic. should be aspect – PKA]. According to Dahl, ‘experiential’ is marked in Indonesian, Sundanese and Javanese; however, in Sasak there is no distinction between experiential clauses and other Perfect tense [sic.] clauses

3. *‘hot news’*, as in:

\[(37)\quad \text{Raje} \quad \text{uah}=n \quad \text{dateng} \quad \text{pfct}=2 \quad \text{pfct}=3 \quad \text{come} \]

‘The king has arrived (after being expected for weeks)’ (Mn, Puyung)
Note that the ‘perfect of persistent situation’ is not expressed in Sasak using *uah* but rather requires the quotative construction discussed in Section 5 below, as in:

(38) \[ \text{Raje dateng uni=n pfct=2 come say=3} \]
\[ \text{‘The king has arrived (they say)’} \ (\text{Mn, Puyung}) \]

The auxiliary particle *jangke* (and its dialect variants) expresses a dynamic event which is on-going over an interval which includes a reference point and thus fits with Dahl’s (1985) definition of continuous aspect. Sasak *jangke* is found in all the prototypical contexts for a continuous as laid out in Dahl’s questionnaire (see Jordan 1998). Examples are:

(39) \[ \text{Nie jangke=n tulis surat. cont=3 write letters} \]
\[ \text{‘He is writing letters/a letter.’} \ (\text{Mn, Puyung}) \]

(40) \[ \text{Aku kenyekaq baca buku sekólah} \]
\[ \text{1sg cont read book school} \]
\[ \text{‘I am reading a school book’} \ (\text{Kt, Kandangkao}) \]

Note that in Sasak only dynamic states of affairs can co-occur with *jangke*. It cannot be used with stative predicates.

### 4.3 Mood

There are a number of Sasak auxiliary particles that express modal semantic distinctions, including deontic modality (connoting the speaker’s degree of requirement or commitment to the realization of a proposition expressed by an utterance) and epistemic modality (connoting the degree of certainty a speaker has for the proposition expressed by an utterance).\(^9\) Table 2 sets out the modal items that are found in the current corpus:\(^10\)

---

\(^9\) For evidentiality see Section 5 below.

\(^10\) Most of my data comes from Menó-mené, Menu-meni and Meriaq-meriku speakers. I have not yet been able to check the full set of modals for Ngenó-ngené and Kutó-kuté. Note that Sasak also has the Arabic loan *wajib* ‘must, obligation’ which speakers identify as stronger than *harus* and *mesti*. It appears to be a noun in Sasak and not an auxiliary particle.
Table 2. Sasak Modals

Deontic modals

\( iaq \) (Mn) \(- \ éaq \) (Mu) \(- \ aq \sim jaq \) (Mr) \(- \ gen \sim gin \) (Ng) \(- \ jaga \) (Kt)

‘projective’ (future)

\( harus \) ‘must’
\( mesti \) ‘must’
\( kadi \) (Mu) ‘must’
\( seharus \) ‘should’
\( perlu \) ‘need, necessary’

Epistemic modals

\( taó \) (Mn) \(- \ tau \) (Ng, Kt) \(- \ iniq \) (Mr) ‘can’
\( bau \) ‘can’
\( mau \) ‘can’

We will now discuss and exemplify each of these in turn.

The modal glossed as ‘projective’ shows wide dialect variation in form in Sasak. In semantics it is close to the prototype FUTURE of Dahl (1985:107) in that it expresses intention, prediction and future time reference. It often translates into English as a future, however it seems to have stronger modal semantics than being a pure future tense marker. Examples containing it always have an element of intention or prediction, as in:

**Intention:**

(41) \( Lamun=k \ uah \ beléq \ iaq=k \ beli \ balé \)
when=1sg pfct big proj=1sg buy house
‘When I am older I will buy a big house.’ (Mn, Puyung)

(42) \( iaq=k \ tulis \ surat. \)
proj=1sg write letters
‘I (am about to) write letters’ (answer to question, what are you planning to do right now?) (Mn, Puyung)

**Prediction:**

(43) \( Lamun=n \ iaq \ terimaq \ képéng \ nó \ iaq=n \ beli=an \)
if=3 proj receive money that proj=3 buy=appl.3

\( dedare \ nó \ hadiah \)
girl that present
‘If he receives the money, he will buy a present for the girl.’
(Mn, Puyung)
Counterfactual conditionals also contain the projective mood marker, even when clearly set in the past, as in the following example:

(44)  Andé=n iaq ndéq mauq kèpèng nó uiq  
       counterfac=3 proj neg obtain money=def that yesterday  

       ndéq=n iaq beli=an dedare nó hadiah  
       neg=3 proj buy=appl.3 girl that present  

‘If he had not got the money yesterday, he would not have bought a present for the girl.’ (Mn, Puyung)

Hypotheticals not marked for time also contain the projective:

(45)  Ape-ape iaq=m ketuan iaq=n tedóq dòang  
       whatever proj=2 ask proj=3 silent only  

‘Whatever you ask him, he remains silent.’ (Mn, Puyung)

For this reason, I prefer to analyse this auxiliary particle as a mood marker rather than a future tense marker.

To express necessity there are three modal particles in Sasak that appear to be synonymous, although future research may uncover some semantic differences between them. Examples of their use are:

(46) Nie harus=n tókól  
       3 must=3 sit  

‘He must sit down.’ (Mn, Puyung)

(47) Dende napi=pun juaq=n iaq te-baòs kun lace-lace  
       fine what=also ever=3 proj pass-talk.about loc wedding.place  

       mesti=n pade ke-beléq-an ató harus=n be-standar  
       must=3 pl nom-big-nom or must=3 intr-standard  

‘Whatever fine we will talk about at the wedding place must be the same size or must be standardized.’ (Mr, Penujaq)

Note that *harus* and *mesti* can co-occur with the projective, as in:

(48) Harus=m iaq ber-ajah nani  
       must=2 proj intr-study now  

‘You have to study now.’ (Mn, Puyung)
(49)  \[ \text{Mesti-}\text{ng}=k \quad \text{iaq} \quad \text{ber-}\text{ajah} \quad \text{nani} \]
\[ \text{must-link}=1\text{sg} \quad \text{proj} \quad \text{intr-study} \quad \text{now} \]
\[ \text{‘I must study now.’} \quad (\text{Mn, Puyung}) \]

The form \text{kadi} only occurs in Menu-meni, as in:

(50)  \[ \text{Nané} \quad \text{kadi}=\dot{o} \quad \text{taòq} \quad \text{silat} \quad \text{léq} \quad \text{bawó}=\text{ng jaran}, \quad \text{ie} \quad \text{ntan} \]
\[ \text{now} \quad \text{must}=2 \quad \text{know} \quad \text{self.defence} \quad \text{loc} \quad \text{on.top}=3 \quad \text{horse} \quad 3 \quad \text{manner} \]
\[ \text{‘Now you must learn self defence on top of a horse, that’s the way.’} \quad (\text{Mu, Ganti}) \]

The auxiliary \text{seharus} expresses the speaker’s evaluation that contrary to fact some situation should hold or have held, as in:

(51)  \[ \text{Seharus}=m \quad \text{kamu} \quad \text{ber-}\text{ajah} \quad \text{lebih} \quad \text{bagus} \]
\[ \text{should}=2 \quad 2 \quad \text{intr-educate} \quad \text{more} \quad \text{good} \]
\[ \text{‘You should have studied harder.’} \quad (\text{Mn, Puyung}) \]

Necessity is indicated by \text{perlu}:

(52)  \[ \text{Laguq} \quad \text{ini} \quad \text{nani} \quad \text{perlu-}\text{n}=t \quad \text{laló} \quad \text{péte} \quad \text{sarat} \quad \text{datu-}\text{n}=t \]
\[ \text{but} \quad \text{this} \quad \text{now} \quad \text{need-} \quad \text{go} \quad \text{find} \quad \text{cure} \quad \text{king-} \quad \text{link}=1\text{pl} \]
\[ \text{‘But now we have to go to look for the cure of our King.’} \quad (\text{Mr, Penujaq}) \]

(53)  \[ \text{Ite} \quad \text{perlu}=t \quad \text{beli} \quad \text{buaq-buaq-an} \quad \text{léq} \quad \text{balé} \]
\[ \text{1pl} \quad \text{need}=1\text{pl} \quad \text{buy} \quad \text{redup-fruit-nom} \quad \text{loc} \quad \text{house} \]
\[ \text{‘We need to buy fruit at home.’} \quad (\text{Mn, Puyung}) \]

For the expression of epistemic modality in Sasak there are three separate expressions that translate into English as ‘can’. The auxiliary particle \text{taò} (\text{Mn}) \text{tau} (\text{Ng}) \text{iniq} (\text{Mr}) expresses ability to perform some action because of a internal physical state or knowledge on the part of an actor, as in:

(54)  \[ \text{Aku} \quad \text{taò}=k \quad \text{taèk} \quad \text{sepéde} \]
\[ \text{1sg} \quad \text{can}=1\text{sg} \quad \text{go.up} \quad \text{bicycle} \]
\[ \text{‘I am able to ride a bicycle.’} \quad (= \text{I know how to ride a bicycle}) \]
\[ (\text{Ms, Puyung}) \]
Note that this particle can fall within the scope of negation, as in:

(55) \[ Maqap \quad ndéq=k \quad taó \quad nge-raös \quad base \quad Sasak \]
\[ sorry \quad not=1sg \quad can \quad N^1\text{-}speak \quad language \quad Sasak \]
\[ ‘Sorry, I cannot speak Sasak.’ \quad (Mn, Puyung) \]

(56) \[ Papuq=ne \quad ndéq=ne \quad taó \quad be-bace \]
\[ grandparent=3 \quad not=3 \quad can \quad redup\text{-}read \]
\[ ‘His grandmother cannot read.’ \quad (Ng, Selong) \]

The particle \textit{bau} ‘can’ expresses ability because of an external state of affairs, e.g., because some entity has appropriate characteristics or the appropriate effort has been made:

(57) \[ Andé=ng \quad be-dóé \quad anak \quad timaq=ng \quad nine \quad masih \]
\[ if =3 \quad intr\text{-}have \quad child \quad even.\text{if}=3 \quad female \quad still \]
\[ bau=ng \quad jari \quad datu \]
\[ can=3 \quad become \quad king \]
\[ ‘If has a child, even if she is female, she can still become Queen’ \quad (Mu, Ganti) \]

(58) \[ Mu=ng \quad bitek=è \quad se-angen-angen \quad isiq \quad dòyan \quad medaran \quad bau=ng \]
\[ then=3 \quad pull=3p \quad one\text{-}redup\text{-}feeling \quad by \quad prefer \quad eat \quad can=3 \]
\[ sugun \quad terus \quad bangkè=ng \quad Raksase \quad nu-q=ng \quad isiq=ng \]
\[ come\text{-}out \quad then \quad corpse=3 \quad Raksasa \quad that\text{-}spec=3 \quad by=3 \]
\[ ‘Doyan Medaran pulled with all his might and then the corpse of Raksasa could come out because of him.’ \quad (Mu, Ganti) \]

Again, negation can occur before and have scope over this auxiliary particle:

(59) \[ Ndéq=k \quad bau \quad taèk \quad sepéde \quad tie, \quad beléq \quad lalòq=n \]
\[ not=1sg \quad can \quad climb \quad bicycle \quad that \quad big \quad very=3 \]
\[ ‘I cannot ride this bicycle, it’s too big.’ \quad (Mn, Puyung) \]

This particle is also used to ask for or give permission, as in the following sentence (note the presence of the projective modal particle here). It makes sense that the ‘external circumstances’ modal should be used since these are the circumstances which determine permission:

(60) \[ Bau=k \quad iaq \quad cóbaq \quad sepéde=m \quad se-beraq \]
\[ can=1sg \quad proj \quad try \quad bicycle=2 \quad one\text{-}while \]
\[ ‘Can I try your bicycle for a while?’ \quad (Mn, Puyung) \]
Finally *mau* ‘can’ expresses ability to do some action or for some state of affairs to occur because time is available for it to happen (e.g., one is not in a rush, has no guests arriving at home, etc.). An example is:

(61) *Aku mau=k* taèk sepéde ni
1sg can=1sg climb bicycle this
‘I can ride this bicycle (because I have time to do so).’  (Mn, Puyung)

Negation of this modal is also possible, as in:

(62) *Ndéq=k mau* atòng buku ni jòk Ali uiq
not=1sg can take book this to Ali yesterday
‘I couldn’t take these books to Ali yesterday (because I didn’t have time).’  (Mn, Puyung)

5. Quotatives and evidentiality

In Sasak there are two ways that quotation of what someone has said (or will say) can be expressed. The first of these is to use a verb of locution such as *muni* ‘say’ (low level) or *base* ‘say (high level) (or more specific lexical items such as *ceritaq* ‘tell a story’, *kócap* ‘narrate’, *badaq* ‘tell’, *beketuan* ‘ask’, *tóntòq* ‘reply’) followed by a noun phrase specifying the speaker, then followed by the quoted material which is expressed as a regular Sasak clause:

(63) *Muni lóq lèpang ite uah be-kuris be-cukur*
say art frog 1pl prfc intr-shave intr-cut.hair
‘Frog said “I have shaved and had a haircut.”’  (Ng, Selong)

It is also possible for the locutionary verb to be followed by a second verb *kene* ‘intend’ which precedes the quoted material:

(64) *Terus senine=ng datu tie muni kene berembé*
then wife=3 king that say intend how
*ntan=te  éaq ôat mate anak=te?*
manner=1pl proj cure eye child=1pl intend how
‘Then the King’s wife said “How shall we cure our child’s eyes?”’
(Mu, Ganti)

(65) *Sayan nóntòq dedare tie kene ndéq=kô*
more N1.reply girl that intend how
*mele te-renggang-ang isiq Indra Bangsawan*
want pass-distant-cause by Indra Bangsawan
‘The Princess replied again “I don’t want to be taken far away by Indra Bangsawan”’  (Mu, Ganti)
Sasak has a second construction that can be used to express quotation in which the quoted clause comes first and is followed by a noun\textsuperscript{11} that refers to an act or product of locution, such as \textit{uni} ‘saying’ (low level) or \textit{base} ‘saying’ (high level), but also including nouns such as \textit{cerite} ‘story’ (see example (16) above). This quotative noun carries a clitic possessive pronoun identifying the speaker, who can be further specified by a noun phrase following this word. Material preceding the possessed noun has the form of a full clause, including its own clitic pronouns, as appropriate, i.e., the structure is $[ \ldots ]_s uni{=}\text{clitic speaker}$. This structure appears to be a zero copula construction of the form ‘$[ \ldots ]_s$ is speaker’s saying/story’. Examples from Sasak texts are the following:

(66) $Ndéq{=}kò \; éaq \; uléq \; uni{=}ng \; inaq \; kanak \; nu$


\begin{tabular}{l}
not=1sg & fut & return & say=3 & mother & child & that \\
\end{tabular}

“\textquoteright\textit{I will not go home}\textquoteright said the child’s mother.” (Mu, Ganti)

(67) $Masih{=}ò \; Aran \; idup \; uni{=}ng \; peng-ulu \; Alim$

\begin{tabular}{l}
still=2 & Name & live & say=3 & agent-head & Alim \\
\end{tabular}

“\textquoteright\textit{You are still alive!}\textquoteright said Bodyguard Alim.’ (Mu, Ganti)

Sasak has several verbs of sensory perception and cognitive states that can be used in this same construction to express evidential-type meanings, i.e., to express the source of evidence that supports a particular utterance. The verbs that occur in this construction are:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{ambu} & ‘smell’ \\
\textit{rase} & ‘taste’ \\
\textit{idap} & ‘feeling’ \\
\textit{angen} & ‘feeling, rumour’ \\
\textit{rue} & ‘appearance’ \\
\textit{inde} & ‘supposition, guess based on contextual evidence’ \\
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{11} In Sasak, as in other western Austronesian languages, there are many verbs that have the same form as semantically related nouns, however a number are formally distinct, such as the verb \textit{muni} ‘say, speak’ and noun \textit{uni} ‘saying, speaking’ (cf. also \textit{cerite} ‘story’ and \textit{ceritaq} ‘tell a story’).
Examples from Sasak texts are the following:  

(68)  
\[ Jangke=ne \ buéq \ se-ari, \ masih \ ndéq \ man \ baé \ 
\text{cont}=3 \ \text{finished} \ \text{one-hand.of.banana} \ \text{still} \ \text{not} \ \text{yet} \ \text{only} \ 
\text{keruan} \ \text{rase}=ne \ 
\text{ready} \ \text{taste}=3 \ 
\text{‘He finished a hand of bananas, but they still didn’t taste ready.’} \ 
\text{(Ng, Selong)} \]

(69)  
\[ Iaq=n \ ujan \ rue=n \ 
\text{proj}=3 \ \text{rain} \ \text{appear}=3 \ 
\text{‘It looks like it will rain.’} \ 
\text{(Mn, Puyung)} \]

(70)  
\[ Oh \ uah=ng \ maté=q \ mónsóh=ng \ rue=ng, \ anak=kò \ ni \ 
\text{oh} \ \text{pfct}=3 \ \text{dead-caus} \ \text{enemy}=3 \ \text{appear}=3 \ \text{child}=1\text{sg} \ \text{this} \ 
\text{Oh, it looks as if he has killed his enemy, this child of mine (has).} \ 
\text{(Mu, Ganti)} \]

(71)  
\[ Mòlah=kò \ angen=kò \ inde=ng, \ nganjeng \ 
\text{easy}=1\text{sg} \ \text{feeling}=1\text{sg} \ \text{suppose}=3 \ \text{stand.up} \ 
\text{‘It seems that I felt at ease, and I stood up.’} \ 
\text{(Mu, Ganti)} \]

(72)  
\[ Laló=ò \ cóbaq=è \ inde=ng \ 
\text{go}=2 \ \text{try}=3\text{p} \ \text{suppose}=3 \ 
\text{‘Is it that you went and tried it?’} \ 
\text{(Mu, Ganti)} \]

(73)  
\[ Mu=k \ inem=è, \ lèilah \ kòtòng \ bëwëh=kò \ idap=ng \ 
\text{then}=1\text{sg} \ \text{drink} =3 \ \text{oh.God!} \ \text{burn} \ \text{mouth}=1\text{sg} \ \text{feel}=3 \ 
\text{‘Then I drank it (the hot water), and my God, it felt like my mouth was} \ 
\text{burning.’} \ 
\text{(Mu, Ganti)} \]

(74)  
\[ Iaq=n \ ujan \ idap=n \ nani \ 
\text{proj}=3 \ \text{rain} \ \text{feel}=3 \ \text{now} \ 
\text{‘Now it feels like it will rain (later).’} \ 
\text{(Mn, Puyung)} \]

Note that these verbs can occur after and take scope over the locutionary verbs used for reported speech. Consider the following report of a conversation on an aeroplane in a Sasak text:

\[ \text{-------------} \]

\[ 12 \text{ Most of the text examples have a third person enclitic, although first person is found} \ 
\text{in (66); it is not clear if other person forms can occur with these verbs. Note that most} \ 
\text{of the text data I have is from Menu-men and information on other Sasak varieties} \ 
\text{needs further checking.} \]
It may also be the case that these verbs can take scope over the locutionary verbs as well (e.g., ‘I said it seems he is sick’), but there are no examples in my corpus.

What I would like to suggest is that this construction is the functional equivalent of evidentials in other languages, though Sasak expresses this semantics differently from modals and does not have a grammaticalised morpho-syntactic category of evidentials or quotatives.

6. Conclusions

This paper is a preliminary outline of the expression of polarity, aspect, mood and evidentiality in the Sasak language spoken on the island of Lombok. It is based on analysis of elicited and textual materials from several Sasak varieties and illustrates the formal and semantic differences between them. The codong a tense is not found in Sasak, and there are two aspectual categories, perfect and continuous. The most elaborated semantic and pragmatic category is mood and the language shows a large number of modal auxiliaries.

There are several other varieties of Sasak, especially Kutó-kuté and Nggetó-nggeté, which have been little studied to date. Further research on these varieties is needed to determine the full picture of Sasak morpho-syntax.
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