

SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF INDONESIAN ASPECTUAL EXPRESSIONS

Nurhayati

Faculty of Humanity Diponegoro University

1. Introduction

Based on the universal grammar point of view, temporality is one of the universal meaning among languages. It means that every language with its own characteristic has a means of expressing the temporal concept. Indonesian grammarians, such as Purwo (1981), Tadjuddin (1992), Sneddon (1996), and Alwi *et al.* (1998) claims that some lexical expressions such *sedang, tengah, lagi, masih, telah, sudah, akan, kemarin, baru saja, sekarang, kini, dan nanti*, function as temporal markers. Among them, Purwo (1981) and Tadjuddin (1992) give more detail analysis of the temporal markers. Purwo (1981) tries to find out the different function of *telah* and *sudah*. He claims that *telah* and *sudah* behave differently in certain context. Meanwhile, Tadjuddin (1992) finds out that Indonesian has some morphological and lexical markers that can be used to translate aspectual meanings of Russian. However, there are some questions related to the topic that have not been answered. One of them is the way the temporal markers interact with other components in a clause. It is interested to study because by understanding the interplay, someone can identify the compatibility and the meaning produced by the interaction.

This paper aims to study the semantic and syntactic features of certain temporal marker of Indonesian, those are *sedang, tengah, lagi, masih, telah, and sudah*. People assume that *sedang, tengah, lagi, and masih* function as imperfective expressions. Moreover, *sedang, tengah, and lagi* are often used to translate the progressive form in English. On the other hand, *telah* and *sudah* are used to translate perfect in English. By doing this research, the writer also wants to know whether the assumption of the equivalence is valid or not. This research uses Indonesian clause containing the temporal marker as data. They were collected from news paper and internet.

2. General Studies of Aspectuality

The term *aspect* is a translation from the Russian word *vid* which means 'see, look (at), or view'. The term, then, is used to refer to the formal grammatical-categories, morphological or syntactic, that express "... different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation" (Comrie 1976:3).¹ Some linguists, however, use the term to refer both the form and the meaning it expresses. It causes the difficulty of studying the aspectual concept in languages that do not have the formal categories. In this paper, the term *aspect* is used to refer to a formal form, especially a grammatical form and the term aspectual meaning is used to refer to the meaning expressed by aspect or other aspectual expressions. The two terms, aspect and aspectual meaning, are under a single term aspectuality.

Discussing aspectuality regards to the differing way of viewing a situation. Generally, we divide aspectuality into two kinds, those are perfectivity and imperfectivity. Perfectivity "views a situation in its entirety without regarding to its internal temporal constituency" (Comrie 1976:12). On the contrary, imperfectivity focuses on "the internal temporal structure of a situation by viewing the situation from within" (Comrie 1976:24). Not all languages have an aspectual opposition between a perfective and imperfective aspect but every language has a means of expressing the aspectual opposition. It means that the aspectual meaning is universal. In the grammar of Russian or other Slavic languages, aspect or *vid* is systematically and overtly marked by morphological affixes whereas English has a syntactic form like *to be + V-ing* that one of its function is to expresses an imperfective meaning. Indonesian, on the other hand, uses certain lexical expressions to express the meaning. The following examples are illustrations of the specific and universal features of aspectuality:

Russian: *Ivan čital, kogda ja vošel.*

English: *John was reading when I entered.*

Indonesian: *John sedang membaca ketika saya masuk.*

The first clause of each of these sentences presents a certain aspectual information, that is the description of its internal phase of a situation while the second clause describes the totality of a situation. In an aspectual study, the first description refers to an imperfective meaning and the second one refers to a perfective meaning. In Russian, the two kinds of meaning are expressed by morphological affixes, the zero morpheme of imperfective in *čital* and a perfective prefix *vo/vos* in *vošel*. English uses a syntactical form of progressive to express the imperfective meaning and Indonesian uses a lexical form such as *sedang* to express the similar meaning. The detailed concepts of perfective and imperfective will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

From the discussion of the previous paragraph, perfectivity is a semantic concept of viewing a situation in its entirety. By using a perfective view point, a situation is depicted in pure and simple way. An English clause *Mary wrote a letter*, for example, is used to describe a situation 'writing a letter' with the perfective view point which is expressed by a zero verb form (Smith 1991:220). Using the perfective view point means describing the situation as a whole including the initial and the final part of the situation (Smith 1991:6). The way of describing a situation produces certain interpretations depending on types of the situation (actionality) and its temporal location (temporality). It can be concluded that aspectuality, actionality, and temporality interact to contribute to the interpretation of a situation. The situation type of the above clause, *Mary wrote a letter*, is an accomplishment that has semantic features [+dynamic, +durative, +telic] and the situation is located before time of speaking (past time). Describing the situation perfectly indicates the interpretation of the successful completion of the situation (Comrie 1976:20). In other words, the clause has a presupposition meaning that 'Mary finished writing a letter'. Another interpretation is produced if the perfective aspect is combined with an activity situation that has a semantic feature [+atelic]. Because the situation does not have a natural ending, the interpretation resulted is stopping, instead of completing, the situation, such in *She walked in the park*. Generally, the perfective view point can interact with all situation types. However, there is a restriction of an interaction between the perfective view point and the temporality. Comrie (1976:66—71) explains that the perfective view point is incompatible with the present time. Therefore, in some languages, the interaction between the perfective aspect and a present tense or non-past tense will be interpreted with habitual meaning, a perfective future, or an imperfective present. Smith (1991:240—241) also claims that in English there is a restriction of the collaboration between the perfective aspect and the present tense. His explanation about the restriction can be read in the quotation below:

Sentences in the *Present* refer to open situations except for marked uses. There is a general semantic requirement on the present tense, blocking the presentation of situations with endpoints (cf Chapter 5). In English it is reflected in a constraint which forces a stative interpretation of all *Present* sentences with the perfective viewpoint. Recall that the English perfective does not span the endpoints of states. In the *Present* tense and the perfective viewpoint stative sentences have their normal interpretation, while non-stative verb constellations have a derived habitual interpretation. (Smith 1991:240)

I now turn to the detail concept of the imperfective viewpoint. As I have mentioned in the previous paragraph, describing a situation using the imperfective viewpoint means focusing the internal temporal constituency of the situation. Comrie (1976:24) argues that the imperfective view point is "viewing a situation from within". In English, the imperfective viewpoint is realized by a progressive form, *be + Ving*, that describes a situation in progress or focuses internal stages of the situation (Smith 1991:223).

In contrast with the interactional feature of the perfectivity, the imperfective expression is compatible with any tense. It means that a situation that is located in the past, present, or future sphere, can be viewed imperfectively. However, the English progressive is only compatible with non-state, durative situations because they have the internal temporal constituency on that the aspect focuses. The such situations are activities and accomplishments. A stative situation, an achievement situation, and a semelfactive situation do not have the internal structure. The stative situation consists of an undifferentiated period, whereas the two other situations have only a single

stage that consists of an initial and final endpoint simultaneously (Smith 1991:36; 56). That is why the three kinds of a situation are normally expressed using the perfective aspectuality. Smith (1991:222—223) argues that if the progressive is used with the situations, there will be specific interpretations. If there is a stative clause combined with the progressive aspect, the clause expresses a temporary state of affairs, such as in *I'm living in Semarang* or expresses a degree of a state of affairs such as in *I'm understanding more about the case*. On the other hand, using the progressive with the achievement produces an interpretation of focusing the preliminary stages of the event, such as in *John was reaching the finish line* and with the semelfactive produces an iterative interpretation, such as in *She was coughing*.

In discussing the aspectuality, some linguists such as Comrie (1976), Binnick (1991) and Smith (1991) consider another temporal category, i.e. perfect, as a marginal category. Comrie (1976) and Smith (1991) categorize perfect as an aspect, instead of a tense, although it is rather different from those two aspects. Comrie (1976:52) argues that the perfect expresses a situation related to a preceding situation. The feature of the perfect that can be combined with a present, past, or future tense has led some linguists such as Comrie (1976) and Smith (1991) consider the perfect as an aspect. On the other hand, some other linguists such as Binnick (1991), Declerck (1991), and Huddleston and Pullum (2002) argue that the perfect is one kind of tense because the perfect can occur either in the perfective or imperfective viewpoint.

The ambiguity of the perfect is caused by the semantic information that is generally expressed by the perfect. Comrie (1976:52) explains that “it [the perfect] expresses a relation between two time points, on the one hand the time of state resulting from a prior situation, and on the other the time of that prior situation”. The information is called a perfect meaning. According to Comrie (1976:56—60), the perfect meaning consists of four types of implicative meanings: (i) the perfect of result, (ii) the experiential perfect, (iii) the perfect of persistent situation, and (iv) the perfect of recent past. The first type expresses the description of the present state as being the result of the past situation; the second type expresses that one situation has happened once or more in the past; the third type expresses a situation that started in the past and has still happened in the present; and the fourth type says that a situation has just recently happened (Comrie 1976:56—60). Moreover, Comrie (1976:53) argues that not all perfect forms express the perfect meaning. English perfect is the example of the perfect that expresses the perfect meaning. On the other hand, Latin perfect expresses both perfect and non-perfect meaning (Comrie 1976:53).

3. Syntactic and Semantic Features of *Sedang/Tengah/Lagi* and *Masih*

Alwi *et al.* (1998:159) talk about *sedang* when they discuss verbal phrases. According to them, a verbal phrase is built by one or more verbs that function as heads plus another word(s) as a modifier. *Sedang* is one of the modifiers. Moreover, Alwi *et al.* (1998:159) argue that *sedang* is an aspect that can function as a front modifier. *Sedang* has two stylistic variants, those are *tengah* and *lagi*. They can combine with a helping verb, such as *akan* but not with *harus*. In this paper, I will not discuss *sedang*, *tengah*, and *lagi* in different part, but I will treat *tengah* and *lagi* as variants of *sedang*. Because *tengah* and *lagi* are less frequent than *sedang* (Sneddon 1996: 198), most of the examples displayed here consist of *sedang* instead of *tengah* and *lagi*.

In the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI), *sedang* is an adverb that has a meaning ‘*masih dalam melakukan sesuatu*’ (in the process of doing something) (KBBI 1991:888). It means that *sedang* expresses the middle phase of a situation. By using *sedang*, a speaker ignores the initial and terminal part of a situation. Thus, in the sentence:

- (1) Dia **sedang menghampiriku** ketika tiba-tiba kakinya terantuk batu.
‘He was approaching me when suddenly his foot knocked against the gravel’

the speaker just gives the information to the listener about the internal structure of the situation and ignores when the situation begins and ends. Using *sedang* in the clause also gives interpretation that the doer of action is in the condition of moving towards the terminal point, that is the position of the speaker. It means that *sedang* in the context describes the progress of an activity. From the explanation, it can be concluded that *sedang* can function as an imperfective expression in Indonesian. Like the progressive *-ing* in English, *sedang* with the activity clause expresses the

progressive meaning. *Tengah* and *lagi*, as variants of *sedang*, can also combine with dynamic verbs such as in *tengah merencanakan* ‘be planning’, *tengah mengamati* ‘be observing’, *lagi menggambar bunga* ‘be drawing flowers’, and *lagi belajar* ‘be studying’.

However, the other semantic feature of *sedang* is different from the progressive *-ing* because *sedang* can occur with stative verbs such in the following clauses.

- (2) Uni Islam Turki **sedang menjadi** kenyataan.
Turkey Islamic Union becomes (impf) reality’
- (3) Salah seorang sahabat saya *sedang memiliki* masalah dengan koneksi internet, ...
‘One of my best friend has (ipf) a problem of an internet connection, ...’
- (4) Dengan ini kita *sedang mengetahui* bahwa kita ada di dalam Dia.
‘Hereby, we know (impf) that we are in Him’

Clauses (2), (3), and (4), contain stative verbs, *menjadi*, *memiliki*, and *mengetahui*. The clauses are grouped into the stative clauses because they describe a stative situation that has semantic features [+ stative] and [+ durative]. Those are homogenous situations because they “consist only a period of undifferentiated moments” (Smith 1991:28). Using *sedang* together with the kind of clause gives the explicit meaning that the speakers foregrounded the internal phase of the situation. The collaboration can also be interpreted as a temporary situation or a marked situation. In Indonesian, stative clauses are also built by non-verbal predication. In this context, *sedang* is often used to highlight the situation, such as in the following examples.

- (5) Jika kalian berpikir aku **sedang patah hati**, kalian salah.
‘if you thought I **were broken hart (ipf)**, you would be fault’
- (6) Bapak, sekarang kondisi *rumah* tangga kami **sedang hancur**, karena sebentar lagi kami akan bercerai karena itulah yang terbaik.
‘Sir, now, the condition of our family **is broken home (impf)** because we are going to be divorced soon because that is the best (solution)’
- (7) Saya tidak dapat menemuinya minggu ini karena ia **sedang di Semarang**.
‘I can not meet him this week because he **is (impf) in Semarang**’

Like the previous examples, the three clauses are stative, but they consist of adjectival and prepositional predicate. The function of *sedang* in the examples are also to highlight the situation and to inform that the situation is temporary. Thus, adjectival phrase *sedang patah hati* in (5) is chosen to describe the condition that might be assumed by the listeners (*kalian*) at the time the speaker speaks. It also results the implicit meaning that the condition of being broken heart occurs at present time, not in the past. By using the similar explanation, the function of *sedang* in (6) and (7) is also to stress the situation of broken home (6) and being in Semarang (7). The deletion of *sedang* for the three clauses does not change the type of the situation, but the foregrounding interpretation is missing. It means that *sedang* with stative clauses expresses the meaning ‘in the middle of certain condition’, instead of ‘in the process of doing something’. In this context, the clause with *sedang* cannot be substituted with the progressive *-ing* form in English, because in English stative is incompatible with the progressive view point. I can also find the similar constructions that consist of *tengah* and *lagi* such as *tengah memiliki*, *tengah kecewa*, *lagi sedih*, dan *lagi sibuk*.

The ‘temporary’ interpretation is reinforced by the findings that not all adjectival predicate can be combined with *sedang/tengah/lagi*. Some other adjectives that are compatible with *sedang/tengah/lagi* are:

{*sedang/tengah/lagi*} + *rusak/ sedih/ senang/ mahal/ murah/*
 ‘damaged/sad/happy/expensive/cheap’
kurus/gemuk/ kaya/ miskin/
 ‘thin/fat/rich/poor’
capek/sendiri etc.
 ‘tired/alone’

They express the unstable condition, and the situation that is expressed by using *sedang* is marked situation. On the other hand, the adjectives that express more permanent condition are usually incompatible with *sedang/tengah/lagi*, such as in:

*{*sedang/tengah/lagi*} + *biru/merah/hijau;bersih/kotor*
 ‘blue/red/green; clean/dirty’
pandai/bodoh/cantik/jelek
 ‘clever/stupid/beautiful/ugly’
tinggi/pendek/panjang/besar/kecil
 ‘high/short/long/big/small’

Sedang can also occur with semelfactive or achievement verbs producing a marked interpretation. Theoretically, imperfective is incompatible with punctual situation because the kind of situation does not have the internal phase. In English, the progressive *-ing* form that occurs with the punctual verbs, such as *be achieving*, *be reaching*, *be knocking*, or *be coughing* constructs iterative meaning or describes the preliminary stages (Smith 1991:239). In Indonesian, *sedang* can also occur with punctual verbs such in the next examples.

- (8) Kehancuran *sedang* datang!!! Kalian tidak tahu kapan waktunya. Kalian tidak ***mengetahui*** kapan harinya. Namun pada suatu hari Shabbat
 ‘The destruction is coming!!! You don’t know when. You don’t know the day. But, in the Sabbath’
- (9) PDF/Adobe Acrobat *sedang mencapai* puncak-puncaknya tanda yang sangat positif.
 ‘PDF/Adobe Acrobat is in the state of reaching the peak... the very positive signal.’
- (10) Tak diragukan kini Fernando Torres *sedang menemukan* ketajamannya lagi.
 ‘To be sure, now Fernando Torres is in the state of finding his sharpness again.’

Example (8) is found from a Bible genre, so the style sounds archaic. *Sedang datang* in the sentence can be interpreted as the preparatory phase of ‘coming’ situation. Thus, the sentence is equivalence with “the destruction is coming...”. On the other hand, the use of *sedang* in the last two examples tends to express the temporary state of situation. It means that by using *sedang*, the speaker of each sentence perceives the situations of ‘reaching’ and ‘finding’ as a durative situation instead of punctual one. In the context, *sedang* cannot be translated into *-ing* in English because ‘be reaching’ and ‘be finding’ in English respectively mean ‘in the preparatory stage of reaching’ and ‘finding repeatedly’

Masih is also an expression of imperfective in Indonesian. Combined with dynamic situation, *masih* expresses that a situation is still in the process or the activity (examples 12—15). Meanwhile, *masih* with stative situation expresses a temporary state (example 11). There is a nuance between *sedang* and *masih*, eventhough they express imperfective meaning. *Sedang* focuses the middle stage of process, activity, or state without informing when the situation begins and ends. *Masih*, on the other hand, describes that a situation is *going on* and the expression implies the information that the situation starts before the time of reference and have not ended yet.

- (11) Cinta datang kepada orang yang *masih mempunyai* harapan, walaupun mereka telah dikecewakan.
'Love comes to people who *still* have hopes, even though they have been disappointed.'
- (12) Edward menyatakan, pihaknya **masih terus melakukan** pengembangan, dan mencari alat bukti terkait aliran pencairan dana Rp 28 miliar tersebut.
'Edward said, he has still been developing the investigation and seeking for the proof related to the liquidity for the twenty eight milliard rupiahs.'
- (13) Hingga kini Tim Manis **masih menunggu** proses penghitungan suara oleh PPK secara manual.
'Up to know, the Manis team is still waiting the process of manual voter-counting by PPK.'
- (14) Kabupaten Kendal, Jawa Tengah *masih menemukan* ratusan jenis makanan dan minuman kedaluwarsa di beberapa pasar dan minimarket ...
'The government of Kendal, Central Java, is still finding hundreds of expired foods and beverages in some supermarkets and minimarkets....'
- (15) Hingga saat ini kasus HIV/AIDS masih tinggi yang menurut estimasi terbaru 2009 dari Departemen Kesehatan (Depkes) *masih mencapai* sekitar 277.000 orang. ...
'Up to now, the case of HIV/AIDS is still high and according to the newest estimation in 2009 from the Health Department, it still reaches 277,000 persons more or less.'

4. Syntactic and Semantic Features of *Telah* and *Sudah*

As being explained in the introduction, Purwo (1981) has studied the syntactic and semantic features of *sudah* and *telah*. He argued that they syntactically and semantically differ. In this part, the argument will be reviewed, but the writer will limit the discussion of the two expressions when they function as an aspectual expression. So, the paper will not discuss the use of *sudah* in the expression such as "sudah jelek, jahat pula" because *sudah* in the expression does not express the aspectual meaning.

As aspectual expressions, the syntactic properties of *sudah* and *telah* can be explained as follows.

- a. They are adverbs and can be used to modify verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.
- b. Usually, *sudah* and *telah* occur before the word or group of words they modified.
- c. For certain styles, *sudah*, but not *telah*, can be placed after the words or group of words modified, such as *pupuslah sudah harapkanku and usai sudah pertikaian ini*.
- d. *Sudah*, but not *telah*, can be combined with certain particles such as *-lah* and *-kah* (Purwo 1981:60)
- e. *Sudah*, but not *telah*, can stand alone as a clause for answering the question like *sudahkan anda membeli tiket?* (Purwo 1981:60)
- f. Between *sudah* and its predicates, but not *telah*, can be inserted by the words *harus, akan, tidak.....lagi*. (1981:60)

The explanation shows that syntactically, *sudah* is different from *telah* in register. *Sudah* has broader distribution than *telah*. Semantically, *sudah* and *telah* as the aspectual markers express the same meaning. Therefore, in this paper, the writer explains *telah* and *sudah* simultaneously. As aspectual expressions, *telah* and *sudah* express a certain phase of a situation that has been achieved. *Telah* and *sudah* can combine with the five types of situation (stative, activity, accomplishment, achievement, and semelfactive). The clauses below show the collaboration of *sudah/telah* with the types of situation:

- (16) Kita *telah/[sudah]* mengetahui bahwa kilat merupakan aspek gangguan yang berbahaya terhadap saluran transmisi ... stative
 ‘we have understood that lightning is dangerous aspect that disturbs a transmission channel’
- (17) Dia **sudah/[telah] berlari** sebelum polisi datang. activity
 ‘He had run before the policemen came’.
- (18) Kelompok kesenian rukun karya berdiri 34 tahun lalu dan **sudah/[telah] mengelilingi** Indonesia menghibur rakyat nusantara. accomplishment
 ‘Rukun Karya, The performing arts, was founded 34 years ago and has gone around Indonesia to entertain people of Indonesia.’
- (19) Operasionalisasi di Pelabuhan Tanjung Priuk *telah/[sudah] pulih* pascabentrokan berdarah antara massa pendukung makam keramat Mbah Priok dengan petugas Satpol. achievement
 ‘The operation of Tanjung Priok harbor was normal after the bloody conflict between a mass supporting the existence of Mbah Priok holy grave and a mass supporting the police.’
- (20) “Saya ikut memukul karena saya lihat yang lain *sudah/[telah] memukul* lebih dulu,” kata Azhar diamini Darmadi. semelfactive
 ‘I participated in hitting [him] because I saw other persons had hit [him],’ said Azhar who was agreed by Darmadi.’

The meaning of *sudah/telah* in the five examples is to foreground the certain phase of each situation. Combining *sudah/telah* with the atelic situation, such as stative and activity results the interpretation of describing initial point of the situation. In sentence (16) and (17) *sudah/telah* function to stress the initial state of ‘understanding’ and ‘running’ respectively. On the other hand, *sudah/telah* with accomplishment (18), achievement (19), and semelfactive (20) express the terminal point explicitly.

Is there a different meaning if *sudah/telah* in the clause above is deleted? Let’s see the counterpart of the clauses below.

- (16a) Kita *mengetahui* bahwa kilat merupakan aspek gangguan yang stative
 berbahaya terhadap saluran transmisi yang menggagalkan keandalan dan keamanan sistem tenaga ...
- (17a) Dia **berlari** mendahului teman-temannya. activity
- (18a) (?) Kelompok kesenian Rukun Karya berdiri 34 tahun lalu dan **mengelilingi** Indonesia menghibur rakyat nusantara accomplishment
- (19a) Operasionalisasi di Pelabuhan Tanjung Priuk *pulih* pascabentrokan berdarah antara massa pendukung makam keramat Mbah Priok dengan petugas Satpol achievement
- (20a) “Saya ikut memukul karena saya lihat yang lain *memukul* lebih semelfactive
 dulu,” kata Azhar diamini Darmadi.

The sentences (16a), (17a), (18a), (19a), and (20a) perform each situation as a whole. It means that without *sudah/telah*, the perfective meaning still occurs. However, there is certain information that does not occur in the five sentences. Those are focusing the beginning of a

situation (ingressive meaning) or the ending of a situation (completive meaning). In (16a), the perfective viewing makes the reader do not understand the initial and the terminal part of the situation. The interpretation that the doer of action is still have knowledge of lightning when they uttered the clause is found out from the shared context that knowledge is a long term memory. In (17a), deleting *sudah/telah* causes the information of the initial point of the 'running' situation is expressed implicitly from the context of the second clause 'mendahului teman-temannya'. The odd meaning is produced in (18a). Actually, the speaker of the sentence intended to inform the activity that has been done by community since 34 year ago. Deleting *sudah/telah* causes the completion meaning does not occur. However perfective interpretation without *sudah/telah* can be shown if the first clause of the sentence is also deleted. So, the sentence will be *Kelompok kesenian Rukun Karya mengelilingi Indonesia menghibur rakyat nusantara*. The perfective information performed in the sentence is viewing a situation pure and simple. The similar description is found from (19a) and (20a)

From the illustration above, it can be generalized that *sudah/telah* is an expression that is used to describe the additional overtones in perfective clause, especially to closely depict the initial or terminal point of a situation. Indonesian speakers use *sudah/telah* if they think it is necessary to contrast the difference between two situations. Examples (17) and (20) show that the contrast between two situations can be interpreted both by using *sudah* and inferring the meaning relation between the first and second clauses.

Having identified the aspectual meaning of *telah* and *sudah*, I would like to explain whether the clauses containing *telah* and *sudah* are always equivalence with the perfect clauses in English, as lay men have assumed. As has been explained before, there are at least four types of perfect in English: "the perfect of result, the experiential perfect, the perfect of persistent situation, and the perfect of recent past" (Comrie 1976:56). My argument is that there is no pure equivalence between an English perfect clause and a *telah/sudah* clause without connecting to any other temporal adverb or other contexts. In example (16), the continuation of understanding is interpreted implicitly from the general knowledge, so it is equivalence with the third type of the English perfect. However, the clause "*Waktu itu hari sudah gelap, tapi dia belum pulang juga*" is best translated into a past tense instead of the perfect tense because the situation depicted happened in the past and didn't have the relationship with the present time. Examples (17) and (20) are best translated into past perfect because the situations depicted happened before other situations in the past. Example (18) is equivalence with the third type of English perfect, because *sudah/telah* in the clause focuses the duration of the situation. Example (19) describes the situation of recovery after the bloody conflict. The meaning does not imply whether the situation has still happened until the present time. According to my opinion, *sudah/telah* in the clause is equivalence not with perfect tense but with simple past tense. The other example is "*Kemarin dia sudah ke sini, sekarang ke sini lagi*". The sentence is best translated into "Yesterday he came here, but today he came here again" because *sudah* in the sentence functions to overtone the punctual situation that happened yesterday and to contrast it with the situation happened today.

5. Conclusion

I have made an attempt to show that *sedang/tengah/lagi*, *masih*, and *telah/sudah* as aspectual markers have certain syntactic and semantic features. Syntactically, they are modifiers that in a clause they modify a predicators. They are compatible with almost any type of situation in a clause. The meanings produced by the aspectual markers depend on their interaction with its predicator and other components in the clause. From the previous analysis, I can find out the aspectual interpretation as follows:

- (i) *Sedang/tengah/lagi* + activity expresses 'the middle process of doing something'
- (ii) *Sedang/tengah/lagi* + accomplishment expresses 'the middle process of moving towards natural end of a situation'
- (iii) *Sedang/tengah/lagi* + stative expresses 'the temporary situation, the internal part of a situation that is foregrounded, marked, or highlighted'
- (iv) *Sedang/tengah/lagi* + achievement expresses 'the preparatory stage of a situation and the foregrounded state resulted by the change of situation'
- (v) *Sedang/tengah/lagi* + semelfactive expresses 'the iterative situation'

- (vi) *Masih* is an imperfective marker that expresses ‘the ongoing situation that implicitly started in the past’.
- (vii) *Telah/sudah* + atelic situation expresses ‘the initial point or state of a situation’
- (viii) *Telah/sudah* + telic situation and semelfactive expresses ‘the terminal point or state of a situation’
- (ix) *Telah/sudah* generally functions to describe the additional overtone in perfective clause especially to focus the initial or terminal phase of a situation.

References

- Alwi, Hasan, Soenjono Dardjowidjodjo, Hans Lapoliwa, dan Anton M. Moeliono. 1998. *Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia*. Edisi ketiga. Jakarta: Balai Bahasa.
- Binnick, Robert. 1991. *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Decleek, Renaat. 1991. *Tense in English: Its Structure and Use in Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Huddleston, Rodney dan Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KBBI. 1991. 2nd Edition. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka
- Purwo, Bambang Kaswanti. 1981. “Menelusuri Perbedaan antara Kata Telah dan Sudah” dalam *Dewan Bahasa*. November 1981.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. London: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge Grammars.
- Tadjuddin, Moh. 1992. *Pengungkapan Makna Aspektualitas Bahasa Rusia dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Suatu Telaah tentang Aspek dan Aksionalitas*. Jakarta: Perpustakaan Nasional.

¹The term situation, according to Comrie (1976:13) is used to cover a perceived physical reality. A situation is grouped into a certain type, such as a state, an activity, an accomplishment, an achievement, or a semelfactive (Smith 1991:6).