

Pragmatic uses of demonstratives in Cirebon Javanese conversation

Michael C. EWING

University of Melbourne

This study examines demonstratives in the variety of Javanese spoken in the region of Cirebon, on the north coast of the province of West Java. After introducing the demonstrative paradigms found in Cirebon Javanese, this study analyses their functional distribution in conversational discourse based on the taxonomy of demonstrative functions presented in Diessel (1999). The use of demonstratives with reference to first and second person and the role of demonstratives in conversational interaction is also discussed. Cirebon Javanese has a three-way demonstrative system with a number of variant forms. The medial forms are by far the most frequently occurring demonstratives in the conversational data. The anaphoric function is by far the most common function. The use of demonstratives with personal deictic forms and the importance of demonstratives in managing talk in interaction suggest avenues for further research.

1. Introduction

Javanese is spoken by some 85 million people (Lewis 2009), mostly in the central and eastern areas of the island of Java, but also by transmigrant communities throughout Indonesia and overseas among migrant communities Malaysia, the Netherlands, Surinam and New Caledonia (Ogloblin 2005, Uhlenbeck 1983). Varieties of Javanese display a wide range of variation not only in lexicon and pronunciation, but also various aspects of morpho-syntactic structure, including in the form and function of demonstratives. The present study examines demonstratives in the variety of Javanese spoken in the region of Cirebon, covering roughly the city and *kabupaten* (county) of the same name. Cirebon is situated on the north coast of the province of West Java, and forms a linguistic border with the Sundanese speaking area to the west. While sometimes popularly characterised as a mixed language, Cirebon Javanese is clearly a variety of Javanese, one which exhibits some influences from Sundanese and Malay, some archaisms no longer used in many other varieties of Javanese, as well as its own innovations. These characteristics make it quite distinct from the variety associated with the court cities of Yogyakarta and Surakarta, which are often taken to be the standard form of the language. These principalities are often considered the ‘exemplary centre’ of Java, yet Keeler (1985) points out that in the political sphere Javanese in rural and outlying areas do not attend so much to an exemplary centre as to their own needs. With regards to language, this tends to be the case for Javanese speakers in Cirebon today, who – regardless of past political and linguistic relationships between the royal courts of western and central Java – generally do not feel the need to emulate the language of the people they describe as *wong wetan* ‘easterners’. (See Smith-Hefner 1989 regarding the history of linguistic independence and later (partial) assimilation in East Java relative to Yogyakarta and Surakarta).

After first introducing the demonstrative paradigms found in Cirebon Javanese, this study analyses their functional distribution in conversational discourse. This is first done by applying the set of pragmatic categories of demonstratives formulated by Himmelmann (1997) and Diessel (1999) to their distribution in discourse. I will then pay particular attention to the use of demonstratives with reference to first and second

person. Finally I examine the role of demonstratives in conversational interaction, particular with regards to information flow (Chafe 1994, Du Bois and Thompson 1991), information packaging and the management of turn-taking (Ford and Thompson 1996, Ford, Fox and Thompson 2002).

Data for this study comprise audio recordings of naturally occurring conversational interaction made in the Cirebon region in 1993 together with transcripts of these recordings, using the conventions of Du Bois et al. (1993). For further details of the particular transcripts, see Ewing (2005).

2. Demonstrative paradigms in Cirebon Javanese

As with other varieties of Javanese, in the Cirebon variety three degrees of proximity are attested. These forms are *iki* 'PROX', *iku* 'MED' and *ika* 'DIST', which are equivalent to those found in Old Javanese (Zoetmulder and Poedjawiyatna 1961:40-41). This is in contrast to central Java where only the proximal form found in Old Javanese is still commonly used. It is now more common to find *kuwi* and *kae* for the medial and distal forms respectively, although the older forms may occur in writing, particularly in literary contexts. In addition, Cirebon Javanese has a number of innovative sets of demonstratives. There is what might be described as a derived set, based on the final syllable of the the longer, two-syllable forms with the addition of *-en*, that is *kien*, *kuen*, *kaen*. There is also a set of short demonstratives which consists of only the final syllable of the long forms, that is *ki*, *ku*, *ka*. In addition, numerous variations on the short forms exist with different initial consonants. The most common of these initial consonants, attested for all three degrees of proximity, are *n-*, *l-* and *g-* (see Table 1.). Another pattern observed in the data is for the initial consonant of the short demonstratives to be a copy of the final consonant of the preceding word, creating what is essentially a geminate consonant across the morpheme boundary. In examples below this is represented with an apostrophe, as in *bos 'u* [bossu] boss MED 'that boss'.

	Long forms:		Short forms:				
Proximal	<i>iki</i>	<i>kien</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>li</i>	<i>gi</i>	<i>'i</i>
Medial	<i>iku</i>	<i>kuen</i>	<i>ku</i>	<i>nu</i>	<i>lu</i>	<i>gu</i>	<i>'u</i>
Distal	<i>ika</i>	<i>kaen</i>	<i>ka</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>la</i>	<i>ga</i>	<i>'a</i>

Table 1. Cirebon Javanese demonstratives

In Cirebon Javanese, the same demonstrative forms are used both pronominally and adnominally. The following exemplify pronominal use of demonstratives.¹

¹ In all examples, transcripts are segmented by intonation unit (see Du Bois et al 1993, Chafe 1994 on intonation units). Transcription conventions and abbreviations used in examples are listed at the end of the chapter. Note also that in free translations, pronouns are given in square brackets when no corresponding noun phrase or pronoun occurs in the original, but where ellipsis in English would render the translation difficult to read. Additional information which will make the free translation more comprehensible is given in round brackets. Corpus location in the form of recording number and line numbers are given at the end of the free translation.

- (1) N: *kuen sih, ya tenang bae, beli abang.*
 MED PART yeah calm just NEG red
 ‘As for him, yeah [he] just stayed calm, didn’t get upset.’ (111:1115-1116)
- (2) T: *Nangis wonge,*
 cry person-DEF

duite langka [maning].
 money-DEF NEG.EXIST more

 O: *[Dadi dititip]aken?*
 so PT-entrust-APPL

 T: *Dititipaken nu.*
 PT-entrust-APPL MED
 T: ‘She cried, her money was all gone.’
 O: ‘So [she] left [it] (with someone)?’
 T: ‘She left [it] (with someone).’ (107:970-973)

In example (1) the long form, *kuen* ‘MED’ is used pronominally to refer to Joko, a gambler speaker N has been telling a story about. This referent is being tracked and here he is being described as remaining calm when he loses, in contrast with others, mentioned just before, who get upset. Thus *kuen* represents a contrastive topic, marked with the topicalising particle *sih*. In example (2) the short form *nu* ‘MED’ is the agent of the passive verb *dititipaken* ‘entrust/leave (with someone)’ and refers to the crying woman mentioned in the first line.

Following are examples of demonstratives used adnominally including both a long form (3) and a short form (4). When a demonstrative is used adnominally, it is always the final element in a noun phrase.

- (3) B: *Ya gara-gara boca Sumedang iku je.*
 yeah because of child S. MED PART
 ‘Yeah [it] was all because of that Sumedang girl.’ (111:208)
- (4) N: *Endi helem ka?*
 where helmet DIST
 ‘Where’s that helmet?’ (111:1310)

Demonstratives often come in pairs, used both pronominally as in (5) and adnominally as in (6).

- (5) D: *Enak Ang As.*
 nice older.sibling A.

 .. *lamun nggawa kaen ka ya.*
 if AT-take DIST DIST yeah
 ‘It’d be nice Ang As, if [you] take that.’ (140:699-700)
- (6) B: *Saking bae wong edan ku nu.*
 because.of just person crazy MED MED
 ‘Just because of that crazy person.’ (107:1043)

And although infrequent, it is nonetheless not unusual for there to be as many as three demonstratives stacked up together.

- (7) A: *Deweke nginum maning.*
3s AT-drink again

Nginum kuen iku lu.
AT-drink MED MED MED

‘She drank again. She drank that very one.’ (140:296-297)

3. Demonstrative adverbs in Cirebon Javanese

Cirebon Javanese has demonstrative adverbs of manner, goal, location and amount, all of which have three degrees of proximity like other demonstratives. These are laid out in Table 2. The manner demonstratives, like the demonstratives discussed above, also have multiple variations in form. The manner demonstratives, also like demonstratives used pronominally and adnominally, are extremely frequent in discourse, having a large number of functions. This is in contrast to the other demonstrative adverbs which are both less frequent in discourse and more consistent in their form.

	Manner*	Goal	Location	Amount
Proximal	<i>kenen</i>	<i>mene</i>	<i>kene</i>	<i>semene</i>
Medial	<i>konon</i>	<i>mono</i>	<i>kono</i>	<i>semono</i>
Distal	<i>kanan</i>	<i>mana</i>	<i>kana</i>	<i>semana</i>

Table 2. Cirebon Javanese demonstrative adverbs

* variants include: *mekenen, mengkenen; mekonon, mengkonon; mekanan, mengkanan.*

Demonstrative adverbs of manner mean something like ‘in this/that way’ or ‘like this/that’. In example (8), speaker D has just explained his approach to balancing his spending between education and going out with girls. He finishes by saying ‘That’s what I think’ – or more literally, in terms of the structure of the Javanese utterance, ‘As for me, my thinking is like that’.

- (8) D: *Kita mikire konon War.*
1 think-DEF like.that.MED War

‘That’s what I think, War.’ (114:431)

Demonstrative adverbs indicating location (here/there) are used together with the general preposition *ning, ng* (at, to, by) as seen in example (9). Because the preposition is general the locative meaning is expressed by the adverb. The demonstrative adverbs of goal (to here/there) do not take a preposition as seen in (10).

- (9) M: *Kaya ng kene, Kasturi la, bisa masak.*
like at here K. DIST can cook

‘Like here, Kasturi can cook.’ (151:29-31)

- (10) A: *Pertama mono, dipai kopi ca.*
first to.there.MED PT-give coffee VOC

‘The first time [I] went there, [I] was given coffee, man.’ (140:267-268)

The demonstrative adverbs of quantity mean ‘this/that many/much/amount’. In example (11) a food seller is indicating a certain amount of a snack and explaining that this would weigh three Indonesian metric ounces (3 x 100g).

- (11) B: *Semene telung on ki ni.*
 this.much three ounce PROX PROX

‘This much of this is three ounces.’ (107:627)

4. Pragmatic functions of demonstratives

Diessel (1999) identifies a set of major pragmatic functions that demonstratives regularly fulfil across languages, based on his analysis of 85 languages. Following many other researchers’ observations about demonstratives, he points out that “they are primarily used to focus the hearer’s attention on objects or locations in the speech situation (often in combination with a pointing gesture), but they may also function to organize the information flow in the ongoing discourse” (Diessel 1999:2). Diessel, following a majority view, says that based on evidence related to acquisition, markedness and grammaticisation, the exophoric function of pointing to things that are physically present in the surrounding context is the primary function of demonstratives from which other pragmatic functions are derived. Others have contended that all functions of demonstratives have an equal status (Himmelman 1997) or that other functions are more central to the meaning of deixis, such as emergent figure/ground orientations (Hanks 1992) and establishing stance among interlocutors (Laury 1997). The discussion in this section will be primarily looking at frequency of occurrence of different demonstrative forms being used for different pragmatic functions. While not tackling the larger theoretical question of primary function, the results do show that the exophoric function is not the most commonly used – the most frequent function of demonstratives in Cirebon Javanese conversational interaction is the anaphoric function, that of referring to entities previously established in discourse.

The frequency of demonstratives in the data is shown by proximity in Table 3. We can see that the medial forms (*iku* and related variants) are by far the most often used, coming in at about two-thirds of all occurrences. The remaining occurrences are closely split between the proximal and distal forms – with only a slightly higher percentage being proximal than distal. The frequency of occurrence of different pragmatic functions of demonstratives is shown in Table 4. Here we see that by far the most frequent function is anaphoric – in which a demonstrative pronoun or noun phrase marked by an adnominal demonstrative is co-referential with a referent previously mentioned in discourse. Anaphora accounts for 64% of demonstrative usage in the data sample. The recognitional function – in which the demonstrative indicates that a referent should be identifiable through shared understanding between interlocutors – comes in as second most frequent at 19%, followed by the exophoric pointing function at 13%. The least frequent function is that of discourse deixis at 4% - in which a demonstrative refers to a proposition in the discourse. In the following sections I will discuss the use of demonstratives for each of the four functions in more detail.

Proximal	71	18%
Medial	262	67%
Distal	59	15%
Total	392	100%

Table 3. Demonstratives in 3000-IU sample

Exophoric	52	13%
Endophoric		
Anaphoric	250	64%
Discourse Deictic	17	4%
Recognitional	73	19%
Total	392	100%

Table 4. Pragmatic functions of demonstratives

4.1 Exophoric use

The exophoric use of demonstratives involves pointing to the physical environment. As mentioned above, this function has been claimed to be basic by many researchers, and this link to the physical world is also considered to be one of the unique characteristics of demonstratives; it differentiates them from other grammatical terms which create links within rather than outside discourse (Diessel 1999). The notion of “pointing” that often accompanies discussion of demonstratives clearly aligns to the exophoric function of linking to physical space. Indeed physically pointing with a gesture (whether with finger, hand, lips or whatever form of pointing gesture is common to a particular culture) is said to often accompany the use of demonstratives. This is a folk understanding of demonstratives as well as an academic one. When one language consultant I worked with wanted to explain the meaning of demonstratives, he moved a plate of snacks into view between us, pointing to it emphatically saying *Kien iki ni!* ‘*PROX PROX PROX*’. The pointing gesture was not simply a statically extended finger, but rather small jab-like motion followed by a small retraction, iterated three times corresponding to the three (varying) iterations of the proximal demonstrative pronoun. Indeed emphatic use of demonstratives as indicated by triplets, seems to be particularly associated with this exophoric function. The triple demonstrative in example (7), while not pointing to something in the physical environment of the recorded discourse, is pointing to something in the physical environment of the narrative world being conjured by the speaker through storytelling. He is thus pointing across the divide between the world of discourse and the world of narrative, drawing his interlocutors’ attention to a glass of coffee that he was (purportedly) staring at and contemplating in his mind at the time the narrated event occurred – although neither pointing at it nor verbally mentioning it at that time.

Most occurrences of exophoric demonstratives are not so clearly emphatic. As the conversations from which these data are drawn were not video recorded, we do not know the extent to which physical pointing did or did not occur. Most of the time voice quality remains consistent, indicating a lack of marked emphasis. Yet the broader discourse context in the recordings clearly indicates that these are examples of referents

that are present in the physical world and attention is being drawn to them through the use of demonstratives. Because of the role of physical context, it may not be surprising that – as seen in Table 5. – the majority of exophoric demonstratives are proximal and medial, with only 6% used to point towards something (at least conceptually) far away.

Proximal	29	56%
Medial	20	38%
Distal	3	6%
Total	52	100%

Table 5. Exophoric demonstratives

In example (12) *iki* ‘PROX’ is used pronominally. Reference is accomplished because of the exophoric existence of the drink sitting between the speakers. In example (13) *ka* ‘DIST’ is used adnominally indicating that the *jambu* ‘rose apple’ tree referred to is one that is outside in the yard.

(12) B: *Mangga Pak. Diinum iki.*
 please sir PT-drink PROX
 ‘Please, sir. Drink this.’ (111:827-828)

(13) P: *Ning= wite jambu ka.*
 at tree-DEF jambu DIST

Jambu cilik ka, mengkonon nu.
 jambu small DIST like.that.MED MED.

‘By that *jambu* tree, that little *jambu*, like that.’ (151:532-534)

While exophoric use is considered by some as the basic function of demonstratives, it should be kept in mind that only 13% of the demonstratives in the Javanese conversational data analysed here are used in this way. This is similar to results in other languages, e.g. English for which Strauss (1993) found only 11% exophoric use in natural language data. Frequency itself is not enough to say that a function is basic – in Diessel’s (1999) analysis, he also considers acquisition and grammaticisation. A more detailed analysis looking at these other factors is beyond the scope of the present study, and so we cannot answer here the question of whether exophoric usage is basic for Cirebon Javanese demonstratives. Nonetheless, the relative infrequency of this function in the data does call into question what ‘primarily’ means when Diessel says “[demonstratives] are primarily used to focus the hearer’s attention on objects or locations in the speech situation (often in combination with a pointing gesture)” (1999:2).

4.2 Anaphoric use

The next three functions to be discussed are subtypes of endophoric reference, that is, reference that is tied to something within the text. First, anaphoric use occurs when a demonstrative is used to indicate co-referentiality with another noun phrase in the discourse. In this function, medial demonstratives are by far the most commonly used, as show in Table 6. Again, anaphoric use was by far the most common in the Javanese data examined here, coming in at 64% of all demonstratives (see Table 4.). One reason

for this high percentage could be the reliance of speakers on demonstratives for third person pronominal reference. Javanese has no non-human third person pronoun and the human third person pronoun found in other varieties of Javanese (*deweke*) is very rare in the Cirebon variety, whose speakers rely more often on demonstratives for explicitly anaphoric reference to people (Ewing 2001, 2005).

Proximal	31	12%
Medial	198	79%
Distal	21	8%
Total	250	100%

Table 6. Anaphoric demonstratives

In example (14), speaker W is telling a story about a motorcycle accident his brother experienced and the doubled medial demonstrative *ku nu* ‘MED MED’ pronominally refers to this protagonist.

- (14) W: *Ceritae apan= wewara mangkat.*
 story-DEF FUT tell leave

ku nu pan mangkat.
 MED MED FUT leave

‘The story is [he] was going to tell (mum he was) leaving. He was going to leave’.
 (114:213-214)

In example (15) N has been telling a story about his search for someone named Cardi. Adnominal *ku* ‘MED’ in this example indicates that ‘the name Cardi’ is anaphoric, identifiable due to prior mention in the text.

- (15) N: *Tapi aran Cardi ku laka je.*
 But name C. MED NEG.EXIST QUOTE
 ‘But the name Cardi didn’t exist he said.’ (111:782)

Examples (16) and (17) show the use of demonstratives with first and second personal pronouns respectively. (See further discussion in Section 0.)

- (16) W: *Beli mangan maning isun nu.*
 NEG eat again 1 MED
 ‘I didn’t eat again.’ (107:512)

- (17) W: *Ente ku <IND harus IND> ngapal-ngapalnang lagu*
 2 MED must AT-memorise-REDUP-APPL song

mengknonon Di.
 like.that.MED D.

‘You have to memorise songs like that, Di.’ (114:162)

4.3 Discourse deictic use

With discourse deixis, the noun phrase marked with a demonstrative refers to a proposition in the discourse. Table 7. shows that distal demonstratives are the most

common form used for this function in the data. The discourse deictic function itself is the least common function in the data.

Proximal	1	6%
Medial	6	35%
Distal	10	59%
Total	17	100%

Table 7. Discourse deictic demonstratives

Discourse deictic demonstratives may refer to a proposition previously mentioned, as in Example (18), where speaker O has just reported what another person's parents had said.

- (18) O: *Ya jare wong tuae ka.*
 yeah QUOTE parent-DEF DIST
 'Yeah that's what his parents said.' (107:483)

Discourse deixis can also occur cataphorically as in example (19). This cataphoric discourse deixis can have the feeling of a word search, where the conversational space is temporarily held while the speakers formulate the desired wording for the up-coming proposition.

- (19) O: *Sengaja kuen sih, beli mangan sega.*
 intentionally MED PART NEG eat rice
 '(He) intentionally does this, doesn't eat rice.' (107:515-516)

4.4 Recognitional demonstratives use

Recognitional demonstratives are those that indicate a referent is identifiable based on shared understanding or familiarity between speaker and hearer. The speaker indicates an expectation that the hearer will be able to identify the referent, although it has not been previously mentioned in the discourse. In the Javanese conversation data, the medial form is most frequently used for this function, although use of proximal and distal forms is not unusual.

Proximal	10	14%
Medial	38	52%
Distal	25	34%
Total	73	100%

Table 8. Recognitional demonstratives

In example (20), the interlocutors have been talking about various snacks that are commonly sold in their area. When A begins to talk about a particular person who uses old cassava leaves when she makes *docang* salad, this snack-seller has not been previously mentioned, but is assumed to be identifiable to the others, as indicated by the use of *ka* 'DIST'.

(20) A: *Ari wong dagang docang ka ya,*
 if person sell k.o.salad DIST yeah

godong campu nu, .. tua-tua,
 leaf cassava MED old-REDUP

‘As for that person who sells *docang*, the cassava leaves are old,’ (107:22-24)

5. Demonstratives and personal reference

In the preceding discussion, the use of demonstratives with first and second person reference was classified with the anaphoric function. It is not, however, clear that this is an appropriate solution. First and second person pronouns are clearly deictic in that their reference is derived through discourse context. However, following Bühler’s distinction, Diessel points out that they display person deixis, being tied to speech participant roles. This is in contrast to place deixis which is tied to entities and places (other than speech participants). Diessel goes on to clarify that “[d]emonstratives are place (or spatial) deictics” (1999:36). For him and others there does not seem to be a need to integrate person and place deixis in the context of demonstratives, possibly because use of demonstratives with first and second person reference is extremely rare and highly marked in German, English and other European languages. However, in Javanese and related languages use of demonstratives for person reference is quite frequent, and so in need of integration into a discussion of demonstratives.

From the perspective of information flow, first and second persons share an identifiability pathway – the means by which a reference becomes identifiable for interlocutors (Du Bois and Thompson 1991, Ewing 2005) – which is different from third person reference. Identifiability of first and second persons derives from their role as speech participants. This is unlike third persons, whose identifiability derives from previous mention, inference from discourse context or shared knowledge. First and second person pronouns are clearly deictic in that their reference is derived through discourse context. Given the set of four deictic functions presented in Table 4. and used in the preceding analysis, the argument for categorising first and second person use of deixis as anaphoric comes from the fact that these referents are typically tracked through discourse, similar to the anaphoric uses of third person forms. By pointing to entities in the discourse context – the interlocutors – they could be considered exophoric. Alternatively, an argument could be constructed which says identifiability is inferred from interlocutors’ shared knowledge about their roles within the speech event, and thus demonstrative reference to them could be categorised as recognitional. Resolving which demonstrative function best fits with first and second person reference is beyond the scope of this study, but the issue is clearly one that is in need of further research. It may be that the best solution is to recognise personal deixis as an additional function of demonstratives (in some languages).

Demonstrative marking of first and second persons in Javanese is also interesting because of questions it raises about the basic motivation of the three-way distinction in the demonstrative paradigm. In the preceding discussion, I have used the terms proximal, medial and distal. Anderson and Keenan (1985) point out that languages with a three-way deictic system may actually be either distance-oriented or person-oriented. In the case of a distance-oriented system, the middle term would indicate medial distance from the deictic centre. In a person-oriented system, the proximal term would indicate close to speaker, while the medial term would indicate close to hearer. In the case of Javanese, some researchers have described the deictic system in terms of

distance (e.g. Arps et al. 2000:47, Wedhawati et al. 2006:270), while others have described it in person-oriented terms (e.g. Robson 1992:36, Uhlenbeck 1978:222-239). Uhlenbeck's (1978:23) systematic analysis of standard Javanese associates the *iki* series with all three persons, the *iku* series with just second and third person and the *ika* series with only third person. In Cirebon Javanese, demonstratives in all three degrees of proximity can occur with both first person and second person reference (third person is not analysed here). In (21) and (22) the proximal demonstrative is used with both first and second person reference. First and second reference can also occur with medial demonstratives, as in (16) and (17) above, and with distal demonstratives as in (23) and (24).

(21) N: *Kita iki, ning kene je.*
 1 PROX at PROX PART

'I was here you know.' (111:786-787)

(22) D: ... *Udud maning lud?*
 smoke again VOC

... *Nyeret terus gi.*
 AT-smoke.opium continue PROX

'[You]'re smoking again, man? You keep smoking (like opium [said jokingly]).'
 (140:667-668)

(23) M: *Kita la, ora bisa.*
 1 DIST NEG can

'I can't.' (151: 33-34)

(24) W: *Apa kang perna dicerita'enang ning ente ka War.*
 what REL ever PT-tell-APPL by 2 DIST War

... *Yen sira kurang seneng, .. hindarana.*
 if 2 less happy avoid-IMP.APPL

'What you told (me) before War. If you don't like (something), avoid [it].'
 (114: 637-639)

The vast majority of examples of demonstratives with both first or second person reference are medial – there are only a handful of examples of either proximal or distal demonstratives used with either first or second person reference. While this does not definitively establish that Javanese demonstratives are not (ever) person-oriented, it does call into question what it might mean to say that they are primarily so. In addition, the high number of medial demonstratives suggests that in terms of deployment in discourse and interaction, demonstratives used to refer to speech participants pattern more or less like (third person) anaphora, rather than exophoric usage. Having said that, there are similarities in choice of form between demonstrative reference to speech participants and recognitional use, which also prefers medial forms.

6. Demonstratives in conversational interaction

In Sections 3 and 4, a number of individual examples of demonstrative use were discussed in order to illustrate key functions and to show trends in preferences for one type of demonstrative over others in these different key functions. These examples have included full intonation units, or in some cases longer utterances, as a minimal context in which to illustrate the relevant functions. However, demonstratives are actually

deployed by speakers in contexts of extended discourse – in the case of the data examined here, in conversational interaction. Looking at demonstrative use in these larger contexts of language use, it becomes clear their pragmatic importance goes beyond local marking of identifiability within individual intonation units. One of the other key functions of demonstratives in Javanese interaction is to aid in projectability. Projectability refers to the feature of natural language-in-use whereby interactants are able to make reasonable hypotheses about the direction a particular instance of language use is headed, in terms of structure, meaning and – crucially – social action (Thompson and Couper-Kuhlen 2005, Auer 2005). One important area where this occurs is in interlocutors' ability to project where one speaker's turn will end, allowing an opportunity for change of speakers. In the organisation of talk in interaction, intonation units are central to the expression of ideas or propositional content (Chafe 1994) and in Cirebon Javanese (as in many languages) the organisation of series of intonation units into larger prosodic clusters is an important structuring strategy in producing units that project syntactic, semantic and interactional completion (Ewing 2005). Demonstratives can play an important role in signposting the development of ideational structure in Javanese interaction (Berman 1998) and thus projectability. This is illustrated in the following examples.

Example (25) illustrates a very common function of demonstrative adverbs in Javanese conversation: as a marker of the end of a prosodic cluster which projects a possible end of turn. Notice that after two intonation units with continuing intonation, speaker W first projects a possible end of his utterance with the final intonation contour of the third line in example (25). This is followed by a second unit with final intonation, produced at a slightly reduced pitch level and containing the adverbial demonstrative *konon* 'like that'. It is at this point that D then responds with laughter.

(25) W: *Margane, sedurunge,*
reason-DEF before

kita .. njaluk maap ndikit. konon.
1 AT-request forgive first like.that.MED

D: @@@@

W: 'So beforehand I'm apologising first. Like that.'

D: (LAUGHING) (114:602-606)

In the following, each intonation unit ends in a demonstrative. Although *ka* 'DIST' at the end of first line is adnominal, while the following two instances of *ka* are pronominal, the repetition of the lexeme in corresponding locations within the prosodic structure helps to mark the ideational units in this utterance, as well as contribute to the expressive nature of how it is produced (see Tannen 2007 on repetition and expressiveness in conversational interaction).

(26) A: *Sambele biasa ka,*
sambal-DEF common DIST

.. manis ka. enak ka.
sweet DIST tasty DIST

A: 'The regular *sambal*, it's sweet, it's nice.' (107: 562-564)

Demonstratives of course do not always occur at the end of intonation units, but various structural facts about Javanese converge to make this a very common location for them. These include the fact that, as mentioned previously, demonstrative determiners are always the final element in their noun phrase and that Predicate-Subject word order commonly occurs with pronominal subjects, most often realised by a demonstrative pronoun. In this way, demonstratives often work with other common intonation unit final particles such as vocatives and quotatives to ensure that the ideational units expressed in intonation units are indicated not only by intonation contour, but by the frequent occurrence of these particles. Example (27) shows intonation unit final short demonstratives alternating with the first person quotative particle *sun* ‘I said / according to me’ to regularly mark the end of each intonation unit in a series.

(27) P: .. *Bi Mesni dipai seg=a sun.*
 aunt M. PT-give rice QUOTE.1

... *Ning Endang 'u.*
 by E. MED

.. *Muni seng Mimi ku,*
 say from mother MED

darane seng= Marsani sun.
 claim from M. QUOTE.1

‘Bi Mesni was given some rice I said, by Endang. (When) [she] said [it] was from *Mimi*, she meant from Marsani I said.’ (151:913-916)

Example (28) shows the use of vocatives together with demonstratives in a similar series of intonation units marked with IU-final particles. Note here that the co-occurrence of demonstrative and vocative helps to project the end of a turn unit, which can be seen by the new turn taken up by D, then again by W’s response after D.

(28) W: (H) *Dadi miring ku, .. kejadiane ku.*
 so leaning MED event-DEF MED

motor kuen Di.
 motorcycle MED D.

D: *Karwan numpak motor lu.*
 K. AT-ride motorcycle MED

Ari kita= ndeleng Karwan ku, motor ku,
 if 1 AT-see K. MED motorcycle MED

beli sok balap <X ndelengaken X> ku War.
 NEG often fast AT-look.at MED W.

W: (*Tsk*) *Iya=.*
 yes

W: ‘So it was leaning over, the situation. the motorcycle, Di.’

- D: 'Karwan was riding a motorcycle. When I've seen Karwan, (on) a motorcycle, [he] doesn't usually go fast it seems, War.'
 W: 'Yes.' (114:297-352)

As noted above, demonstrative adverbials commonly mark the end of an utterance and can, often together with other cues, project a transition relevance point where a change in speaker can take place. This is illustrated in (29). Here L's second line ends in a demonstrative and does in fact project a possible point of transition. There is a pause without uptake by another speaker and so L continues. His next line serves as a coda to his short narrative illustrating how one needs to be careful when visiting women. This is accomplished by repeating the setting of the scenario and finishing with the demonstrative adverb *mekonon* 'like that' which serves the discourse anaphoric function of drawing attention to the set of actions and attitudes that L has just outlined. These together further project the end of L's turn, and this time A responds by instigating a new topic, directed to a different speaker.

- (29) L: *maca bismillah diki=t ira,*
 read bismillah first 2

temenan kita nu.
 seriously 1 MED

... *Boko ning umae boca wadon mekonon.*
 if at house-DEF child female like.that.MED

- A: .. *Ira coba bae Ul.*
 2 try just U

- L: You really need to recite *bismillah* first I tell myself. ... When I'm at a girl's house, it's like that.

- A: You know what Ul. (140:287-294)

This examination of interactive conversation illustrates the important role played by demonstratives – in all their different forms and pragmatic functions – in the projectability of units and the organisation of talk.

7. Conclusion

Cirebon Javanese has a three-way demonstrative system, which has generally been characterised as distance-oriented and sometimes as person-oriented. In addition to this three-way semantic distinction, there is a formal distinction between a variety of long and short form demonstratives, which exhibit individual and stylistic variation in use. The medial forms are by far the most commonly occurring demonstratives in the conversational data examined here. However, preferences for different forms can be seen when the various pragmatic functions of demonstrative use are considered. The anaphoric function – by far the most common function – together with the recognitional function both favour use of medial demonstratives. The exophoric function however favours use of proximal demonstratives. In contrast, the discourse deictic function favours use of distal demonstratives. Demonstratives have also been shown to play an important role in the on going interactional development of conversational talk. These findings suggest that Javanese demonstratives maybe be better characterised in terms of stance and orientation to discourse and personal involvement, rather than physical proximity or grammatical person, and point towards productive avenues for further

research into the multifaceted roles these important grammatical elements play in conversational interaction.

Transcription Conventions

.	final transitional continuity
,	continuing transitional continuity
?	appeal transitional continuity
line break	each intonation unit appears on a separate line
..	short pause
...	long pause
@	pulse of laughter
=	lengthening of preceding segment
A:	speaker attribution
[]	overlapping segment of speech
<IND IND>	Indonesian
<X X>	unsure hearing of words between brackets

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
APPL	applicative
AT	A trigger
DEF	definite
DIST	distal
FUT	future
IMP.APPL	imperative applicative
MED	medial
NEG	negative
NEG.EXIST	negative existential
PART	discourse particle
PROX	proximal
PT	P trigger
QUOTE	quotative particle
QUOTE.1	first person quotative
REDUP	reduplication
REL	relative clause particle
VOC	vocative

References

- Anderson, S.R. and E.L. Keenan. 1985. Deixis. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description Volume 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 259-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arps, Ben, Els Bogaerts, Willem van der Molen, Ignatius Supriyanto and Jan van den Veerdonk. 2000. *Hedendaags Javaans* [Contemporary Javanese]. Leiden: Opleiding Talen en Culturen van Zuidoost-Azië en Oceanië, Universiteit Leiden.
- Auer, Peter. 2005. Projection in Interaction and Projection in Grammar. *Text* 25:7-36.
- Berman, Laine. 1998. *Speaking through the silence: narratives, social conventions and power in Java*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, consciousness, and time: The flow and displacement of conscious experience in speaking and writing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Du Bois, John W. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1991. *Dimensions of a theory of information flow*. MS University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Du Bois John W., Stephen Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino and Susanna Cumming. 1993. Outline of discourse transcription. In J.A. Edwards and M.D. Lampert (eds.) *Talking data: transcription and coding methods for language research*, 45-89. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ewing, Michael C. 2001. "Reference and recovery in Cirebon Javanese conversation." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21.1:25-47.
- Ewing, Michael C. 2005. *Grammar and inference in conversation: identifying clause structure in spoken Javanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ford, Cecelia E. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. Interactional units in conversation: Syntactic, intonational, and pragmatic resources for the management of turns. In Elinor Ochs, Emanuel A. Schegloff and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Interaction and Grammar*, 134-184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Cecilia E., Barbara A. Fox and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. 2002. *The language of turn and sequence*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hanks, William F. 1992. *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space among the Maya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1997. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara A. Fox (ed.) *Studies in anaphora*, 205-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Keeler, Ward. 1985. Villagers and the Exemplary Center in Java. *Indonesia* 39: 111-140.
- Laura, Ritva. 1997. *Demonstratives in Interaction: the Emergence of a Definite Article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lewis, M. Paul, ed. 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Sixteenth edition. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.

- Ogloblin, Alexander K. 2005. Javanese. In K. Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus Himmelmann (eds.) *The Austronesian Languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 590-624. London: Routledge.
- Robson, Stuart. 1992. *Javanese Grammar for Students*. Clayton VIC: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Smith-Hefner, Nancy J. 1989. A social history of language change in highland East Java. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 48.2: 257-271.
- Strauss, Susan. 1993. Why 'this and 'that' are not complete without 'it'. In *Proceedings of the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 403-417.
- Tannen, Deborah. 2007. *Talking Voices*, Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, Sandra A. and Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen. 2005. The clause as a locus of grammar and interaction. *Discourse Studies* 7:481-505.
- Uhlenbeck, E.M. 1978. *Studies in Javanese Morphology*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Uhlenbeck, E.M. 1983. *Javanese linguistics: a retrospect and some prospects*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Wedhawati, Wiwin Erni Siti Nurlina, Edi Setiyanto, Restu Sukesti, Marsono and I. Praptomo Baryadi. 2006. *Tata Bahasa Jawa Mutakhir* [Modern Javanese Grammar], Revised Edition. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Zoetmulder, P.J and I.R. Poedjawiyatna. 1961. *Bahasa Parwa: Tatabahasa Djawa Kuno* [The Ancient Language: a Grammar of Old Javanese]. Jakarta: Obor.