

ANAPHORIC MARKERS IN INDONESIAN TEXTS

Keith McCune and Azhar M. Simin

0. INTRODUCTION

Ever since reading the important work of Dardjowidjojo (1979) on the anaphoric markers *se-*, *nya*, and *itu*, the present authors have been wondering how to supplement the description found in that article, in order to account for certain exceptions. This paper shall attempt to describe:

- (a) conditions for the use of *se-* which will explain why some non-familiar NP's in a discourse are not marked with *se-*,
- (b) conditions for the use of *-nya* which will explain why some inferable NP's are not marked with *-nya*, and
- (c) conditions for the use of *itu* (and *ini*) which will explain why some previously mentioned NP's are not marked with *itu* or *ini*.¹

The three determiners will be treated in the following order: part 1 deals with *se-*, part 2, *-nya*, and part 3, *ini* and *itu*. Part 4 is a brief discussion of the use of these markers in certain literary devices.

1. CONDITIONS FOR THE USE OF *se-*.

1.0 Introduction

Se-, as used here, is an abbreviation for the form *se-* + classifier. (In this study, *s(u)atu* has been included as a variant of the *se-* option, although in fact there are important differences between *se-* and *s(u)atu* *one* which must be taken up in future analysis.²

Non-familiar entities in texts (that is, those not assumed to be familiar to the reader by either presence in the situation, prior mention, inference or general knowledge) tend to be marked with *se-* only when the encoding NP is performing one of two overlapping functions: either creating a discourse referent, or measuring singular quantity. Otherwise, non-familiar NP's are normally left non-determined.

Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm, eds *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, vol.4: *Thematic variation*, 71-100. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-77, 1983.

© Keith McCune and Azhar M. Simin

1.1 Creating a discourse referent

Karttunen (1968) has described two categories of indefinite nominals in English which do not create discourse referents: (a) indefinite, non-specific predicate nominals and (b) indefinite nominals dominated by negation or an irrealis modality.³ (An NP has created a discourse referent if a subsequent reference to the same entity can take a marker of definiteness, such as the English *the*, or a pronoun.) The reason Karttunen gives for the properties that these NP's exhibit in texts is that they are non-specific, not really referring to an individual. The speaker does not normally have an individual in mind in such cases.

Creation of a discourse referent is probably a condition for *se-*. Thus, many non-familiar, unmarked NP's in Indonesian fit into Karttunen's categories of non-specific NP's. Under type (a), we will consider not only equative clauses but also comparisons. Under type (b) we will look at negations, conjectures and requests. In addition we will look at (c) nominals in adverbial constructions.⁴

1.1.1 Descriptive NP's

Indefinite predicate nominals in equative clauses, since they merely encode membership in a class, tend to be unmarked. This is true in the following four examples:

- (1) Kalau perempuan itu mata-mata, maka ia adalah sebagian dari musuh yang pernah mencincang kawan-kawanku di pinggir sungai Progo. (K — see SOURCES OF DATA, p.98.)
*If the woman were a spy, then she was part of the enemy that had hacked my comrades to pieces on the bank of the River Progo.*⁵
- (2) Aku dulu ingin jadi pelukis dan menggambar tubuh-tubuh yang bagus.
I used to want to be an artist and draw beautiful bodies.
- (3) Aku menjadi benci kepada diriku sendiri, ... Aku pengecut! (K)
I begin to hate myself ... I was a coward!
- (4) Dikejar-kejar oleh Belanda selama empat bulan ini ia lebih merupakan beban yang menghambat kaki untuk melarikan diri dari maut. (K)
Being chased by the Dutch for these four months, she was more a burden weighing down my feet in my fleeing from death.

This is the normal pattern for nominal predicates.⁶ Like indefinite predicate nominals, the scope of a comparison (the NP following the word meaning *like*) is unmarked in most cases:

- (5) Sedangkan daun-daun yang kering, luruh menghampiri tanah seolah permadani. (H)
And the dry leaves completely covered the ground like a carpet.
- (6) Apapula suara berdentung seperti meninabobo. (H)
Moreover the sound hummed like a lullaby.

In these instances, an unmarked nominal represents the compared-with entity, and this indeed is the most common pattern. The reason is that in most comparisons, only the class is relevant, and thus no individual is referred to.⁷

The two examples below are exceptions to this norm: the compared-with entity is marked with se-. However, as we shall see in these examples, se- is appropriate because some kind of individuality is, in fact, established.

- (7) Dan Jim tiba-tiba memegang dahinya, matanya dipejamkannya.
 Mula-mula dia kelihatan seperti seorang aktor yang lupa menghafal dialog yang mesti dikuasainya... (D)
And suddenly Jim grabbed his forehead, and closed his eyes.
At first he looked like an actor who has forgotten to memorise a dialogue he ought to know by heart...

In this case the author is not merely indicating a set, as he is in (5) or (6), but is creating the image of a particular individual. He is pointing out a similarity between two individuals, for each of which he intends the reader to establish mental 'files' or 'addresses'. The latter terms, drawn from computer science, denote centres in memory to which information may subsequently be directed. Such information appears in the rather long relative clause. The reader is given a brief 'life history' of the compared-with NP. These relative clauses then, reflect the establishment of the individuality which seems to be a requisite for introducing an entity with se-. Again, in (8) below,

- (8) Dan aku sudah bosan kepada perempuan ini. Selama ia bunting ini ia rupanya seperti satu luka yang membusuk yang membarah yang memualkan perutku. (K)
And I was already tired of this woman. As long as she was pregnant she seemed like a foul, festering, nauseating wound.

One is presented with more than mere membership in the set 'wound': considerable detail is provided, enough to imagine this particular wound rather vividly.⁶

1.1.2 Negative and irrealis modes

When a non-familiar entity falls under the scope of a negative, in narrative use, it tends to be unmarked. The following excerpts demonstrate this tendency.⁹

- (9) Di dalam perjuangan tidak ada soal nilai dan kehormatan, keculai kejantanan dan penghindaran dari maut. (K)
In war there is no question of values or respect, except for masculinity and escape from death.
- (10) Tidak pernah ada mata-mata dapat lolos hidup-hidup dari tanganku. (K)
There was never a spy that could escape from my hands with his life.
- (11) Ketika keesokan harinya si Kabayan pergi ke hutan, ia tidak melihat perempuan. (H)
The next day when Kabayan went to the forest, he didn't see any woman.
- (12) Tetapi keesokan harinya, ketika dinihari mertuanya membangunkan si Kabayan, ia tak mendapat jawaban. (M)
But the next day, when at dawn his father-in-law came to wake up Kabayan, he got no answer.

Non-familiar entities mentioned in conjectures also usually fail to create a discourse referent. In (13) and (14), the speakers present hypothetical conditions. (13) portrays an imagined and unlikely situation, while (14) is a pseudo-conditional generalisation.

- (13) "Ya, tetapi bagaimana kalau nanti ada orang yang menanyakan nama Bapak kepadaku? Bukankah jelek kalau aku tak bisa menjawab?" (M)
"Yes, but what if someone (or: a person) asks me your father's name? Wouldn't it be awful if I couldn't answer?"
- (14) Tetapi ketika ia lagi duduk di bawah sebatang kelapa, dilihatnya seekor tetinggi lagi berjalan dengan kakinya yang beribu-ribu itu. Kalau ada barang yang menyentuh tubuhnya, segera binatang itu menggulingkan badan menjadi bulat seperti roda (H)
But when he was sitting under a coconut tree, he saw a centipede walking with its thousands of legs... If something touched its body, the animal immediately rolled its body up round like a wheel.

(A more literal translation of *orang* and *barang* might be *person* and *thing*.)
 The examples below highlight the result of a hypothetical condition.

- (15) Begitu pula kalau mengerjakan ladang, ia tak pernah meminta bantuan menantunya. Ia tahu, tentu akan ada-ada saja alasan si Kabayan untuk mengelakkan perkerjaan. (M)
So if he worked in his field after that, he never asked for his son-in-law's help. He knew Kabayan would surely have an excuse to avoid working.

Finally, one example shows an unmarked nominal in a prediction.

- (16) Aku mendengar desing-desing yang menyayat-nyayat lagi udara, lalu bunyi seperti kipas besi yang berputar-putar. Tanda peluru akan dekat jatuhnya. (K)
I heard a whistling sound tearing the air again, then a sound like an iron propeller whirling. That meant that a shell was about to land nearby.

Like conjectures, requests involve a semantic 'maybe'. Thus, one would expect them to follow the same pattern of non-marking of the NP, as indeed is true of (17) and (18):

- (17) Malam itu juga aku bangunkan Pak Merto yang rumahnya kupakai menginap itu, minta pinjam sarung dan dengan kain itu di tanganku aku masuk ke biliknya. (K)
That night I woke up Pak Merto whose house I was using for lodging, and asked to borrow a sarong and with that cloth in my hand, entered her room.
- (18) "Peggy, my love.
 Aku butuh penjelasan. Kenapa kau tidak jadi datang?" (D)
*"Peggy, my love.
 I need an explanation. Why didn't you come?"*

At the time of mention, the entities mentioned have not yet materialised, and in this sense, they remain irrealis.¹⁰

However, as will be shown in section 1.2 of this paper, this principle is overridden in many requests quoted in *Secangkir kopi dan sepotong donat*. The reason may be that these requests are all food-orders in a restaurant, in which specification of quantity is important. Quantification, not individualisation, would then be the purpose of the use of *se-*.

1.1.3 Adverbials

Non-familiar NP's tend to be non-determined in adverbial phrases of manner. This can be seen in the following data:

- (19) Istrinya bisa dikasih mengerti. Kemudian perlahan-lahan, dengan suara gemetar karena takut kena tullah, suaranya berdesis menjawab: "Guto." (M)
He was able to make his wife understand. Then slowly, with a voice trembling for fear of being struck by some catastrophe, she whispered her answer: "Guto."
- (20) Aku melangkah maju dan menangkap tangannya, hendak menyeretnya ke luar. Ia membelalak kepadaku dengan pandangan meminta-minta... (K)
I stepped forward and caught her hand, intending to drag her outside. She stared at me with an imploring look...

However, se- can occur in a manner phrase:

- (21) Kemudian dengan satu tarikan yang sebat dan tegas dengan lipstick dilukiskannya satu gambaran jantung yang besar di kaca itu. Dan dengan gerakan yang sama tegas dan sebatnya ditariknya satu lukisan panah yang dengan garangnya menembus jantung yang besar itu. (D)
Then with a quick, sharp jerk she drew with her lipstick a picture of a big heart on the mirror. And with a move just as sharp and quick she sketched a drawing of an arrow piercing cruelly through that big heart.

This example is made even more interesting by the fact that the second clause contains a parallel phrase without se-.¹¹

1.2 Measuring singular quantity

Se- is required when the quantity 'one' must be specified.

- (22) ... urat sarafku yang selalu tegang selama dalam perjuangan ini masih menangkap bunyi tambakan meletup di kejauhan. Mungkin di Jenggotan satu kilometer dari sini, tempat menetap pasukan Sumarjo.
... my nerves, which had always been tense while I was in this war could still catch the sound of shooting in the distance. Perhaps in Jenggotan, one kilometre from here, where Sumarjo's division was staying.

An extension of the measuring function of se- is its use for emphatic negation: the idea of 'not even one'.

- (23) Tapi tidak seorangpun yang berani bergerak. (D)
But no one dared to move.
- (24) Tak seorangpun manusia dilihatnya. (M)
He didn't see a single person (or: anyone).

Specification of quantity however, is apparently not always crucial in conversation. Note the two following restaurant orders:

- (25) "0, seperti biasa, Peggy. Kopi dan sepotong cruller." (D)
"Oh, the usual, Peggy. Coffee and a cruller."
- (26) "Peggyyyy, secangkir kopi lagi dan donat macaroon." (D)
"Peggyyyy, another cup of coffee and a macaroon donut."

Since the location of se- is exactly switched in these two requests, it seems that in this setting quantity is assumed to be singular, unless stated otherwise.

In informal contexts at least, se- can be omitted when quantity is recoverable without it. In *Si Kabayan pergi ke hutan*, there are three occasions where Kabayan's meeting of some new thing in the forest is reported first by the author to the reader, and then by Kabayan to his mother-in-law. (27) describes his encounter with a beehive, (28) with a deer, and (29) with a beautiful woman.

- (27) ... Maka terpeganglah olehnya daun yang sudah kuning. Sambil meggerutu, dilemparkannya, lalu diinjak-injak sampai hancur. Kemudian ditengokkannya kepalanya ke atas. Maka nampak olehnya sebuah sarang lebah yang amat besar pada dahan yang paling rendah ...
"Ya, tetapi apakah kau tidak menemukan apa-apa, sehingga pulang bertangan hampa?"

"Ada sarang lebah saya temukan ..." (H)
... Then he found he was holding a yellowed leaf. Grumbling, he threw it down and trampled it into powder. Then he turned his head to look up. And he saw a very large beehive on the lowest branch ...
"Yes, but didn't you find anything - is that why you've come home empty-handed?"
"I found a beehive ..."

- (28) Si Kabayan tidak tahu lagi jalan ke tempat sarang lebah yang kemaren dilahatnya. Tetapi di sebuah semak yang agak rimbun, dilihatnya seekor rusa lagi tidur di bawah naungan pohon ...

Waktu sampai di rumah, mertuanya bertanya:

"Kabayan, apakah yang kautemui di hutan?"

Si Kabayan menjawab malas:

"Ada seekor rusa. Ia lagi tidur ..." (H)

Kabayan no longer knew the way to the beehive he had seen the day before. But in a rather dense thicket he saw a deer sleeping under the shelter of a tree ...

When he got home, his mother-in-law asked:

"Kabayan, what did you find in the forest?"

Si Kabayan answered lazily:

"There was a deer. He was sleeping ..."

- (29) Tatkala ia berjalan di jalan-tempuhan yang merupakan lorong dalam hutan, kebetulan dari arah depan ada seorang perempuan cantik yang sedang menuju ke arah si Kabayan. Melihat ada yang berjalan ke arahnya, si Kabayan berkata dalam hati: "Ini dia!" ...
 Ketika ia tiba di rumah, mertuanya bertanya:

"Apa yang kau temui di hutan, Kabayan, maka mukamu pucat tak berdarah seperti itu?"

Jawab si Kabayan singkat:

"Ia mati kutombak."

"Apa yang mati kau tombak?"

Si Kabayan: "Perempuan itu."

Mertuanya: "Perempuan yang mana?"

Si Kabayan: "Tadi waktu saya di hutan ada perempuan. Lalu saya lakukan pesan Emak. Ia saya tombak, mati ... " (H)

When he was walking along the alley that penetrated the forest, by chance from the other direction there was a beautiful woman coming toward him. Seeing there was someone walking toward him, Kabayan said to himself: "This is it!"... when he got home, his mother-in-law asked:

"What did you find in the forest, Kabayan, to make your face all pale like that?"

Kabayan answered curtly:

"Something I speared to death."

"What did you spear to death?"

Kabayan: "The woman."

His mother-in-law: "What woman?"

Kabayan: "When I was in the forest a while ago there was a woman. Then I did what you said to do. I speared her; she died..."

In (27) and (29) the author's first mention of the beehive and the woman takes se-, while Kabayan's does not. On the other hand, in (28), both the author and Kabayan use se-.

The explanation for this pattern may be as follows. Given certain grammatical contexts, se- is used less in informal conversation than in literary writing. Kabayan, unlike the author, omits se- whenever the quantity 'one' is recoverable without it. Thus, sarang can remain non-determined because it is the nature of wild beehives to occur alone. However, since deer can appear in pairs or even larger groups, it is helpful to clarify the quantity of deer by adding seekor. As for the woman, quantity is recoverable in that case because of the immediately preceding conversation.

2. CONDITIONS FOR THE USE OF -nya

2.0 Introduction

The NP-marker -nya encodes either (a) possession by, or (b) inference from some entity previously mentioned or present in the situation, or (c) both possession and inference. However, the converse is not true. Specifically, it is not true that inferability is always encoded with -nya.

2.1 Inference and possession

As background, let us begin by giving examples of the three uses of NP-marker -nya described above. First, -nya can represent possession when inference is not operative. (For heuristic reasons, 'possession' here will be defined in terms of English possession.)¹² An instance of this is seen in the very moving opening scene of Tur's *Yang hitam*. First, the reader gradually learns that the main character is blind. He then reads:

- (30) Ia merubah letak duduknya. Dan roda-roda keretanya bergesekan pada asnya. Ia mengeluh lagi. Mengeluh lagi. Mengeluh lagi. Di saat ia tidak tidur, ia harus duduk di kursi kereta itu ... (Y)
He changed his position. And the wheels of his chair rubbed against the axle. He sighed again. Sighed again. Sighed again. When he wasn't sleeping, he had to sit in this wheelchair...

In this case the underlined NP is possessed by the man. It is not, however, inferable; on the contrary, the wheelchair comes as a surprise.

Secondly, *-nya* can mark nominals that are inferable from, but not possessed by, a previously mentioned entity.

- (31) Tiba di markas sudah petang dan malamnya aku suruh dia meniduri bilik di sebelahku. Di luar Darso menjaganya, berbaring di ruang tengah. Hawanya dingin dan tengah malam aku terganggu... (K)
When we arrived at headquarters it was already afternoon, and that night I ordered her to sleep in the room beside mine. Outside, Darso was guarding her, sleeping in the middle room. The weather was cold and at midnight I was disturbed...

The two underlined NP's above, *malamnya that night* and *hawanya the weather* illustrate this point. Malam is inferable as a member in the sequence suggested by petang *afternoon*. And of course every time and place is characterised by some kind of weather (*hawa*). But neither of these NP's would be appropriately translated with a possessive, in English: *its night, its weather*.

Thirdly, *-nya* sometimes marks nominals that stand in both a possessive and an inferential relation to the antecedent.

- (32) Jonggrangan ialah dukuh yang lebih ke atas lagi mendekati gunung Sumbing. Penghuninya jarang... (K)
Jonggrangan was the next highest, a village even higher up towards Mt Sumbing. The/Its inhabitants were few...

The reader can infer the presence of inhabitants from normal expectations about villages: the village has inhabitants (*dukuh itu ada penghuni*). The underlined NP is both inferable and possessable.

2.2 Inference without *-nya*

Having established this background, we now shall proceed to our main point. Some inferable entities in texts are marked with *itu* rather than *-nya*.¹³ Consider excerpt (33) below:

- (33) Langit hijau di mukaku. Hari sudah subuh waktu itu. (K)
The sky was green in front of me. At that time it was already dawn.

The underlined NP is inferable in the sense that every state must by natural necessity obtain at some time. Then why is the NP marked with *itu*, rather than *-nya*? This case seems very similar to *hawanya the weather* in (31): every time and place must have some kind of weather just as certainly as every state must occur during some time. Yet the former inference is represented by *-nya*, while the latter is not. (One might ask, conversely, how the effect would differ if in (31) the underlined NP's were changed to malam *itu* and hawa *itu*.) It seems likely in this case that the explanation lies in a property of certain general nouns denoting the time and place of an event (such as waktu *time*, ketika *point in time*, saat *moment* and tempat *place*). These nouns are used with demonstratives (*itu* or *ini*) to create deictic anchors for the cohesion of a text. This anchoring effect could not be achieved with the mere marking of inference by *-nya*.

Apparently inferable entities are also marked with *itu* rather than *-nya* when the inference is based on what Schank (1975) calls a 'script'. Scripts are our expectations that a given social activity will imply certain steps, props, goals and roles. This is seen in the following two examples:

(34) Sudah banyak kali aku menjatuhkan hukuman. Orang itu kusuruh membikin lobang sebesar dia ... (K)
Many times I had pronounced the death sentence. I would order the person to make a hole as big as himself...

(35) Akan tetapi sekali ini yang amat menyenangkanya benar. Biasanya selalu tawar-menawar dahulu. Selalu diperbencangkan uang. Menurut perasaannya, menyebut-nyebut uang selalu merusakkan perasaan kemudian. Dia lebih suka dia membayar kemudian lebih banyak, asal perempuan itu jangan tawar-menawar seakan pedagang saja. (S)
But this time it was really quite satisfying. Usually there was some haggling beforehand. Always these money negotiations. He felt that mentioning money always spoiled the pleasure later. He preferred paying more, as long as the woman didn't go bargaining as though it were merely business.¹⁴

Since both of these excerpts describe activities whose scripts require a second participant, even the initial mention of that second participant (the condemned in (34), the female consort in (35)) has *inferred* status.

The hypothesis being presented here is that roles inferred from scripts take *itu*, not *-nya*. One might present as counterevidence example (32), where the inhabitants (*penghuninya*) are inferable from a 'village script' and yet do not take *-nya*. However, that case is too ambiguous to be a valid counter-example, since the *-nya* in that NP could be attributed to possession rather than to inference.¹⁵

Thus we must introduce the first modification of our hypothesis. An entity inferable by script is marked with *itu* rather than *-nya* when it is not construed as possessable by the antecedent.

A further qualification of the hypothesis may be in order, in light of the following data. If a performer were extremely late for a concert in Indonesia, and the manager of the hall came out on stage, an irate member of the audience might shout:

(36) "Mana orangnya?"
 "Where's the man?"

This intuitive data might be more satisfying if supported by material in a larger text, and yet the difference of marking between this last example and (34) should be accounted for. It may be that *itu* is used to more completely integrate the inferred entity into the discourse. This seems to be the case in (34) and (35), where the two underlined NP's represent (a class of) participants with whom the main participant is fully interacting.¹⁶

3. CONDITIONS FOR THE USE OF *itu* AND *ini*

3.0 Introduction

Four constraints of varying strengths seems to determine whether a demonstrative (*itu* or *ini*) is used to mark an NP (as opposed to no demonstrative).¹⁷ To these, in order to convey their relative degrees of strength, one can assign rough numerical values, as shown below:

1. Exophoric Reference: +3
2. Non-restrictive Modifier: +3
3. Prior Mention: +1
4. Non-bounded Reference: -2

Of course these values do not have hard and fast predictive significance, nor are they computed by careful countings. Instead, they are a rough representation of the frequency of correlation of a given NP property with the use of demonstratives. They also indicate which constraints override others. An NP with a positive score (≥ 1) after all values are added is likely to be marked by a demonstrative. Each of the four constraints will be described in turn.

3.1 Exophoric reference

This term is taken from Halliday and Hasan (1976). Fillmore (1975) was getting at the same idea when he opposed gestural and symbolic deixis (which require a knowledge of speaker's time and place for comprehension) to anaphoric deixis. Exophoric reference or gestural/symbolic deixis, then, deals with space and time.

Two examples of this occurrence from the data show that the exophoric constraint operates independently of the endophoric (prior mention) constraint.

(37) "Jangan bawa koja itu!" teriaknya. (H)
"Don't take that pouch!" he shouted.

(38) Aku tertarik kepada langit biru, kepada seni, kepada mimpi. Seperti orang yang doyan madat. Tetapi kesukaan lama itu tampak dari waktu sekarang ini sebagai kelemahan yang kecut. (K)
I was attracted to the blue sky, to art, to dreams. Like an opium addict. But that old fondness looks, from the present time, like a cowardly weakness.

Neither of the underlined NP's has been mentioned before as such in the text. Rather, the demonstrative is used to point in space (37) or time (38). This constraint has a high ranking, because gestural/symbolic deixis seems to always use a demonstrative.

3.2 Non-restrictive modifier

A non-restrictive modifier is a modifier encoding properties that are: (a) not essential or defining: these properties "can be changed without changing the meaning of the proposition",¹⁸ and (b) not identificational: not answering a presupposed question "which one?" Thus, the purpose of such modifiers is not primarily to enable the reader to single out the correct member of the set denoted by the head noun, but rather to *supplement* the reader's understanding of some referent.¹⁹

The following example shows that the non-restrictive modifier condition operates independently of exophoric reference and prior mention.

(39) Kagum si Kabayan melihat tanduk rusa yang panjang bercabang-cabang itu. Ia menilik dengan teliti. Lalu teringat akan pesan mertuanya. Maka diambilnya koja yang tersandang di bahunya itu. Dari dalamnya dia keluarkan obor dan kayu api. (H)
Amazed, Kabayan looked at the deer's long, branching antlers. He studied it carefully. Then he remembered his mother-in-law's instructions. So he took the pouch slung at his shoulder. From inside it he got out a torch and some firewood.

Since the pouch at this point is not familiar by previous mention, inference or general knowledge; and since the author is not pointing to it in the extra-textual situation, we conclude that the factor conditioning the *itu* is the presence of the non-restrictive modifier. To see the non-restrictiveness of this relative clause, compare it to the relative clause in (7). In the former case, it is not likely that the modifier is intended to distinguish this pouch from some other pouch competing for the reader's attention. On the other hand, the modifier in (7) encodes an essential identificational property: it answers the question "what kind of actor?"

Two other examples will illustrate that the non-restrictive modifier condition is not only independent of prior mention and exophoric reference (since these NP's have neither property), but also overrides the non-bounded reference condition (to be explained in section 3.4).

- (40) Ketika keesokan harinya si Kabayan pergi pula ke hutan, ia tidak melihat perempuan. Tetapi ketika ia lagi duduk di bawah sebatang kelapa, dilihatnya seekor tetinggi lagi berjalan dengan kakinya yang beribu-ribu itu. (H)

The next day, when Kabayan went to the forest again, he didn't see any women. But while he was sitting under a coconut tree, he saw a centipede walking with its thousands of feet (or: its feet, which were thousands).

- (41) Taksiranku ia sudah berumur 20-21 tahun. Tapi karena tubuhnya yang penuh itu, ia rupanya lebih tua lagi. (K)
By my guess she was 20-21 years old. But because of her full-figured body, she looked even older.

A person's body is certainly a unique entity, and hence non-bounded, (see section 3.4), and yet the demonstrative occurs. It is because of such data as (41) that the non-restrictive modifier constraint is assigned a positive value greater than the negative value of the non-bounded reference constraint.

However, a few non-restrictive modifiers are *not* followed by demonstratives.

- (42) Aku sempoyangan jatuh ke muka. Tanganku yang mencari tumpuan terseng-gol oleh tepi meja dan pistolku terpelanting dari tanganku. (K)
I stumbled and fell forward. My hand, which was looking for support, was bumped by the edge of the table, and my pistol flew out of my hand.

- (43) Ketika aku sampai di halaman, aku masih mendengar ia berteriak: "Aku akan mati, mas. Aku akan mati!!!!" Aku dapat membayangkan mulutnya yang berkerinyut-kerinyut tegang. (K)
When I reached the garden, I could still hear her shouting: "I'll die. I'll die!" I could picture her mouth, all wrinkled up tight.

These two examples are included to show that the constraint as now formulated is not exceptionless. The following properties of the NP's involved would *not* explain why the demonstratives mark the first pair (40) and (41), but not the second, (42) and (43). First, of the second pair of NP's, each is previously mentioned, while neither of the other pair is. If anything, this would lead us to expect the opposite result. Secondly, in each pair there is one NP at the end of its sentence, and one non-final NP. Thus, syntactic position is not the same.

One might posit (based on these data alone) that only modifiers containing information *thematic* in the story would condition the demonstrative. The fact that the centipede has an unusual appearance, and that Sulinah is attractive, are rather important themes in the stories: attributes which command the attention of the main characters in each story, and determine the direction of the plot. The same cannot be said of the 'searching' or 'wrinkling' of (42), and (43). These are minor details by comparison. In a similar vein, the modifiers in the first pair denote *inherent* attributes; those in the second denote accidental ones.

Sometimes the non-restrictive modifier constraint seems to be motivated by communicative expedients related to parsing: the clarification of a modifier's scope or the closure of a heavy NP.²⁰ Two good examples of the need to clarify a modifier's scope are:

- (44) Tak syak lagi! Benar ada orang yang memanggil namanya. Tetapi siapa? Segera ingatannya lari kepada makhluk-makhluk gaib yang menghuni Pasir Muncang. Kepalanya yang tiba-tiba menjadi berat seribu kali itu ditolehkannya ke arah kuburan keramat yang tak jauh dari tempatnya berladang. (M)
There could be no more doubt! Someone really was calling his name. But who? Immediately his memory flew to the mysterious creatures that haunted Pasir Muncang. He turned his head, which suddenly grew a thousand times heavier, toward the graveyard shrine not far from where he was farming.
- (45) Malam itu juga aku bangunkan Pak Merto yang rumahnya kupakai menginap itu minta pinjam sarung dan dengan kain itu di tanganku aku masuk ke biliknya. "Ini selimut. Jangan mengerang lagi!" geramku, sambil melemparkan sarung itu di atas bale-bale di sampingnya. (K)
That night I woke up Pak Merto, whose house I was using for lodging, and asked to borrow a sarong, and with the cloth in my hand entered her room. "Here's a blanket. Quit moaning!" I growled, throwing the sarong onto the cot beside her.

In both cases, *itu* makes it clear that the NP's last modifier is part of the preceding nominal, not of the following predicate. Otherwise in (44) it might appear that the man turned his head a thousand times, and in (45) that the house was being used for the purpose of borrowing sarongs.

In any case these parsing conditions would apply to only a part of the NP's with non-restrictive modifiers. It may be that the desire for a demonstrative after a non-restrictive modifier can be explained using Foley's (1976) Bondedness Hierarchy.²¹ Foley's idea is that the more weakly an NP-margin (article, number, adjective, gerund, clause) is bound to its head, the more it needs a marker to make the unity of the NP explicit. Since a non-restrictive modifier is less essential to its head than is a restrictive modifier (in the ways described at the beginning of 3.2), the demonstrative may be a kind of compensating strategy. The demonstrative may be used to emphasise that all material preceding it, even though it is only supplementary, belongs to the last head noun.

3.3 Prior mention²²

A demonstrative is used when an entity has been mentioned earlier²³ in the discourse, with two qualifications: (a) This excludes cases where no discourse referent was created, that is, under conditions outlined in part 1.1 above. (b) The 'givenness' marked by a demonstrative also includes cases of inferability that cannot be construed as possessive, as described in part 2.1 above. Some examples of this constraint are shown below.

- (46) Si Kabayan tidak tahu lagi jalan ke tempat sarang lebah yang kemaren dilihatnya. Tetapi di sebuah semak yang agak rimbun, dilihatnya seekor rusa lagi tidur di bawah naungan pohon. Rusa itu tidur seperti bangkai. (H)

Kabayan no longer knew the way to the beehive he had seen the day before. But in a rather dense thicket he saw a deer sleeping under the shelter of a tree. The deer was sleeping like a corpse.

Prior mention also includes time-units; as seen in (45): malam itu *that night*. In addition, prior mention takes in 'extended reference': the nominal expression of what was previously presented in non-nominal form.²⁴

- (47) Mawardi menemukannya di Bandongan. Ketika itu serdadu Belanda baru saja meninggalkan tempat itu. Perempuan ini asing di dusun itu, karena itu ia ditangkap. Katanya ia baru datang dari kota mau menyusul bapaknya yang sudah sebulan mengungsi ke gunung. Mawardi tak percaya dan dibawanya sebagai tawanan ke mana saja pasukan bergerak.

"Kalau memang mata-mata mengapa tidak ditembak saja!" tegurku kepada anakbuahnya, yang melaporkan kejadian itu kepadaku... (K) Mawardi had met her in Bandongan. At that time the Dutch soldiers had just left that place. This woman was a stranger in that village, so she was taken prisoner. She said she had just come from town to follow her father who had fled to the mountains a month before. Mawardi didn't believe her and took her along as a prisoner wherever the division moved.

"If she's really a spy why don't you just shoot her!" I chided his man, who had reported this event to me...

In (47), the antecedent constitutes an entire paragraph, whereas in (48), it is a clause.

- (48) Waktu malam di gunung Sumbing sangat dinginnya. Hawa dingin itu... (K)
Night on Mt Sumbing is extremely cold. The cold air...

These are just a few of the most common kinds of previously mentioned entities in texts.

3.4 Non-bounded reference

This term denotes exhaustive reference to an entire set, such that there is no need to draw a conceptual boundary around any one member or subset.²⁵ Unlike the preceding three factors, this one tends to condition the non-occurrence of a demonstrative. This type of reference comprises two subtypes: non-specific and unique. Non-specific reference can be either mass reference (where the set has no distinct members) or generic (where all members are referred to). Unique reference is the case where the set contains only one member relevant to the universe of discourse.

3.4.1 Non-specific reference

Mass reference is the non-count status of a particular NP at a particular point in a text; it is not the intrinsic degree of countability of the head noun considered 'in isolation'.²⁶ Thus, the underlined NP's in (49) and (50) below are mass references, while in (51) and (52) this is not the case, even though the head nouns of all four NP's might be listed in a dictionary as non-count.

- (49) Aku tak mungkin meninggalkan pasukan dan kembali ke kota. Itu berarti penghianatan kepada perjuangan dan penghianatan harus dibayar dengan nyawa. (K)

I couldn't leave my division and go back to town. That would mean treason against the struggle, and for treason one must pay with one's life.

- (50) Di dalam perjuangan tidak ada soal nilai dan kehormatan kecuali kejantanan dan perhindaran dari maut.

Dan aku sudah bosan kepada perempuan ini... Dikejar-kejar oleh Belanda selama empat bulan ini ia lebih merupakan beban yang menghambat kaki untuk melarikan diri dari maut. (K)

In war there is no question of value or respect except for masculinity and escape from death.

And I was already tired of this woman... Being chased by the Dutch for these four months, she was more a burden, weighing down my feet in my fleeing from death.

- (51) Malam itu malam gelap... Aku merasa aman dalam gelap itu. Aku merasa satu dengan kegelapan. Aku gelap sendiri. Aku telah memilih kegelapan ini... (K)

It was dark night... I felt at peace in the dark. I felt one with darkness. I was darkness itself. I had chosen this darkness.

- (52) "Kanon Belanda beraksi!" terkilat dalam kepalaku. Dan secepat pikiranku itu terdengar peluru meletus. Blarr!

"The Dutch are firing their cannons!" flashed into my head. And as soon as that thought came to me (or: as fast as that thought of mine) I heard a shell explode. Blarr!²⁷

Generic reference is reference to all members of a set, as in

- (53) Seni hanya tersisa bagi perempuan dan orang-orang lemah. Perempuan tidak punya watak. (K)

Art is only left for woman and weak men. Women have no character.

Both of these kinds of non-specific reference — mass and generic — are constraints against the use of a demonstrative, which — as examples (49), (50), and (53) show — override prior mention. Hence the numerical value of -2 is assigned to this constraint to override the +1 value of prior mention.

3.4.2. Unique reference

The concept of *unique reference*, needed to explain the absence of demonstratives in certain previously mentioned NP's, is actually somewhat different from, or more elaborate than, various earlier treatments in the literature. For example, one can begin with Cartier's insight that an account of definite markers requires some appeal to uniqueness, to nominals which "refer to one and the same thing in the natural world of both speaker and hearer".²⁸ In extending this definition to cover more data, we have found the need to rethink both "speaker or hearer" and "world".

It turns out that the person for whom an entity's uniqueness is defined can be not only speaker or hearer, but also a third person, for example a participant in a narrative. When the narrator in H says in (54):

- (54) Hutan tak begitu jauh tempatnya. (H)
The forest wasn't very far away.

it is not in his world or the reader's that the forest is unique, but in the world of the chief character, Kabayan. Kabayan is the relevant experiencer.

In addition, the concept of "world" must be re-cast to include "worlds" of varying durations, changing scenes and situations, as well as the changing perspectives of the experiencer. Uniqueness can be thought of as a continuum from permanently unique to non-unique. Some permanently unique entities are those which are unique in nature: matahari *sun*, langit *sky*, bumi *earth*. Under most circumstances, each of these nouns has only one possible referent. Another kind of permanently unique entity consists of those which are unique for each person:

- (55) Aku dulu ingin jadi pelukis dan menggambar tubuh-tubuh yang bagus. Tapi ibuku mentertawakan aku ...

Tapi ibu tetap tak mau percaya... (K)
I used to want to be an artist and to draw lovely bodies. But my mother laughed at me ...

But mother kept on not believing.

- (56) Tawanan Mawardi bernama Sulinah... Taksiranku ia sudah berumur 20-21 tahun. Tapi karena tubuhnya yang penuh itu ia rupanya lebih tua lagi... Bajunya lurik, amat rapat potongannya dengan badannya. (K)

Mawardi's prisoner was named Sulinah... By my guess she was around 20-21 years old. But because of her full-figured body she looked even older... Her blouse was made of lurik, cut to fit quite snugly with her body.

Notice that in these last two examples, the uniqueness of the underlined NP overrides its prior mention, such that no demonstrative is used. The same is true of all the unique entities cited here.²⁹

Other entities are unique in some long-standing situation. This is true (as pointed out by Cartier, this volume) of many location NP's:

- (57) Setelah menggisik matanya yang terasa berat mengantuk itu, si Kabayan berjalan ke arah dapur... Lantaran kekenyangan, kantukpun datang. Maka pergi pula ia dari dapur ke... biliknya. (H)
After rubbing his eyes, which feel heavy with sleepiness, Kabayan walks toward the kitchen... Since he is quite full, weariness comes over him. So he goes from the kitchen to... his room.

- (58) "Aku tak tahan lagi", gerutu perempuan itu selalu. "Engkau bawa aku ke kota!"

Aku tidak menjawab. Aku tidak perlu menjawab... Aku tidak mungkin meninggalkan pasukan dan kembali ke kota. Itu berarti pengkhianatan kepada perjuangan dan pengkhianatan harus dibayar dengan nyawa. (K)
"I can't stand it any more!" she always grumbles. "Take me to town!" I don't answer. I don't need to answer... I can't leave my division and go back to town. That would mean treason against the struggle, and for treason one must pay with one's life.

These underlined NP's denote the one *salient* member of the given set. For instance, in (58), the question "which city" does not arise. The intended city is the one nearby, the one with which the experiencer has the most dealings.

Other entities have a unique status limited to a situation of shorter duration. Some locations have this status. A clear example is *markas headquarters* in a story about guerillas whose headquarters is continually moving:

- (59) "Turut sekarang juga!" bentakku sambil mendahului dia ke luar.
Darso, ajudanku, telah siap menjaganya dari belakang dengan mausernya.
Kami bertiga berjalan kembali ke posku ...
Tiba di markas sudah petang ... (K)
"Come on now!" I snapped, walking out ahead of her. Darso, my adjutant, was guarding her from behind with his mauser. The three of us walked back to my post ...
When we arrived at headquarters it was already afternoon ...

Certain props may have the same kind of status.

- (60) Ketika aku sampai ke pintu, ia sedang berbaring melingkar di atas bale-bale ...
... Matak u menelan lagi garis-garis tubuhnya yang menggelombang dengan lemasnya dari lengannya, pinggangnya, lalu menyusup ke gelap pangkuannya. Pandangannya sepi sesepi nyala api di meja.
"Ke luar!" perintahku parau ...
Ia bangkit dari baringnya dengan ragu-ragu.
"Ke luar!" seruku, kini lebih tegas. Ia belum percaya dan memandang dengan geramnya ke arah senjata di tanganku. Ia menggelengkan kepalanya. Tidak! Sambil menangkupkan diri lagi ke bale-bale ...
Aku seret dia dari bale-bale ... Ia jatuh ke tanah dan mencoba melawan dengan mengaitkan tengannya kepada kaki meja.
... Aku sempoyongan jatuh ke muka. Tanganku yang mencari tumpuan tersenggol oleh tepi meja dan pistolku terpelanting dari tanganku. Meja bergoyang dan tiba-tiba ruang kamar itu menjadi gelap gulita. (K)
When I got to the door, she was lying restlessly on her cot ...
... My eyes devoured once again the lines of her body that undulated in a supple way from her arms, her waist, and disappeared in the darkness around her loins. Her gaze was as empty as the flame on the table.
"Out!" I ordered hoarsely ...
She got up from her bed in confusion.
"Out!" I ordered, this time more sharply.
She didn't believe me yet and looked at the weapon in my hand.
... She shook her head. No! And she threw herself back onto the cot ...
I dragged her from the cot. She fell to the floor and tried to resist by hanging onto the table leg ...
... I stumbled forward. My hand, which was groping for support, banged against the edge of the table and my pistol was knocked out of my hand. The table wobbled and suddenly the room was pitch black.³⁰

Even though the woman in this passage has been as nomadic as the guerillas, and has slept in many rooms, at this point in the story she has (according to normal expectations), one cot and one table.³¹ Similarly, an Indonesian officer may be expected to be using no more than one pistol at a time.

An example of extremely short-term uniqueness is seen in the following excerpts. In (39), when Kabayan has espied the deer, we read:

- (61) Lalu teringat akan pesan mertuanya.
Then he remembered his mother-in-law's instructions.

The *pesan message* refers to his mother-in-law's instructions to burn the bottom of what he found in the forest. Later in the story we see the following:

- (62) Tetapi si Kabayan sangat patuh akan pesan mertuanya. Ia tak menghiraukan ajakan orang-orang itu. Menolehpun tidak. (H)
But Kabayan was very obedient to his mother-in-law's instructions. He didn't pay any attention to the people's invitation. He didn't even turn his head.

However, at this point in the story, *pesan mertuanya* refers to a different message: the instruction to ignore what he found in the forest.

On each occasion, the *pesan message* refers to a different instruction, and yet at each point when it is referred to, that piece of advice has unique status in Kabayan's consciousness. It is as though each cycle in the story wipes out the relevance or awareness of the preceding advice.

However, there are a number of cases where the same entity is viewed from two different perspectives. Within the close or involved perspective, the entity has unique status, but within the distant or detached perspective, the same entity no longer has unique status. Consider the following examples:

- (63) Maka diambilnya koja yang tersandang di bahunya itu. Dari dalamnya dia keluarkan obor dan kayu api. Sementara menyiapkan obor, si Kabayan repot. Ia tak tahu bagaimana menaruh koja. Untuk menyandangkannya pula, ia merasa kepalang. Maka disangkutkannya koja itu pada sebuah cabang tanduk rusa itu. (H)
Then he took the pouch that was slung at his shoulder. From inside it he got out a torch and some firewood. While he was getting the torch ready, he had too much to do. He didn't know where to put the pouch down. He didn't feel he could sling it back on his shoulder. So he hung the pouch on a branch of the deer's antlers.

- (64) Keesokan harinya tatkala si Kabayan pergi pula ke hutan, ia ... menjinjing sepucuk tombak punya mertuanya ...
 Melihat ada yang berjalan ke arahnya, si Kabayan berkata dalam hati: "Ini dia!"
 Lalu tombakpun disiapkan. Matanya tajam mengawasi perempuan itu, supaya jangan lari. Ketika sudah dekat, segera si Kabayan melemparkan tombak ke arah perempuan itu. Tombak mengena dengan jitu ... Maka dia cabut tombak itu dari tubuh kurbannya. (H)
The next day when Kabayan went to the forest again, he...was carrying a spear of his father-in-law's ...
Seeing that someone was coming towards him, Kabayan said to himself: "This is it!" Then he got the spear ready. His eyes watched the woman keenly, so she wouldn't escape. When she was close, he immediately threw the spear toward her. The spear hit home ... Then he pulled the spear from the body of his victim.

In both of these cases, while the instrument is under the agency of Kabayan, it is unmarked. Then, when it leaves his control, it takes *itu*. Hanging the pouch on the deer's antler is a loss of control – the deer subsequently runs off with it. At the moment of Kabayan's throwing the spear, he is still exercising control; later, the spear is outside of his sphere of influence. It is as though *itu* signals a new distance between experiencer and object, which overcomes the object's uniqueness.

Two other examples of this change in distance and perspective come from the narrator's abandoning of Sulinah in K:

(65) Aku bangun dari baringku dan melangkah ke pintu.

"Engkau pergi ke mana, mas!" tanya perempuan celaka itu dengan cemas.

Aku tak menjawab.

"Aku akan mati mas, kalau engkau tinggalkan!" ancamnya ke arahku ketika aku sudah sampai ke pintu. Seolah-olah ia sudah merasai maksudku. Tetapi aku berjalan terus dan menutup pintu di belakangku tanpa menoleh kepadanya ...

"Sulinah! Sulinah!" teriakku, tetapi suaraku tinggal tersekat di tenggorokanku. Aku masih melihat dia sempoyongan melepaskan diri dari pintu itu lalu melangkah ke muka ... (K)

I got up from where I had been sleeping and stepped toward the door.

"Where are you going!" asked the tragic woman anxiously.

I didn't answer.

"I'll die if you leave!" she threatened in my direction when I had reached the door, as though she'd already guessed my plan. But I kept walking and closed the door behind me without turning toward her ...

"Sulinah! Sulinah!" I shouted, but my voice stuck in my throat. I could still see her stumbling, freeing herself from the door, then stepping forward.

In this sequence, the door of his hut is referred to three times as he is making the decision to abandon his village and his female companion: when he steps toward the door, gets to the door, and closes the door. Here it is called pintu, since he is close to it and involved with it. The fourth reference, however, is pintu itu, because the door is being viewed from a distance, as the narrator tries to return to this hut during a bombing.

The second entity which undergoes a change of perspective and distance, and hence of uniqueness, is the village. In this case the pattern is not manifested so neatly, as apparently some other factors are at play.

(66) Jonggrangan ialah dukuh yang lebih ke atas lagi mendekati gunung Sumbing ... Malamnya aku dengan Darso berjaga-jaga di pinggir desa ...

Aku turun dari dukuh itu dan berjalan melalui jalan setapak dan tanggul ...

Seperti terkejar-kejar aku kembali melintas tanggul dan jalan setapak menuju ke dusunku. Benturan peluru meriam yang jatuh menggegerkan bumi di bawah kakiku ... Dua puluh langkah lagi, sepuluh langkah, lima langkah lagi dari batas desa! Sampai di pagar bambu aku jatuh tertelungkup kepayahan. Di muka tampak olehku halaman dan kampung dukuh itu ... (K)³²

Jonggrangan was a village higher up towards Mt Sumbing ... That night Darso and I were on guard duty at the edge of the village ... I went down from the village and walked past the footpath and the dike ...

As though I were being chased, I ran back past the dike and the footpath toward my village. The crash of falling cannon shells shook the ground under my feet ... Twenty more steps, ten steps, five more steps to the edge of the village! When I got to the bamboo fence I fell headlong with exhaustion. Ahead, I could see the gardens and the homes of the village.

Basically the same pattern governs (66) as (63)-(65): the non-determined form correlates with closeness, and the use of *itu*, with distance. However, between the narrator's initial separation (departure from dukuh *itu*) and his final separation (watching helplessly at a distance from dukuh *itu*) falls an intervening period. During this period, the absence of any demonstrative with 'village' suggests the following: the narrator's desire to be close to the village overrides the fact of his physical distance.

The very fact that a demonstrative functions as shown in (63)-(66), shows an interesting interpenetration of exophoric and endophoric usage, of pointing beyond the discourse and pointing within the discourse. If the analysis here is correct, then this is a phenomenon akin to free (or direct) indirect discourse, a merging of viewpoints of narrator and participant, of speaker's deixis and actor's deixis. That is, the narrator is employing *itu* not merely anaphorically, but in such a way as to parallel the deictic usage that would appear in direct quotation of the actor's thoughts.

This kind of change of perspective and hence of uniqueness can also involve NP's of more permanently unique status. Consider the example below:

- (67) Setelah selesai makan, si Kabayan berangkat ke hutan. Hutan tak begitu jauh tempatnya. Orang-orang kampung kalau hendak mencari kayu, buah-buahan ataupun berburu pergi ke hutan itu. (H)
"After he finished eating, Kabayan left for the forest. The forest wasn't very far away. The people of the village, if they wanted to look for wood or fruit or to hunt, went to that forest.

In the first two underlined NP's, the author is speaking of the forest that needs no singling-out, because it is the single salient candidate in the neighbourhood of his story. However, the third reference to the same forest sets that forest up in contrast to others, taking a more objective view, implying that there are other forests for other villages.³³ Even entities that are normally considered permanently unique can be viewed from both perspectives. Consider the following reference:

- (68) "Pagi ini engkau mau apa, coklat atau marmalade?" tanya Fatma.
 Suryono memandang padanya, dan berkata, "Wah, alangkah baiknya ibu ini. Aku mau selapis mentega, dilapis dengan kiju yang diiris tipis, dan di atas kiju selapis marmalade, dan kemudian..." Suryono menyentuh kaki Fatma di bawah meja, dan Fatma tertawa kecil kesenangan.
 "Engkau anak jahat, kurang ajar sama ibu sendiri", katanya. (S)
*"What do you want this morning, chocolate or marmalade?" asked Fatma. Suryono looked at her, and said, "My, how nice this mother is. I'd like a layer of butter, covered with thinly sliced cheese, and over the cheese a layer of marmalade, and then..." Suryono nudged Fatma's foot under the table, and she giggled with pleasure
 "You naughty boy - bad manners, and with your own mother", she said.*

Fatma is referred to here as *ibu ini this mother*; Suryono is viewing her, perhaps in comparison with other mothers. Because he is playing the role of a judge, less involved than a child, the normal uniqueness of *ibu* is suspended. (This is not difficult for him, since Fatma is his step-mother and he is involved with her in an adulterous affair.)

Now that the concept of uniqueness has been sufficiently broadened to include these varying degrees of permanence, what remains outside the category?

For one thing, the vast majority of animate, common nouns in a text are non-unique. Perhaps the explanation is that normally, inanimate entities constitute the background against which animate entities move. Thus, at any point an additional woman or sergeant might be added to the story, but probably another bed will not be added to the scene, nor is an officer likely to produce a second pistol. (We are dealing here with normal expectation.)

Of course, there are animate entities that *do* have unique status of both permanent (e.g. ibu in (55)) and temporary duration. For an example of the latter, consider:

- (69) Mawardi menemukannya di Bandungan... Katanya ia baru datang dari kota mau menyusul bapaknya... Mawardi tak percaya dan dibawanya sebagai tawanan ke mana saja pasukan bergerak...

Tawanan Mawardi bernama Sulinah. (K)

Mawardi had met her in Bandungan... She said she had just come from the city to follow her father... Mawardi didn't believe her, and took her as a prisoner everywhere the troop moved...

Mawardi's prisoner was named Sulinah.

Here, it is already clear beforehand that Mawardi has only one prisoner.

It has probably been obvious throughout this discussion that uniqueness is related to relevance. One further implication of this connection is that an entity may count as unique if in fact there is more than one member of the set present, but the difference between members is irrelevant. Even for second mention, *tanganku my hand* is normally used instead of *tanganku itu* because the question "which hand?" is rarely relevant. Thus, practically speaking, *tanganku* is unique.³⁴

4. THE MARKERS AND LITERARY EFFECTS

Also of interest are the various creative ways in which these nominal markers can be applied by authors to achieve certain effects. For instance, the distribution of *se-*, since it is an 'introducer', can reflect the overall structure of a story. The narratives we examined showed *se-* to be reinforcing both cyclical and climactic narrative structures. In two folk tales by Asip Rosidi, cycles were marked by recurrences of *se-*. In *Si Kabayan pergi ke hutan*, each form of *rezeki* or *fortune* that Kabayan discovers is marked with *se-*, as is the setting in which the 'fortune' is located. Cyclicity is also marked by *se-* in the other folktale, *Si Kabayan dengan mertuanya*, although somewhat differently. It is not concrete objects, but units of time, that are marked with *se-* (e.g. *Pada satu hari one day*). This emphasis on cycles of time matches the agricultural theme of the story.

A more linear narrative progression, cumulative movement toward a single peak, is supported by the significantly increased frequency of *se-* during the climax of *Kejantanan di Sumbing*. This may be one of the author's means of quickening the pace by a rapid flow of newly introduced individuals, all clamoring for attention but none of them dwelt on for very long.

Another creative use of the determiners is in pretending that the reader has less or has more information about some entity than is really the case. These two strategies may be called, respectively, *defamiliarisation* (Stacy's (1977) rendering of the Russian formalists' term *ostranenie*)³⁵ and by analogy, *prefamiliarisation*. In *defamiliarisation*, a previously mentioned entity,

presented from a new perspective, appears with *se-*, as though the narrator were disavowing his prior knowledge of it. For instance, in the climax of *Kejantanan di Sumbing* the author watches the bombing of the hut where his female companion Sulinah is staying. He portrays her from a great psychological distance during this event:

- (70) ... Meriam berdentum-dentum di kejauhan.
 Tiba-tiba aku melihat sesosok tubuh berpapah-papah ke luar dan bertelekan dengan seluruh badannya pada tiang pintu...
 "Sulinah! Sulunah!" teriakku... (K)
 ... *Cannons were booming in the distance.*
Suddenly I saw a figure leaning out with all its weight against the doorpost...
"Sulinah! Sulinah!" I shouted...

Although in fact the underlined nominal refers to a very prominent character in the story, the narrator does not establish the connection. In this way, perhaps it is debatable whether the narrative persona (the 'I' of the tale) is portraying himself here as genuinely ignorant about the identity of the 'figure'. This usage could also plausibly be viewed as a self-conscious means of imparting his altered perceptions during the bombing. In either case, the use of *se-* heightens the effect.

Prefamiliarisation is pretending the opposite: that the reader is already familiar with some entity, when in fact he is not. *-nya* is used in this way to anticipate the 'seduction' of the narrator in K.

- (71) Aku menjadi geram. Aku merunduk akan merenggutnya ke luar dengan sekeras tenagaku. Tetapi kemudian aku tak jelas lagi bagaimana mulanya. Aku rupanya tersandung pada kaki perempuan itu... Aku belum tersadar dari terkejutku, ketika perempuan itu merangkul aku.
 (K)
I got angry. I stooped to pull her outside with all my might. But then, it's not clear any more how it started (or: what its/the beginning was like). It seems I stumbled and fell at her feet... I hadn't yet recovered from my surprise, when she embraced me.

A similar prefamiliarising use of *itu* causes a small-scale communication breakdown in excerpt (29) above (repeated here for convenience). Here Kabayan speaks as though his mother-in-law were already aware of the woman he met. In fact she is not, and she reacts accordingly:

- (72) "Apa yang kau temui di hutan, Kabayan, maka mukamu pucat tak berdarah seperti itu?"
 Jawab si Kabayan singkat:
 "Ia mati kutombak."
 "Apa yang mati kautombak?"
 Si Kabayan: "Perempuan itu."
 Mertuanya: "Perempuan yang mana?"
 Si Kabayan: "Tadi waktu saya di hutan ada perempuan..." (H)
"What did you meet in the forest, Kabayan, to make your face all pale like that?"
Kabayan answered curtly:
"Something I speared to death."
"What did you spear to death?"
Kabayan: The woman."
His mother-in-law: "What woman?"
Kabayan: "When I was in the forest a while ago there was a woman..."

5. SUMMARY

In summary, the conditions on the use of the three markers *se-*, *-nya* and *itu* seem to be as follows:

Se- has two primary (overlapping) uses: creating a discourse referent and measuring one. Since it is used in creating discourse referents, it does not normally mark those non-familiar nominals which do not refer to individuals, and hence do not create discourse referents. Such nominals tend to occur in the following kinds of constructions: descriptive NP's (in equatives and comparison, unless the author does intend the NP to somehow create an individual or identity in the reader's mind), under negation or irrealis modality (negatives, conjectures, requests) or in adverbial constructions. It is also used to indicate singularity, being optional in conversation when quantity is recoverable.

The NP-marker *-nya* encodes possession, inference or, in some cases, both. However, inference is expressed by *itu* rather than *-nya* when the inferable entity is either (a) the time or place of an event, or (b) inferred from a script (as for instance, a required role) and not construed as possessive.

The use of the demonstratives *itu* and *ini* seems to be conditioned by four factors, which have relative strengths approximated by the following numerical values: (a) exophoric reference: +3; (b) non-restrictive modifier: +3; (c) prior mention: +1; and (d) non-bounded reference: -2. An NP with a positive score will tend to be marked with a demonstrative. The non-restrictive modifier condition may be motivated by a desire to clarify syntactic parsing or to compensate for low NP bondedness.

Non-bounded reference (a property correlating with absence of demonstrative) is comprised of non-specific (generic or non-count) reference and unique reference. The latter property is subject to the following principles: The uniqueness of an entity can be anchored to any relevant experiencer (speaker, hearer, or a third person), and to 'worlds' of varying durations. A given entity's uniqueness status can change with the perspective of, distance from, or relevance to the experiencer.³⁶

Finally, these markers can enter into various literary effects. *Se-*, as an introducer, can reflect cyclical or climactic narrative structures. The three markers can also be used in defamiliarisation and prefamiliarisation.

NOTES

1. Prince (1979) posits three major categories of 'familiar' entities: inferable, evoked (present either in the preceding discourse or the extralinguistic situation) and 'unused'. Section 3.4 of this article touches on the latter.
2. Besides this perhaps unfortunate inclusion, the present analysis makes the following exclusion: that of *se-* when followed by a non-classifier, e.g. *sebentar*, *secepat*.

3. In fact, Karttunen (1968) mentions indefinite predicate nominals in passing, referring to the passage in Bach's "Nouns and noun phrases" (Bach 1968:103-106) where he says that indefinite predicate nominals do not refer to an individual by themselves. In fact, says Karttunen, one must further qualify this: indefinite and non-specific predicate nominals. Under irrealis modes, he says, discourse referents can be created, but they tend to be short-lived, since subsequent references to the same entity can occur only under the same modality.
4. In an earlier draft of this paper, these three kinds of constructions were called 'offstage constructions' because in them the narrator does not bring an entity onto his 'stage' to include it in the events of the story.
5. Morpheme glosses are omitted because they would make the already lengthy examples unwieldy, and it seems that for the purposes of this analysis a free translation will serve. More information about Indonesian structure is retained or noted where crucial.
6. However, there is an exception: the first sentence of *Si Kabayan pergi ke hutan*:

(73) *Si Kabayan seorang pemaes.* (H)
Kabayan was a sluggard.

The predicate nominal in (73) encodes a permanent, and unquestioned attribute of Kabayan. By contrast, the unmarked predicate nominals in (1)-(4) represent contingent, hypothetical attributions.

7. The construction below with *sebagai as* is similar to a true comparison, and also tends to take a non-determined nominal:

(74) *Kalau ia tidak bunting oleh aku, ia pun akan bunting oleh anggota pasukan lain di gunung ini, dan mungkin sekali oleh Mawardi yang menawanya dulu sebagai mata-mata.* (K)
If she hadn't got pregnant by me, she would've got pregnant by someone else in the division here on this mountain, quite possibly Mawardi who first caught her as a spy.
8. The status of these exceptional nominals may be like those nominals under irrealis modality which nonetheless do create (short-lived) discourse referents. Subsequent reference to the same entity is indeed possible as long as the discourse remains in a hypothetical key.
9. We have said that *se-* tends to create an individuality, while non-familiar NP's with no determiner refer to a class only. From this it may follow that, under negation, *se-* involves the negation of some individual, particular, or secondary characteristics, while unmarked non-familiar NP's represent complete negation of a class. This might provide an interpretation for the NP underlined below.

(75) *Sebentar kemudian jam berdenting sepuluh kali dan satu pagi yang sempurna di New York dalam "Fluffy Donut" Coffee House akan tidak begitu "beautiful" lagi, sebab jam sepuluh berarti "jamngopi" ... sampai jam sebelas. Dan sesudah itu hari bukan lagi pagi dan "Fluffy Donut" bukan lagi satu warung kopi.* (D)

Then the clock chimed ten times and a peaceful morning in New York at the "Fluffy Donut" Coffee House was about to become no longer quite so "beautiful", since ten o'clock means "coffee time"... till eleven o'clock. And after that it's not morning any more and the "Fluffy Donut" isn't a coffee shop any more.

If the word *satu* were eliminated from the last sentence of (75), the meaning would be that at eleven o'clock the shop became, say, a discotheque or a gymnasium. That is, the scope of the negative *bukan*, when paired with a non-determined NP, is the entire class "*coffee-shop*". On the other hand, with *satu* as it appears here, the sentence means only that certain particular or secondary features of coffee-shopness have been lost; such as the serving of coffee and donuts.

10. Karttunen says that indefinite NP's in questions and requests are normally interpreted as non-specific. In addition, requests are semantically similar to the class of sentences Karttunen describes in his appendix: those containing verbs like *want*, *need*, etc. What these verbs share, he says, is the ability to take an existitive or possessive clause complement; e.g. "I need (to have) a hammer".
11. It is not clear why the first of these two manner phrases uses *se-* (in this case, *satu*). What is clear is that it would be awkward to use *se-* in the following, parallel phrase, since the newness encoded by *se-* is incompatible with the givenness of *sama just as* (lit. *the same*), and of *-nya*, which also points to some kind of antecedent.
12. Choosing the English grammar of possession as a basis for the comparison with the function of *-nya* is simply an attempt to avoid the circularity of defining a thing in terms of itself. Two potential sources for a more thorough analysis of the possessive role of *-nya* are: (a) the list of Recoverably Deletable Predicates in Levi (1978) and (b) the list of functions of the Greek genitive in Beekman and Callow (1974).
13. There are also cases of non-determined inferable entities:
 - (76) Baru bangun 'ku terus mandi. Jangan lupa menggosok gigi.
As soon as I get up I bathe and don't forget to brush my teeth.
 - (77) Aku berjalan ke arah bilik Sulinah. Ketika aku sampai ke pintu, ia sedang berbaring... (K)
I walked toward Sulinah's room. When I came to the door, she was lying...

The non-marking in (77), according to Dardjowidjojo, would be a result of the 'non-nuclear' position of the NP: it is neither subject nor direct object.
14. Note that both (34) and (35) have generic quality which may affect the choice of determiner.
15. The same response applies to the apparent counterexample in Purwo (1978):
 - (78) Saya masuk ke sebuah restoran. Pelayannya cantik-cantik.
I went into a restaurant. The/their waitresses were good-looking.

16. A certain interpretation of the NP underlined below gives rise to interesting speculations about other functions of -nya.

(79) "Bapak belum melihat perempuannya!" sahutnya seraya memandang ke arahku dengan penuh arti. (K)
 "Sir, you haven't seen (a) what a woman she is/ (b) the woman/ (c) his (Mawardi's) woman!" he answered, giving me a meaningful look.

Of the three translations for *perempuannya*, (c) is the simplest: possessive. (b) is based on inference. But (a) is inspired by the idea of emphatic nominalisation, which is exemplified in the following two sentences:

(80) Waktu malam di gunung Sumbing sangat dinginnya. (K)
Night on Mt Sumbing is extremely cold.

(81) "Wah, alangkah baiknya ibu ini. (S)
 "My, how nice this mother is."

Morphologically, these underlined words resemble such undisputed nominalisations as adanya *existence* and tingginya *height*, even though they do still behave in a way that seems to be non-noun in translation, like the quotative expressions *katanya*, *sahutnya*, etc. But the -nya nominalisations of degree adjectives are often *emphatic* in function. This flavour may carry over to *perempuannya* in (79). *Perempuan* in this setting may be somewhat predicate-like; at least its morphology is deverbal.

17. Although *itu* is the more frequent, *ini* can be used in many similar ways, with respect to the constraints outlined in this chapter. Thus they are treated together here. Also, use of demonstratives with pronouns and proper names will be bracketed as a special case, and not treated here.
18. Karttunen, p.20.
19. The word 'modifier' is used because the use of the relative ligature *yang* may not be a requisite.
20. As for the view that demonstratives give closure to heavy NP's, no proposed definition of 'heaviness' (such as number of words or clauses) really accounts for the data. However, it would be interesting to examine those patterns of reference and modification which create the impression that Indonesian texts contain greater nominal redundancy than English texts.
21. Verhaar (1983) applies Foley's Bondedness Hierarchy to Indonesian.
22. (a) The prior mention constraint appears to subsume and even outdo certain other explanations that initially seemed plausible. For example, the data examined for this paper do not support the view that one of the conditioning factors in the use or non-use of a demonstrative is the case, subjecthood or topichood of the NP.

One explanation in terms of case which initially seems plausible is that demonstratives do not occur in locative or instrumental NP's. Another hypothesis that does not seem necessary or satisfying is that subjects take demonstratives more than other NP's.

While locatives may in fact correlate negatively and subjects positively with demonstratives, it appears that once the four principles proposed here are taken fully into account, there is no explanatory work left over, which case, subjecthood, or word order can solve. We have encountered in

texts no data for which subjecthood would be the only explanation. However, Dardjowidjojo states that generic and uniquely salient nominals have the option of taking *itu*, in subject position only.

Verhaar (personal communication) has talked about *itu* having one function as a topic marker. One piece of evidence he offers in support of this claim is that the topic marker *itu* can co-occur with the phoric *itu*, e.g.

(82) Orang itu itu sakit terus.

As for that man, he is sick all the time.

Since, (as with Dardjowidjojo's hypothesis) we simply have encountered no data of this kind so far, we trust that the prior mention constraint will handle all the other NP's which Verhaar might prefer to call instances of the topic marker. (Topics, like subjects, tend to be previously mentioned.) Of course, the validity of both of these hypotheses remains for us as an empirical question. Probably both are accurate, but we have not yet seen the need for them in describing the written texts in our corpus.

(b) An earlier draft of this paper was overreacting to the idea that prior mention completely explains the (non-exophoric) use of demonstratives. . It overreacted by completely throwing out prior mention as a conditioning factor. But in fact, the distribution of *ini* and *itu* can be much more effectively explained if one assumes that prior mention *does* correlate with these determiners.

An additional problem with the analysis proposed in that earlier draft is that it attributed to *itu* certain *negative* functions, e.g. the prevention of a generic interpretation. For one thing, this creates the analytical difficulty of second guessing what *might* have been interpreted generically if the demonstrative had been omitted. Moreover, it seems counterintuitive to attribute such preventive meanings to any morpheme, even a function word. When a writer uses the word *father*, it carries a positive impact of its own, and is not used merely to discourage the reader from thinking *mother*.

23. Or later, in the case of cataphoric reference. Our data do not happen to include this possibility.
24. This term comes from Halliday and Hasan (1976).
25. This concept is outlined by Acton (1977) for English article usage.
26. Allan (1980) provides the descriptive framework for this statement.
27. One problematic NP for the non-count reference hypothesis is the following example, which seems to be specific and yet is not marked:

(83) Aku melihat di berjongkok di dalam air dan badannya sudah tidak berbaju lagi. (K)
I saw her stooping in the water, and already her body was unclothed.
28. Dardjowidjojo distinguishes as a basis for leaving certain NP's unmarked, uniqueness (e.g. bulan *moon*) and 'unique saliency' (e.g. raja *king*). Likewise, Cartier (this volume) posits such a class of NP's with two main subgroups: locations and groups of people. (This list is expanded in the present analysis.) Prince (1979) has also described a similar class of NP's: those referring to 'unused' entities. These are present in long-term memory of the speaker and hearer, but are not inferable from or evoked by the linguistic or extralinguistic context.

29. Dardjowidjojo gives examples of generic and unique references marked with *itu*, in which the *itu* serves to mark the entire construction as a clause rather than an NP:

(84) Harimau itu binatang.
The tiger is an animal.

(85) Bulan itu bagus.
The moon is beautiful.

It happens that no clauses of the kind occur in our data.

30. Concerning the temporarily unique entity *baringnya her bed* in (60), it should be said that uniqueness and grammatical possession overlap, but only partially. The unique *matahari sun* is not possessive, and the possessive *pikiranku itu that thought of mine* in example (52) is not unique.
31. (a) This is in contrast to the status of *sarong* in (45). In that passage, the *sarong* he is taking to *Sulinah* must be distinguished from the one he is wearing.

(b) Two nominals deviate from this tendency. Although they would seem to have (temporarily) unique status, they take *itu*. (The first one appears with a fuller context in (60).)

(86) *Tanganku yang mencari tumpuan tersenggol oleh tepi meja dan pistolku terpelanting dari tanganku. Meja bergoyang dan tiba-tiba ruang kamar itu menjadi gelap gulita. (K)*

My hand, which was groping for support, banged against the edge of the table and my pistol was knocked out of my hand. The table wobbled and suddenly the room was pitch black.

(87a) *Sinar pagi ... menerangi kelokan sungai tempat mandi. Aku melihat dia berjongkok di dalam air dan badannya sudah tidak berbaju lagi ... Aku tetap tegak di pinggir kali itu, ketika ia memungut pakaiannya ... (K)*

Morning sunbeams ... had lit up the bend in the river where people bathed. I saw her stooping in the water, and already her body was unclothed ... I stood right there on the bank of the river, while she picked up her clothes ...

The narrator later regrets the morning's lost opportunity:

(87b) *Mengapa perempuan itu tidak kubunuh tadi di kali? (K)*
Why didn't I kill that woman today at the river?

One possible explanation for the unexpected *itu* in (86) is the 'emotive' function posited by Lakoff (1974), as in the English exclamation: "And can you imagine — that crazy room went pitch black!"

(87) presents an even more serious problem, since it exactly reverses the perspective hypothesis formulated here. When the object is close, *itu* appears, and when the object is distant, the noun is unmarked. It may be that *itu* is not used in (87b) because it would imply something false: that only *that river* was an appropriate place to kill *Sulinah*.

32. The possibility that perspective, and hence uniqueness can change may explain some of the variation Cartier encounters in the definiteness marking of singular, specific, concrete objects (especially when each mention uses the same lexeme).

33. (a) It is also true that the change to hutan itu occurs when the forest has become, for the first and only time in the text, a discourse topic in itself (at the opening of a brief digression about the forest). This is not, however, what Verhaar intends by 'topic', since the NP is not in sentence-initial position. (See note 22a).
- (b) A similar contrast obtains between gunung (whatever mountains are nearest to a given participant, and thus seen as unique in his world) and gunung ini (which always refers to Mt Sumbing) in K.
34. A similar NP is mataku which can mean *my eyes*, where duality is irrelevant.
35. Ostranenie is also translated as *the device of making strange, estrangement or dishabituation*. It involves the "accurate notation of phenomena without any concern for their meaning" (Stacy 1977).
36. It is worth noting that there are similarities between (a) the factors governing uniqueness of entities in a text, (b) the factors governing sectioning or paragraphing in a text, and (c) the factors that can constitute basic cohesion systems for texts. All three lists include place, time, person and perspective. (a) is treated in this paper, (b) is surveyed in McCune (1980), (c) is touched on in Givón (1979), and has been elaborated on by Becker (personal communication).

SOURCES OF DATA

- (K) *Kejantanan di Sumbing*: Subagio Sastrowidjojo
- (H) *Si Kabayan pergi ke hutan*: Ajip Rosidi
- (M) *Si Kabayan dengan mertuanya*: Ajip Rosidi
- (S) *Senja di Jakarta*: Mochtar Lubis
- (Y) *Yang hitam*: Pramudya Ananta Tur
- (D) *Secangkir kopi dan sepotang donat*: Umar Kayam

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ACTON, William

- 1977 A conceptual framework for teaching articles in English. In H. Douglas Brown, Carlos Alfredo Yorio and Ruth H. Crymes, eds *On TESOL '77: teaching and learning English as a second language: trends in research and practice*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

ALLAN, Keith

- 1980 Nouns and countability, *Language* 56/3:541-567.

BACH, Emmon

- 1968 Nouns and noun phrases. In E. Bach and R.T. Harms, eds *Universals in linguistic theory*, 90-122. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

BEEKMAN, John and John CALLOW

- 1974 *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

CARTIER, Alice

- 1983 Strategies of the definite/indefinite patient in passive sentences. In this volume, pp.251-267.

DARDJOWIDJOJO, Soenjono

- 1979 A classifier, *itu*, *-nya* or none of the above: the way the Indonesian mind operates. Paper presented at the International Conference on Malay Studies, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, September 8-16, 1979.

FILLMORE, Charles

- 1975 *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

FOLEY, William A.

- 1976 Comparative syntax in Austronesian. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.

GIVÓN, Talmy

- 1979 *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya HASAN

- 1976 *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

KARTTUNEN, Lauri

- 1968 What do referential indices refer to? Paper presented at the Linguistics Colloquium, University of California at Berkeley.

KRIDALAKSANA, Harimurti

- 1972 *nya* sebagai penanda anafora. *Dewan Bahasa* 16/4:146-155.

LAKOFF, Robin

- 1974 Remarks on *this* and *that*. *Papers from the Tenth Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: CLS.

LEVI, Judith

- 1978 *The syntax and semantics of complex nominals*. New York: Academic Press.

MCCUNE, Keith

- 1980 A survey of the literature on discourse sectioning. MS. University of Michigan.

PRINCE, Ellen

- 1979 On the given/new distinction. *Papers from the Eighteenth Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 267-278. Chicago: CLS.

PURWO, H. Bambang Kaswanti

- 1978 The point-line dimension in Indonesian: a way of looking at some aspects of the referential system of Indonesian. In John P. Daly, ed. *Working papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota*, vol.22:54-61.

SCHANK, Roger and the Yale Artificial Intelligence Project

1975 SAM - A story understander. Research Report #43. Yale University.

STACY, R.H.

1977 *Defamiliarization in language and literature*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

VERHAAR, John W.M.

1983 On the syntax of *yang* in Indonesian. In this volume, pp.43-70.