Chapter 4

Two definite markers in Manado Malay

Asako Shiohara
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

Anthony Jukes
La Trobe University

This chapter discusses referential strategies in Manado Malay (MM), a variety of trade Malay spoken in North Sulawesi, with special focus on how a lexical NP is marked according to the information status of the referent. Like some other Malay varieties, MM uses two strategies to indicate definiteness: articles and the third person singular possessive. The articles are derived from demonstratives and used for direct situational and anaphoric reference, while the possessive is used for reference in which some kind of association is required for identification. An article and a possessive may co-occur in one NP. The semantic domain each form covers is not exclusive to the other but rather belongs to intrinsically different semantic dimensions. Thus, the MM system enables speakers to mark that the referent is textual-situationally accessible and, at the same time, associable to the larger shared situation.

1 Introduction

This paper discusses referential strategies employed in lexical NPs in Manado Malay (hereafter MM). There, forms functionally similar to what is called the “definite marker” in other languages are grammaticalizing from two distinct sources: one is from the third person singular possessive marker depe and the other is from the demonstratives.

MM is a variety of trade Malay spoken in Indonesia by upwards of 2 million people in North Sulawesi, the Sangir and Talaud archipelagos to the north, and Gorontalo to the west. It seems to have developed from North Moluccan Malay, but it has developed independently since the 17th century (Paauw 2008: 43–44). Until relatively recently, first language speakers were mainly found in the city of Manado, while elsewhere MM was used as a second language by speakers of the indigenous Minahasan and Sangiric languages. In recent decades MM has become the first language of virtually the entire population of the region. Although most of the Minahasan and Sangiric languages are still
spoken, even elderly people grew up with MM and it could be considered a “joint” first language, while for many people of all ages, it is their first or even their only language.

The notion of monolingual MM speakers requires some clarification. The education system, media, and government administration largely use standard Bahasa Indonesia (BI), and so everyone is exposed to this variety and code switching and mixing are pervasive. Some speakers are clear about the significant grammatical and lexical differences between BI and MM, and they call MM “Melayu Manado” or “Bahasa Manado”, recognizing that it is not the same as BI. Others do not have this meta-awareness and believe that the language that they speak is BI. As noted by Paauw, “Manado Malay and Indonesian (and, in particular, colloquial Indonesian) have been converging to the point that speakers of Manado Malay, to varying extents and often subconsciously, employ Indonesian vocabulary and constructions when using Manado Malay, and it is often difficult to draw a line between the two languages” (Paauw 2008: 44).

The data sources of this study are (i) translation/elicitation from standard Indonesian sentences, (ii) semi-spontaneous monologue that was obtained using a procedural video as stimulus, and (iii) an unpublished MM-BI dictionary compiled by the Pusat Penerjemahan Bahasa (PPB, Translation Centre) in Tomohon. The last item was particularly useful and the authors would like to thank Albert Polii for making it available to us.

The structure of this chapter is as follows: §2 provides a brief overview of the NP structure of MM. In §3, we will examine the semantic function of the two definite marking devices, that is, articles and the third person possessive depe based on elicited and published data, and provide a brief comparison to the other Malay varieties. In §4, we will see larger texts elicited using a procedural video and confirm the usage of the two devices discussed in §3. In §5, we look at the MM definite marking strategy from a cross-linguistic perspective.

2 NP structure in MM

Before discussing the referential strategy of MM, we will show the NP structure in MM, largely based on Prentice (1994: 424–429). (1) is the structure that Prentice suggests. Note that Prentice calls the demonstrative “deictic”.

(1)  (article) (POSSESSOR+pe) N_head (attributive n/v)1

Two articles tu and ni, “both translatable by the” (Prentice 1994: 424), are derived from the distal demonstrative itu and proximal demonstrative ini, respectively. “The articles both mark the referent of the following noun as being known to both speaker and addressee, while ni has the added function of indicating geographical temporal and/or psychological proximity to the speaker” (Prentice 1994: 424). Examples (2a–b) are examples from Prentice (1994: 424).

1Quantifiers may precede or follow the head noun according to its pragmatic status, which we will not go into further in this research.
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(2) a. tu angin
   ART wind
   ‘the wind (e.g. which blew down my coconut palms.)’

   b. ni angin
      ART wind
      ‘the wind (e.g. which is blowing now.)’

Prentice suggests that the demonstratives may either precede the head-noun alone or follow the combination of article + noun, as shown in Example (3a–d).

(3) ‘that island’ or ‘those islands’/ ‘this island’ or ‘these islands’
   a. itu pulo
      that island
   b. ini pulo
      this island
   c. tu pulo itu
      ART island that
   d. ni pulo ini
      ART island this

We assume that Prentice’s data was collected in the 1980s and 1990s. More recent MM data shows that the pre-predicate slot is more frequently, though not exclusively, filled by the article. Thus, phrases like (2a–b) or (3c–d) are more common than ones like (3a–b).

In more recent MM data, the form tu may co-occur with either the demonstrative itu or ini, as seen in tu ruma itu in example (4) and tu parkara ini ‘this problem’ in example (5).

(4) Tu ruma itu ancork lantaran da kena bom waktu prang.
    ART.D house that broken because PST affected bomb time war
    ‘That house is broken because it was bombed in the war.’ (PPB:2)

(5) Tu parkara ini so lama nyanda klar-klar.
    ART.D issue DEM.P PFV long NEG solved
    ‘This issue has not been solved (lit. finished) for a long time.’ (PPB:62)

Example (4) and (5) suggest that the form tu has undergone semantic bleaching, as it is neutral regarding the distance to the reference point.

The occurrence of the determiners tu and ni exhibits a syntactic restriction in that they only occur with S, A, and P but not with an oblique. Consider examples (6) and (7) below, which Prentice (1994: 430) provides to show word order variation in the MM transitive clause. Examples (6) and (7) both denote almost the same proposition in which “T” is the actor, the basket is the location, and the rice is the theme; and the non-agent NP occurs with the determiner tu only when it is P.
(6) Kita so isi tu loto deng padi.
   1SG PFV fill ART.D basket with rice
   ‘I have already filled the basket with rice.’

(7) Kita so isi tu padi di loto.
   1SG PFV fill ART.D rice at basket
   ‘I have already filled the rice with a basket.’

In possessive structures, the possessor noun or pronoun precedes the head (the possessed item) being followed by the possessive marker pe, the short form of punya ‘have’ in standard Malay. Table 1 contains the paradigm of possessives with personal pronouns and a lexical noun.

Table 1: Possessives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>3PL</th>
<th>lexical noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kita / ta pe</td>
<td>torang / tong pe</td>
<td>ngana pe</td>
<td>ngoni pe</td>
<td>dia pe / depe</td>
<td>dorang / dong pe</td>
<td>NOUN pe kamar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pe anak ‘my child’</td>
<td>torang pe anak ‘our child’</td>
<td>ngana pe anak ‘your (sg.) child’</td>
<td>ngoni pe anak ‘your (pl.) child’</td>
<td>depe anak ‘his/ her/ its child’</td>
<td>dorang pe anak ‘their child’</td>
<td>anak pe kamar ‘a child’s room’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the forms presented in Table 1, the long form of the first-person possessive (kita pe) and the short form of the third person (depe) are not shown in Prentice (1994: 424). However these forms, especially depe, are much more frequently observed in current MM than their alternatives.

In MM, the possessor is obligatorily marked when the referent of the matrix NP is possessed by, or has a part-whole relation to, a referent whose identity is clear from the previous utterance – thus, in sentences (8) and (9), the possessive obligatorily occurs.

(8) Tu anak pe gaga. depe mata basar deng depe mulu kacili.
    ART.D child POSS beautiful 3SG.POSS eyes big and 3SG.POSS mouth small
    ‘How beautiful the child is. Her eyes are big, and her eyes are big, and her mouth is small.’ (elicited)

(9) Sayang ini pohon, depe ujung so potong.
    pity DEM.P tree 3SG.POSS tip PFV cut
    ‘(This) poor tree, the (its) top has been chopped off.’ (elicited)

2The third person pronouns dia (sg) and dorang (pl) may refer to both animate and inanimate referents, and so may the possessives, as seen in sentence (8) and (9) among others.
The article and possessive may co-occur in pre-head noun position, as seen in examples (10) and (11), suggesting they are assigned to separate syntactic positions.\(^3\)

(10) *Serta tu depe ubi milu deng sambiki so mandidi.*
    
    after ART.D 3SG.POSS potato corn and pumpkin PFV boil
    
    ‘after the potato, corn and pumpkin are boiled.’ (elicited narrative, speaker D: 45)

(11) *Dia no tu / ni kita pe papa.*
    
    3SG PTC ART.D / ART.P 1SG POSS father
    
    He is my father. (lit. the my father) (PPB dictionary:89)

This co-occurrence also suggests that they each have semantic functions independent of each other. We will return to this point in §4.

As will be seen in the section that follows, the use of *depe* partially overlaps with that of English definite article *the*, but not all *depe*-marked NPs refer to a so-called definite referent.

In example (12), neither the possessor *ayang* ‘chicken’ or *de* ‘3SG’ in the possessive is referential, but used attributively.\(^4\)

(12) *Kita suka ayang pe kaki, mar nyanda suka depe dada.*
    
    1SG like chicken POSS leg but NEG. like 3SG.POSS breast
    
    ‘I like chicken leg meat, but not chicken breast meat.’ (elicited)

The development of the articles and possessives that we have seen in this section have been observed in other varieties of Malay, to a lesser or greater extent. We will give a brief comparison in §3. The variation of the position of the demonstratives and the long and short forms of the third person possessives mentioned above illustrate the transitional status of the two strategies.

3 Semantic functions of the articles and the possessive construction

As mentioned in the introduction, MM has developed two types of definite markers, the sources of which are the demonstratives and possessives. Their compatibility in one NP (e.g. *tu depe ruma* ‘the house of him/her/it) implies that each device has a function

\(^3\)As for the status of possessives, Lyons (1999: 130–134) proposed a typological distinction of DG language and AG language; in the former, the possessive is assigned to the determiner position and, in the latter, to the adjectival or some other position. The compatibility of the article and possessive, seen in sentences (10) and (11), suggests that MM belongs to the latter (AG) type.

\(^4\)Note that the antecedent of *depe* in example (12) is the expression *ayang* ‘chicken’, not the referent of the expression *ayang* ‘chicken’. (See Krifka & Musan 2012: 23 on the distinction of expression givenness and denotation givenness.) This type of anaphorical usage is not observed in the third person possessive pronoun in many other languages, such as English *its* or *nya* in standard Indonesian. Thus, the sentence ‘I like chicken leg meat, but not its breast meat’ cannot be accepted as the English counterpart of example (12).
independent of each other. In this section, we will examine the semantic function of each strategy, mainly based on MM sentences obtained as translations of target sentences from standard Indonesian and utterances observed in every day conversation.

Hawkins (2015: Chapter 3) makes a distinction between four major usage types of the definite article *the*: anaphoric, immediate situational, larger situational, and associative anaphoric uses.

The MM articles *ni* and *tu* are used in cases similar to the first two types, that is, anaphoric use and immediate situational use. In sentence (13), the two forms are used for making reference to the entity in the speech situation, in sentence (14), one of the two forms *tu* is used for making reference to the entity or situation mentioned in the previous discourse.\(^5\)

\[13\] _Bole pinjam tu / ni pulpen?_

may borrow ART.D / ART.P ballpoint.pen

‘May I borrow that ballpoint pen?’ (elicited)

\[14\] _Ada parampuang gaga deng dua anak da masuk ke satu ruangan. kita langsung tahu apa tu parampuan itu._

directly know who ART.D woman DEM.D

‘An elegant lady and two children came in the room. I immediately knew who the woman was.’

These two uses correspond with what Lyons (1999: 166, 198) calls “textual-situational ostension”. According to Lyons, “what these have in common is that the referent is immediately accessible.” Lyons suggested that a primary distinction of definiteness should be made between textual-situational ostension and other usages. The former functionally overlaps with demonstrativeness, and the others do not. A similar view is presented in many previous studies, such as Hawkins (2015: Chapter 3), Himmelmann (1996), and De Mulder & Carlier (2011: 528).

Demonstratives are a well-known source of definite markers in many languages, as suggested by Heine & Kuteva (2002) and Lyons (1999) among others. De Mulder & Carlier (2011: 528) suggest that the crucial semantic shift from demonstratives to the definite article is seen from *direct reference* that corresponds to the direct situational use and anaphoric use of Hawkins, to *indirect reference*, which corresponds to anaphoric associative use and larger situational use.

Notwithstanding the distinct syntactic position in NP from the demonstratives, the uses of the articles in MM have not undergone a semantic shift and have not extended

\(^5\)(14) is a sentence obtained as a rough translation of sentence (i) below; an example of anaphoric use of the English definite article is given in Lyons (1999: 3).

\[(i)\] An elegant, dark-haired woman, a well-dressed man with dark glasses, and two children entered the compartment. I immediately recognized the woman....
beyond direct reference. Instead, indirect uses are covered by the third person possessive 
*depe* ‘3sg.poss’ in MM. In the anaphoric associative use of *the*, the NP refers to something 
associable to the referent of a previously mentioned NP, while in the larger situational 
use, the NP refers to something associable to the situation of the utterance itself. In 
both uses, the hearer is supposed to use shared general knowledge for identification; the 
hearer and the speaker need to know the referent is associable to the antecedent or the 
utterance situation in question.

Sentences (15–16) are examples of anaphoric associative uses.\(^6\)

(15) *Kita lebe suka Australia daripada Jepang karna depe sayur-sayur lebe sadap deng murah.*

1sg more like Australia from Japan because 3sg.POSS vegetable.RED more tasty and cheap

‘I like Australia more than Japan, because vegetables there are tastier and cheaper.’ (elicited)

(16) *Kita baru pulang dari pesta kaweng. Depe broid ta pe tamang.*

1sg just come.back from party wedding. 3sg.POSS bride 1sg POSS friend

‘I have just come back from a wedding party. The bride was a friend of mine.’ (elicited)

Employment of the third person possessive *depe* for this use can be easily explained by its 
original meaning; the possessive *depe* includes *de*, the shortened form of the third person 
pronoun *dia* ‘3sg’. The pronoun *dia* may be used as an anaphor, and in the possessive, it 
indicates the presence of a whole to part relation between the referent of the pronoun 
and the matrix NP.

From sentences (15) and (16) above, we can see that the semantic relation between the 
possessor and the head noun is not limited to the simple whole to part relation that is 
exemplified in sentence (8) and (9) shown in §2. There may be various relations, such as 
location, as seen in example (15), and occasion, as in example (16).

However, the semantic range the possessive covers does not seem to perfectly overlap 
with that of anaphoric associative *the*. Consider example (17), which Lyons (1999: 3) gives 
as one of the examples of associative use of the English definite article.

(17) *I had to get a taxi from the station. On the way, the driver told me there was a bus strike.*

In sentence (18), a rough MM equivalent of sentence (17), the counterpart of the English 
definite NP does not receive any explicit marking, as seen in sentence (18).

---

\(^6\)Example (16) is obtained as a rough MM equivalent of sentence (ii) below; an example of associative anaphoric use of English *the* given in Lyons (1999: 3).(ii) ‘I have just come back from a wedding party. The bride wore blue.’
In this situation, we can reasonably associate the referent of sopir ‘the driver’ to taksi ‘a taxi’, and that is the reason the NP undergoes the definite marking in English sentence (17), but that is not the case in MM. The reason may be that the semantic relation between sopir ‘the driver’ and the associated taksi ‘a taxi’ cannot be taken as a possessor-possessed, or whole to part relation, to the MM speakers; one of the MM speakers suggested that he could not use the possessive depe here because the driver possessed the taxi, not the reverse. This example may show the difference between the English definite article in associative use and MM possessives; the former may indicate any type of association, while the latter exhibits some limitations which presumably are attributed to the original possessive meaning. At the present stage of our research, however, we do not have enough data to provide the precise condition where the possessive may or may not occur.\footnote{We might be able to infer that if the 'possessed' NP is animate and the 'possessor' NP is inanimate, the marking with depe may not be permitted, as it contradicts the concept of possession we intuitively would have.}

The use of depe in example (19) and (20) overlaps with the “larger situational use” of the in Hawkins’s classification, where the referent of the depe NP is associable to the utterance situation. Note that there is no clear antecedent of the possessive in these examples.

In sentence (19), the NP depe cuaca refers to the weather of the place the speaker and hearer are located in.

(19) \textit{Depe cuaca bae.}\newline3SG.POSS weather good

‘The weather is nice (today).’ (spontaneous utterance obtained from daily conversation)

The sentences in (20) are from a Facebook post. Example (20a) is the original Facebook post made with a picture of yams, and (20b) and (20c) are comments posted by two friends of the poster. In both comments, ubi ‘yam’ mentioned in the original post is marked by tu and depe, and the antecedent of depe is not explicitly mentioned.

(20) a. \textit{Slamat pagi, panen ubi jalar serta menanam ulang.}\newlinegood.morning harvest yam spread after plant again

‘Good morning, harvesting yams and then planting them again.’
b. *Mantaap Beng pe besar-besar kang tu depe ubi?*8
   great Beng very big RED ITR ART.D 3SG.POSS yam
   ‘Great Beng the (lit. the its) potatoes are very big, aren’t they?’

c. *Banyak tu depe batata ada panen.*
   many ART.D 3SG.POSS sweet.potato PST harvest
   ‘Lots of the (lit. the its) sweet potatoes were harvested.’

The lack of a clear antecedent9 in sentences (19) and (20) shows that the form *depe* does not function as the possessive marker. Instead, we can claim that the form *depe* plays a similar semantic role to the larger situational use of *the*, whichever label we give to it in MM grammar. In this use, the referent is identified by two processes: one is identifying the nature of the “shared” larger situation intended by the speaker, and the other is identifying the referent using the “shared” knowledge that presupposes the existence of the referent in the situation (Hawkins 2015).

A similar type of development from the possessive to the definite marker is observed in other languages that are not genetically related, such as Amharic (Rubin 2010) and Yucatec Maya (Lehmann 1998: 86–88), as well as colloquial Indonesian, as mentioned in §3. This development can be explained by an affinity between the association and indication of the part-whole relation. Hawkins (2015: 123–124), in discussing the similarity of associative anaphoric and larger situational use, claims that “(T)he notion ‘part-of’ seems to play an important role in defining the number of possible associates. The trigger (of the association) must conjure up a set of objects which are generally known to be part of some larger object or situation.” (For a more recent and precise discussion of the development from possessive to definite marker, see Fraund 2001; Gerland 2014; 2015).

---

8The commentator uses the spelling of *bsr2* and *dp* for *besar-besar* and *depe*, respectively, in her original post.

9We asked the commenter to identify the antecedent of *depe* in sentence (20)c several times, but her answers were not consistent. Her response may show that the referent of the antecedent is not a concrete entity that can be clearly mentioned. We might be able to insist that the third person pronoun *de* refers to the implied “shared situation”, but the claim may not be accepted, because the third person pronoun *dia*, from the long form of *de* in *depe*, may not refer to the situation or proposition. Consider the three pairs of sentence (i). A situation or proposition can be referred to only by the demonstrative *begitu*, not by the third person pronoun *dia*.

(i) a. *Albert so nya mo pusing deng orang laeng pe emosi. So bagitu Albert pe kalakuan.*
   Albert PFV NEG want bothered with person other POSS emotion PFV like.that Albert POSS behavior
   ‘Albert doesn’t want to be bothered with other people’s feelings. The character of Albert is like that.’ (elicited)

b. *Albert so nya mo pusing deng orang laeng pe emosi. *Dia Albert pe kalakuan.*
   Albert PFV NEG want bothered with person other POSS emotion 3SG Albert POSS behavior
   *(Intended meaning) Albert doesn’t want to be bothered with other people’s feelings. That’s the character of Albert.*
Other varieties of Malay exhibit similar developments to a greater or lesser extent. Adelaar & Prentice (1996: 675) suggest that the use of the short form of the demonstratives *ni* and *tu* as well as forms such as *pu* or *pun* (derived from *punya* ‘have’ as possessive marker) are among several morphosyntactic features shared among trade Malay varieties, which Adelaar & Prentice (1996: 675) call Pidgin-Derived Malay (PDM) varieties. Regarding the development of demonstratives into the definite markers, Adelaar (2005: 212–217) points out the anaphoric use of the short forms of demonstratives *tu* and *ni* in Ambon Malay and Cocos Malay; they also underwent semantic bleaching similar to that of MM. Similar types of development are reported in both Papuan Malay (Kluge 2017: 384–388) and Ternate Malay (Litamahuputty 2012: 263, 277).

The development of the possessive into a definite marker is also observed in colloquial Indonesian, in which the third person possessive enclitic =*nya* is used to indicate identifiability, exhibiting functions similar to MM *depe* in associative anaphoric use and larger situational use (Englebretson 2003: 161–168). A rather different distribution was observed in Baba Malay, spoken in Malaka and Singapore by “Strait-born” Chinese. In Baba Malay, the articles *ini* and *itu* cover larger semantic domains, including associative anaphoric use and larger situational use (Thurgood 2001: 477–480), although the third person possessive suffix -*nya* also has similar functions to the articles (Thurgood 1998: 132–135).

4 Determiners and possessives in elicited procedural text

4.1 Method

In this section, we will see larger texts elicited by a short cooking video as stimulus to confirm the syntactic and semantic functions of the two strategies outlined in the previous sections. The advantage of employing this method for elicitation is that (i) this type of non-linguistic stimulus enables us to collect more naturalistic data without the influence of a medium language, and (ii) the reference tends to be clear in the text obtained through this method when compared to purely spontaneous utterance in which the referent of each NP may not always be easily identified (see Majid 2012 for details of elicitation methods using stimulus materials.)

The video employed as stimulus here is titled Tinutuan ‘Manadonese porridge’. The video was shot by one of the authors and is available from https://youtu.be/cyJanYzjXoo. We asked four speakers of MM (H, I, D and A) to watch the video and give a commentary in MM. In the video, the main dish *tinutuan* ‘Manadonese porridge’ and the side dishes *tahu goreng* ‘fried tofu’ and *dabu-dabu* ‘chili sauce’ are cooked. The outline of the cooking process is shown in Table 3.
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Figure 1: Tinutuan ‘Manadonese porridge’, tahu goreng ‘fried tofu’ and dabu-dabu ‘chili sauce’.

Table 2: MM speakers who provided the narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Beo, Talaud</td>
<td>Talaud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Beo, Talaud</td>
<td>Manado Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sonder, Minahasa</td>
<td>Manado Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Tomohon, Minahasa</td>
<td>Tombulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Outline of the cooking process

Scene 1: showing ingredients
Scene 2: cut and peel hard vegetables such as yam and pumpkin
Scene 3: put the vegetables and rice into a pan and heat them
Scene 4: cut and wash the leafy vegetables
Scene 5: mash the pumpkin in the pan, put the leafy vegetables in the pan and mix all the ingredients
Scene 6: prepare the side dish tahu goreng (fried tofu)
Scene 7: prepare dabu-dabu (chili sauce)
Scene 8: serve the dish
4.2 Results

4.2.1 Referent and general referential strategies observed

There are 45 entities mentioned in the narrations of the four speakers; the range of entities that each speaker mentioned varies depending on the speaker, and the term for the same entity may vary among speakers, too. The referents can be grouped into the semantic categories below.

- The speaker (1 type): Isye
- The name of dishes (3 types): tinutuan ‘porridge’, tahu goreng ‘fried tahu’, and dabu-dabu or laburan ‘chili sauce’
- Ingredients (1 type): bahan-bahan ‘ingredients’
- Base ingredients, i.e. root vegetables and rice (6 types): ubi ‘potato’, batata or ubi manis ‘sweet potato’, ubi kayu ‘cassava’, sambiki ‘pumpkin’, milu ‘corn’, beras merah, beras ‘rice’, aer ‘water’
- An attribute or a part of ingredients (4 types): kuli ‘skin’, daong ‘leaf’, isi ‘contents, edible part of vegetable’, warna (kuning) ‘(yellow) color’
- Body parts of the cook (2 types): tangan ‘hand’, jare ‘finger’

The text length and number and varieties of the referents mentioned vary among the speakers. Table 4 shows the number of words and referents included in each narrative. Each referent can be expressed by either a personal pronoun, a demonstrative pronoun, or a lexical NP. Table 5 counts the occurrences of each strategy.

It should be noted that the argument of the predicate is not expressed when it is salient in discourse; category zero counts such arguments.

The actor (the cook) is not mentioned at all in three of the four narratives and is mentioned only once (by the third person singular pronoun dia) in the remaining narrative. Other non-agent arguments are also often not expressed; a series of cooking processes
Table 4: The number of words and referents included in each narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Words included</th>
<th>Types of referent mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Occurrence of each strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Zero pronoun</th>
<th>Personal pronoun</th>
<th>Demonstrative pronoun</th>
<th>Lexical NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is expressed by a co-ordinate clause, and the entity mentioned in the first clause is not expressed in the clauses that follow it. Consider sentence (21), which consists of coordinate clauses expressing a series of actions processing garlic. Here, the actor does not occur throughout the sentence, and the patient, *bawang putih* ‘garlic’ occurs only once in the first clause, but not in the three clauses that follow.

(21) Aa kase ancor bawang <me-10> bawang putih so kase ancor φ lagi iris-iris φ itj caus crush onion <re-> onion white pfv caus crush again slice lagi hh campur φ di tahu. again itj mix at tofu

'Aa...(she) crushes the onion...the garlic, after crushing, (she) will slice (it) and mix (it) with tofu.' (speaker H 37–38)

In what follows, we focus on how lexical NPs are marked with the articles and/or the possessive. A lexical NP may occur (i) in unmarked form, that is, a bare NP, (ii) with the article *tu* or *ni*, (iii) with possessives *depe* or *dia pe*, (iv) with both the article *tu* and the possessive, (v) with a postposed demonstrative, or (vi) with =*nya*, the third person singular possessive enclitic used in standard Indonesian.

Most of the possessives are that of the third person singular *depe* in the text; the text includes only one example of the lexical noun possessor, *sambiki le pe kuli* [pumpkin also poss skin] ‘pumpkin’s skin’.

Table 6 shows the occurrence of the article and the possessive construction.

10In this utterance, the speaker started to say *bawang merah* ’shallot’, and then corrected herself saying *bawang putih* ’garlic’.
As observed in §2, in current MM the pre-head noun position is much more frequently filled by the article than by a demonstrative. This data confirm the observation; we can see only 3 instances of pre-head noun demonstratives compared to 65 instances of articles. We also mentioned the variation in form of the third person singular possessive. The short form depe occurs much more frequently (66 examples) than the long form diape (3 examples).

The individual narratives exhibit considerable variation in the frequency with which each speaker uses the two strategies – the determiner and the possessive. For example, speaker I prefers to use the article, while speaker H prefers the possessive depe. Speaker D uses both in similar frequencies, while speaker A rarely uses either of the markers.

Notwithstanding the difference in preference in using each device, the use in the text maintains the basic semantic function of the determiners and the possessive, which we have shown in §3; the articles mark a textual-situationally given referent, while the possessive depe or diape marks a referent associable to a given referent or utterance situation.

Table 7 shows the distribution of NPs with an article and the possessive depe in a textually accessible environment.

Table 7: The distribution of the articles and possessive depe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Articles</th>
<th>Possessive depe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not textually accessible</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textually accessible</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the nature of the text, most of the referents are visible to both the speaker and addressee. That makes it difficult to verify how direct situational accessibility affects both devices. The fact that a considerable number of NPs were not marked by either of the devices, however, suggests that situational accessibility is not a crucial factor for either of the markings.

---

\(^{11}\)The addressee in any given narrative is whichever of the authors was present at the time of recording.
Regarding textual-accessibility, we can see a clear difference of frequency between the articles and possessives. In the 59 occurrences of the NP marked with articles in total, 56 refer to a textually accessible – in other words, previously mentioned, entity.

In contrast to the articles, as expected by the observation of §3, textual-accessibility does not influence the use of the possessive depe.

In the following sections, we will see the details of how each strategy works in the text.

### 4.2.2 Textually accessible use of the article

As mentioned above, in almost all the occurrences the NPs marked with an article refer to a textually accessible referent. The frequency of *tu* is far higher than that of *ni*, as seen in Table 6, which supports Prentice’s view that *ni* is semantically marked (see §3). From the text obtained by the experiment, though, we could not clearly see the functional difference between the two articles.

As mentioned in §2, the determiner *tu* occurs with core arguments (S, A, and P). However, not all textually given S and P referents are marked by the determiner. Table 8 shows the frequency of use of the determiner for textually given S and P referents.\(^\text{12}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Textually accessible ASP</th>
<th>Marked by ART</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38 (69%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21 (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6 (20%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preference varies among the speakers. Speaker I and D more frequently used *tu* than the other two speakers. They are younger than the other speakers, and so this may represent a change in progress.

### 4.2.3 The use of the possessive pronoun

As shown in §2 and §3, the possessive covers anaphoric associative use as a part of its possessive meaning and also covers the larger situational use of Hawkins (2015) as a result of semantic change.

The obligatory marking of the possessor mentioned in §2 is attested by the narratives. Sentence (22) is a typical example.

\(^{12}\)No given A occurs in the four texts.
Asako Shiohara & Anthony Jukes

(22)  **Serta so ta-kaluar depe kuli, mo kupas lei tu sambiki.**

`After PFV PASS-peel 3SG.POSS skin FUT peel again ART.D pumpkin`

‘After all the peel has been removed, (then she) will peel the pumpkin, too.’ (H 13)

The form *depe* in (22) retains its possessive meaning and indicates that the referent of the whole NP is associable to the referent of previously mentioned NP. In actual sentences, the associative use and larger situation use cannot always be separated clearly.

Consider sentence (23). This is the first sentence in scene 6 (preparation of a tofu dish), and the antecedent of *depe* in the NP *depe tahu* ‘the tofu’, is not clear, or is at least unavailable in clauses that directly precede sentence (23).

(23)  **Skarang mo bekeng depe tahu. tahu taro di panci.**

`now FUT do 3SG.POSS tofu tofu put at pan`

‘Now (we) want to make the tofu. Put the tofu in the pan.’ (I 052)

Sentence (24) provides a similar example. This is the first sentence in scene 7 (preparation of chili sauce), and the antecedent of *depe* in the NP *depe laburan* ‘the sauce’, is not clear, or at least is unavailable in the clauses that directly precede it.

(24)  **Itu mo bekeng depe laburan.**

`that FUT make 3SG.POSS sauce`

‘There (she) is going to cook the (its) sauce’. (D 80)

According to the speaker, in both cases, the possessor is the main topic of the whole text: *tinutuan* ‘Manado porridge’, fried tofu and chili sauce always come together with the porridge as a side dish and can be considered a part of the dish.

The dish *tinutuan* does have prior mention and we could therefore say that sentences (23) and (24) are examples of anaphoric associative use. But the prior mention of *tinutuan* is made in the very beginning of the whole narrative — far from sentences (23) and (24) (51 and 78 clauses away from each *depe* NP, respectively). It is therefore difficult to consider the NP *tinutuan* to be antecedent of the possessive *depe*. It may be more plausible to think that the referent of *depe* NP is associable with the larger situation in which the utterance was made, that is, watching, and talking about, the cooking process of *tinutuan*.

Table 9 shows the frequency with which each speaker uses *depe*; each use is classified into those that have an antecedent available in directly preceding clauses – in other words, associative anaphoric use and larger situational use.

Differences among speakers are observed in their use of larger situational *depe*.

As seen in Table 9, one of the four speakers (Speaker H) showed a marked preference for wider topic *depe*, while Speaker I did that to a lesser extent. Speaker H’s distinct use of *depe* is clearly seen in the beginning of his narrative, where he introduces ingredients immediately after the title *tinutuan* ‘Manado Porridge’ is shown. Sentence (25) shows that part; here, speaker H marked the NP expressing ingredients with *depe* ‘3SG.POSS’.
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Table 9: Frequency of the form depe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lexical NP</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>Associative anaphoric use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

want make food name-3SG.POSS(BI) tinutuan
‘(She) wants to cook food named tinutuan.’ (Speaker H: 01)
b. Ado e pe sadap skali ini, aah ini batata, depe batata, 
   ITJ ITJ ITJ delicious very this ITJ this sweet.potato, 3SG.POSS sweet.potato, 
   depe ubi. 
   3SG.POSS yam
‘Oh, it is very delicious, this is sweet potato, the sweet potato, the yam.’

Unlike H, the other three speakers introduce the ingredients without any marking. In sentence (26), speaker I describes the same scene.

(26) Bahan-bahan, bete, ubi kayu sambiki milu...
ingredients taro sweet.potato pumpkin corn
‘Ingredients...taro, sweet potato, pumpkin, and corn...’ (Speaker I: 02)

Differences among speakers are also seen in the description that follows (25) and (26), respectively, which explains the cooking procedure. Sentence (27) is a description that follows sentence (25). Speaker H keeps employing depe for referring to the ingredients given in the previous part of his utterance; here, one of the ingredients batata ‘sweet potato’ is marked with depe.

(27) Aah sekarang depe batata mo di-kupas kase kaluar depe kuli.
   ITJ now 3SG.POSS sweet.potato FUT PASS-peel give go.out 3SG.POSS skin
   ‘Ah, now (she) is going to peel the potato, peel off the skin.’ (Speaker H: 11)

In contrast to that, speaker I employs tu to mark all the ingredients that were given in the preceding part of the utterance. Sentence (28) is a part of the description that follows sentence (26).

(28) Pertama kase bersi tu bete, kupas depe kuli.
   first CAUS clean ART.D taro peel 3SG.POSS skin
   ‘First, clean the taro, and peel its skin.’ (Speaker I: 18)
It should be noted that all the speakers use both strategies to a greater or lesser extent. Speaker H, who very frequently uses depe, also uses tu twice to mark a textually accessible referent, as in sentence (22), while speaker I, who uses tu for most of the textually given referents, also employs larger situational depe, as seen in sentence (23) above.

The variation observed in the frequency of each device among speakers, therefore, is not caused by differences in the referential system each of them employs, but by which strategy they prefer to code an anaphoric relation of a referent in the discourse and discourse situation. Speaker I prefers to code a relation of a referent in the previous discourse and therefore uses anaphoric articles more frequently, while speaker H prefers to relate a referent to a shared situation told by the whole discourse and therefore uses the possessive more frequently.

As mentioned in §2, the article and possessive may co-occur in one NP. The elicited text includes three examples of such a co-occurrence. Example (29) below and example (10) above from the elicited text and (20)b and (20)c above, which are spontaneous utterances, show this compatibility. In sentence (29), the article tu indicates a textual-situational accessibility and the possessive depe indicates that the referent can be associated with the shared larger situation.

(29) Kase ancor tu depe sambiki supaya dapa lia warna kuning.
    cause smash ART.D 3SG.PSS pumpkin so.that get see color yellow

    ‘(We) smashed the pumpkin, so that we could see the yellow color.’ (I 42)

This suggests that the semantic domain each device covers is not exclusive to the other and belongs to intrinsically different semantic dimensions; one may mark the referent as textual-situationally accessible and, at the same time, as identifiable through association with the larger situation shared between the interlocutors.

5 Summary and discussion

We have shown referential strategies of MM, with special focus on how a lexical NP is marked according to the information status of the referent. MM has two strategies to mark so-called “definiteness”: articles and the third person singular possessive depe. The articles are derived from demonstratives and are used for direct situational reference and anaphoric reference, while the possessive is used for references in which some kind of association is required for identification, which corresponds to anaphoric associative use and larger situation use of English in the classification of Hawkins (2015).

Both devices still retain their original semantic functions. The semantic domain of the articles does not extend beyond textual-situational accessibility, a direct semantic extension of the demonstratives; while the possessive does not cover all the “associative” relations that would be expressed by the definite NP in English, as seen in §3.

Demonstratives are a well-known source of definite markers in many languages. MM articles have established a syntactic position in NPs separated from the postposed demonstratives, and especially tu (derived from the distal demonstrative) has undergone semantic bleaching. We could expect that the use of the articles might be extended further to
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indirect reference, such as anaphoric associative or larger situational use (Hawkins 2015). This cross-linguistically plausible scenario, however, seems to be blocked by the semantic extension of the possessive depe, at least in the present stage.

The article tu and possessive depe may co-occur in one NP. This fact suggests that the semantic domain which each form covers is not exclusive to the other and belongs to intrinsically different semantic dimensions; one may mark the referent as textually-situationally accessible and, at the same time, as identifiable through association.

A very similar type of referential system with demonstratives and possessives is observed in Cirebon Javanese, a genetically related language (Ewing 1995; Ewing 2005). In Cirebon Javanese, as in MM, the determiners derived from the demonstratives mark directly shared identifiability, and textual-situational accessibility, while the possessive suffix -é, marks identifiability through indirect association. The two devices can frequently co-occur in one NP, because they “are not in some sort of complementary distribution” (Ewing 1995: 80).

Similar, but apparently more grammaticalized patterns of marking are observed in Fehring, a dialect of North Frisian. In Fehring, according to Lyons (1999: 161ff), which is based on the description of Ebert (1971a,b), and De Mulder & Carlier (2011), the strong, less grammaticalized, article is used for textual-situational accessibility, while the weak, more grammaticalized, article is used to indicate anaphoric association, unique entity, and generic entity (De Mulder & Carlier 2011: 529). The two articles exhibit complementary distribution in the pre-head noun determiner slot. The result of definite marking development in MM may be the pattern observed in Fehring.

Another possible development may be that one of the two strategies becomes more dominant than the other. As shown in §4, among the four speakers who have provided narrative data, one elder speaker prefers to use the possessive, while the two younger speakers prefer to use the articles. From this generational difference, we might predict that the article will become dominant and extend its semantic domain to indirect reference in the future.

MM is rapidly obtaining native speakers. As it goes in this direction, processes of standardization or homogenization could be expected to affect the marking of definiteness. The process should be monitored through ongoing research.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>the 1st, 2nd, 3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.D</td>
<td>distal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART.P</td>
<td>proximal article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM.D</td>
<td>distal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM.P</td>
<td>proximal demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PST</td>
<td>past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>discourse particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>reduplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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