Development of two definite marking strategies in Manado Malay

Asako Shiohara and Anthony Jukes

This presentation follows up research by Jukes and Shiohara (2016) on the referential strategy of Manado Malay. We noted two definite marking strategies observed in the language, namely tu, the reduced form of the demonstrative itu, which is preposed to the head noun, and depe, the third person possessive form. This research aims to further describe the use of each form. Data was elicited using a procedural (cooking) video as stimulus, and also obtained by translation of selected sentences from standard Indonesian.

The data obtained by translation shows quite clearly that tu marks a large range of textual-situational definiteness, while depe marks so-called bridging cross-reference or associative definiteness (Lyons 1999: 4, 7, 161, and 198). Depe, however, retains the feature of possessive in that it is used only when the whole referent of depe NP (X) exhibits a part-whole relation to the given entity (Y), in the way that X is a part of Y.

Table 1 shows the definite marking strategy of XMM contrasted with standard written Indonesian (Shiohara 2014), colloquial Indonesian (Englebretson (2003) and Djenar (2014)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Standard (written) Indonesian</th>
<th>Colloquial Indonesian</th>
<th>XMM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>textual-situational</td>
<td>itu</td>
<td>itu/tuh</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ini/ nih nya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non textual-situational</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>nya</td>
<td>φ / depe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: definite marking strategy in three Malay varieties

Observing larger texts elicited from four speakers (H, I, D and A) using a stimulus video shows variation among speakers in the choice of definite marking, though the basic pragmatic distinction shown in Table 1 was maintained by every speaker. Interestingly, one of the four speakers (H) preferred employing depe throughout the narrative, and other two preferred marking with tu (I, D) especially for a textual-situational definite referent. The other one speaker (A) rarely used either of the markers. The variation in usage suggests that the two forms are in the process of being established as definite markers and the two strategies are competing in the actual usage of individual speakers.
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