

International Workshop on
 Deixis and Spatial Expressions in Indonesian Languages
 National Museum of Ethnology (Minpaku)
 Osaka, 22-23 July 2011

THIS AND THAT IN INDONESIAN

Dwi Noverini Djenar

novi.djenar@sydney.edu.au

This paper discusses the Indonesian demonstratives *ini ~ nih*, *itu ~ tuh*, and the combinations thereof. These two sets of forms represent the contrast between proximal and distal deictics respectively. The full forms *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’ occur in standard and colloquial Indonesian, while the reduced forms *nih* and *tuh* (and their variants, *ni* and *tu*) are closely associated with colloquial Indonesian.

While the uses of *ini* and *itu* in spatial and non-spatial contexts have been discussed in detail (e.g. Kaswanti Purwo 1984), *nih* and *tuh*, and their co-occurrences with the full forms have been under-studied. In his description of colloquial Indonesian, Ewing (2005) writes that the sets *ini ~ nih* and *itu ~ tuh* can function as demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative determiners. As pronouns, they may refer to human or non-human referents already established in discourse, or to a propositional content. As determiners, the same forms serve to indicate that the referent is identifiable from the discourse context, either through shared perceptual access, prior mention, or by association with some other identifiable referent which may or may not have been mentioned previously or be present in the discourse context. Ewing briefly comments that a discussion on the functional differences between the forms ‘awaits further research’. In his study of Jakartan Indonesian, Sneddon (2006: 70-72) accounts for the demonstratives as those which function as ‘intensifiers, giving (special) emphasis’. When the full forms and reduced forms occur together (i.e., *ini nih* ‘this this’ and *itu tuh* ‘that that’), the reduced form acts as a ‘particulariser’. When the reduced forms follow adjectives and verbs (e.g., *Patut dicurigai tuh* ‘(He) should be held in suspicion *tuh*’), they should be considered as discourse particles.

What emerges from the current descriptions is an indication that to explain the functions of the demonstratives necessarily requires an examination of the discourse contexts in which they occur. The next task, then, is to articulate what kinds of

contexts are called into service when these forms are employed. Articulating these contexts would afford insight into why some referents are emphasised or particularised in preference to others, for while such terms as ‘(special) emphasis’, ‘intensifier’, and ‘particulariser’ capture the broad pragmatic meaning of the demonstratives, they do not explain what the purpose of the emphasis itself is. Furthermore, how the use of *nih* and *tuh* as discourse particles relates to the demonstrative use remains to be accounted for.

The purpose of this paper is to begin addressing these issues by examining spatial uses of the demonstratives (primary deixis) and specifying how they relate to uses in transferred contexts (secondary deixis). Following Hanks (1990, 1992, 2000), I take the use of a demonstrative form to be relational in that in spatial uses the form indexes a referent in relation to an ‘indexical framework’, i.e., the speech event or discourse in which reference is performed (or ‘participant framework’ in transferred contexts (Grenoble’s (1998)). Based on data from comic cartoon, informal interviews, and casual conversation, I show that in spatial frameworks all four forms index relative proximity to participants, and serve as presentatives and directives. In transferred frameworks, *itu* is commonly used to introduce new referents, mark shift of topic, and serve definitional, identificational, and recognitional functions. *Tuh* tends to be used to track main participants and other identifiable elements, serving as a cohesive device at local and global levels. Meanwhile, *ini* tends to be used for indexing temporal and affiliative proximity, whereas *nih* predominantly occurs as a primary deictic. To the extent that *itu* and *tuh* are used to signal new and given information respectively, they pattern similarly to NPs and pro-forms in anaphoric marking.

References

- Ewing, Michael. 2005. Colloquial Indonesian. In Alexander Adelaar & Nikolaus Himmelmann, eds. *The Austronesian languages of South East Asia and Madagascar*. London: Routledge/Curzon.
- Grenoble, Lenore. 1998. *Deixis and Information Packaging in Russian Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hanks, William F. 1990. *Referential Practice: Language and Lived Space Among the Maya*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hanks, William F. 1992. The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Alessandro Duranti and Charles Goodwin, eds. *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, pp. 43-76. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hanks, William F. 2000. Indexicality. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9(1-2): 124-126.
- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. *Deiksis dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.