

4-30-2008

"Ini apel ni nya" 'This here apple now'; Deictics in the Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants in the Netherlands1

Aone van Engelenhoven
Leiden University, a.van.engelenhoven@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana>



Part of the [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), and the [Other Languages, Societies, and Cultures Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

van Engelenhoven, Aone (2008) ""Ini apel ni nya" 'This here apple now'; Deictics in the Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants in the Netherlands1," *Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*: Vol. 10: No. 1, Article 6.

DOI: 10.17510/wjhi.v10i1.180

Available at: <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/wacana/vol10/iss1/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty of Humanities at UI Scholars Hub. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wacana, Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia by an authorized editor of UI Scholars Hub.

Ini apel ni nya ‘This here apple now’ Deictics in the Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants in the Netherlands¹

AONE VAN ENGELENHOVEN

ABSTRAK

Dialek Melayu yang dipakai para pendatang asal Maluku Selatan di Belanda ini memperlihatkan rangkaian demonstrativa dan endofora yang tidak ditemukan dalam bahasa Indonesia baku. Makalah ini mengkaji semantik dari rangkaian unsur deiktik tersebut dalam kerangka linguistik kognitif dan menjelaskannya sebagai sesuatu yang muncul dari bahasa ibu penutur, dengan mencontohkan bahasa Meher dan Leti. Makalah ini ditutup dengan mengaitkan penemuannya dengan bahasa Melayu Tangsi yang diduga adalah nenek moyang dari dialek Melayu yang digunakan pendatang Maluku di Belanda. Dinyatakan bahwa pencarian asal-usul dialek turunan Melayu Pijin sejenis ini hanya bisa dilakukan dengan berfokus pada makna yang disampaikan lewat konstruksi-konstruksinya.

KATA KUNCI

deictic stacks, Malay as a second language, Southwest Malukan languages, Tangsi Malay.

¹ (Leads in the search for Tangsi Malay?). In writing this article I benefitted from the discussions with various colleagues, of whom Hein Steinhauer and Bert Tahitu deserve special mention. Any shortcomings in this article are of course my own responsibility alone.

AONE VAN ENGELENHOVEN took his PhD degree at Leiden University where he is assistant professor in Indonesian and Austronesian linguistics at the Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania, Leiden University, The Netherlands. His main research interests are descriptive linguistics, sociolinguistics, and oral traditions in East Indonesia, East Timor, and the Malukan community in The Netherlands. His most recent publication is ‘Ita-nia nasaun oin-ida, ita-nia dalen sira oin-seluk, Our Nation is One, Our Languages are Different; Language policy in East Timor’, in: Paulo Castro Seixas and Aone van Engelenhoven (eds), 2006, *Diversidade Cultural na Construção da Nação e do Estado em Timor-Leste*, pp. 106-131, Porto: Publicações UFP. E-mail: a.van.engelenhoven@let.leidenuniv.nl.

I INTRODUCTION

MALUKAN MIGRANTS IN THE NETHERLANDS AND TANGSI MALAY

In reaction to the assent of the Federal state of East Indonesia to its inclusion in the unitary Republic of Indonesia, Malukan members in the East Indonesian government proclaimed an independent Republic of the South Moluccas, *Republik Maluku Selatan* (RMS) on Ambon Island, on April 24th, 1950. When a few months later the Dutch government disbanded its colonial army, the Dutch Court of Justice disallowed any involuntary demobilisation on Indonesian territory. In 1951 and 1952, the Malukan soldiers who had either not yet resigned or refused to go over to the Indonesian army were transported to the Netherlands together with their families.

Malay already was the medium in the Dutch colonial army, and it was therefore obvious that it was to remain the primary contact vernacular among the migrants. Furthermore, the majority originated from those villages in Central Maluku (76%) where Ambonese Malay functioned as the first language. The vernacular that was brought along to the Netherlands, however, evolved in the barracks in the Dutch East-Indies, because of which it is dubbed Tangsi Malay or Barracks Malay in the literature (Adelaar et al. 1996:678).

Tahitu (1989, 1993) sees Tangsi Malay as one of the sources from which emerged the vernacular as it is spoken today in the Malukan community. In the formation of Tangsi Malay the influences from the various regional languages played an important element. This is especially salient on the lexical level, where Malukan Malay nowadays features loans from Javanese that are absent in Ambonese Malay. Grammatical influences from Tangsi Malay are more difficult to pinpoint. Being a Pidgin Malay Derived dialect or PMD (Adelaar et al. 1996: 675), Tangsi Malay probably displayed the same features that have been identified for all PMDs. Although it is generally assumed now to be extinct, Van Engelenhoven (2002a) reports that elements from Tangsi Malay may still be observed in the speech of those who at the time of their migration to the Netherlands were in the school-going age. This article intends to put this assumption to the test by comparing the deictic systems that are displayed in the Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants and two indigenous languages of that region, respectively.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The present discussion adheres to the cognitive linguistic framework, which equates meaning with the conceptualisation of the speaker (Langacker 1991: 278). Essential in the theory is the schema, through which the speaker construes the interrelationships between the entities in a scene (Shibatani 1999: 158).

A speaker who wants to communicate the situation or event that he perceives needs to locate the participating elements in the 'Who, Where and When of the event, the intersection of which has been called the *deictic center*' (Svorou 1993: 4). The tools with which these elements are tracked and foregrounded in an expression are provided by Jakobson (1957). In his

famous analysis of the verbal categories in Russian, Jakobson distinguishes speech (abbreviated as 's') and its topic, the narrated matter (abbreviated 'n') from the Event (abbreviated as 'E') and its participants (abbreviated as 'P'). From these concepts he distils the following four co-ordinates that are used in this article:

- 1) En: the narrated event;
- 2) Es: the speech event;
- 3) Pn: the participant(s) of the narrated event, or narrated participant(s);
- 4) Ps: the participant(s) of the speech event, or speech participant(s).²

II DEMONSTRATIVES, ENDOPHORA AND DEICTIC STACKS IN THE MALAY SPEECH OF SOUTHWEST MALUKAN MIGRANTS (MM)

DEMONSTRATIVES

Conform to most Malay variants in East-Indonesia, the demonstratives in the Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants precede the head in a noun phrase (NP). A demonstrative (D) indicates the relative spatial distance between the referent and the speech participants, as exemplified in (1a).

- (1a) Ini Opel tra bagus.
D1 Opel not nice

'This Opel is not nice.'

The Opel is conceived of as being close to the speaker, which allows the definition of the demonstrative *ini* as,

ini: [+PROX/Ps]Pn, the narrated participant is located in space near to the speech participants

In the next example, the referent of Opel is perceived as being either farther away from the speaker and/or hearer or even outside the range of both speech participants.

- (1b) Itu Opel tra bagus.
D2 Opel not nice

'That Opel is not nice.'

The demonstrative *itu* therefore defined as:

² The research underlying the present article consisted of interviews, because of which a speaker-hearer distinction could not be set up.

itu: [-PROX/Ps]Pn, the narrated participant is located in space not near to the Speech participants

When used in contrast, demonstratives are put at the end of the NP, for example:

(1c) Opel ini tra bagus.
Opel D1 not nice

'This Opel is not nice (I do not mean the other one).'

ENDOPHORA AND PREDICATE CONSTITUENTS

Beside pure demonstrative markers, MM also has three anaphoric markers; *ni* (d1), *tu* (d2) and *nya* (d3). Anaphoric markers, or d-markers, are placed in the end of the NP. See the following example:

(2a) Ocep bli Opel ni di Vaassen.
Joseph buy Opel d1 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys the Opel I am talking about now in Vaassen.'

As can be seen from the example above, *ni* signals that the Opel is recently introduced in the discourse. Stated differently, the moment of the introduction of the Opel is located near in time to the actual speech event, or even at the same time with it. This contextual-anaphoric marker can thus be formulated as:

ni: [+PROX/Es]Pn, the narrated participant is located in time near the moment of speech

This definition does not explicitly indicate, whether an NP marked by *ni* contains information which is new for one of the speech participants, say, the hearer. Rather, it signals the importance or prominence of its referent in the scene that is described. In the terms of Mulder (1996), *ni* identifies the moment of speech as the background against which the referent of the NP, Opel, is distinguished as a figure. This formula implies that *tu*, being the counterpart of *ni*, be located far from the moment of speech. This is confirmed by (2b).

(2b) Ocep bli Opel tu di Vaassen.
Joseph buy Opel d2 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys the Opel I talked about then in Vaassen.'

In this sentence, the background against which Opel is profiled is a moment in time where the speaker and hearer established a different speech event. In other words, this moment is part of the frames-of-reference of both speech participants and must logically precede the present speech event in time. Otherwise it would be impossible for the speech participants to localize it. This can now be formulated as:

tu: [-PROX/Es]Pn, the narrated participant is not located in time near the moment of speech.

The formula does not explicate whether reference is made to a momentum that precedes or follows the actual event of speech. However, since the deictic meaning of *tu* relies on the cognition of the speaker and hearer, *tu* can only be anaphoric and refer back in time. Future events are beyond the frame-of-reference of the speech participants and therefore can never be deictically indicated. Hence, when that particular moment is not construable for one of the participants, or neither of them, it cannot be localized. For example, the speaker may report the event of Joseph buying a car in which the hearer was not present. Or, the speaker narrates a 'hear-say' account of an event which he himself did not experience either. This is exemplified by (2c).

(2c) Ocep bli Opel nya di Vaassen.
Joseph buy Opel d3 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys the Opel in Vaassen.'

Accurate localization in time thus requires that both speech participants share their knowledge. In (2c), the existence of the referent of Opel is acknowledged by both participants, but the 'where-and-when' is not specified. As such, *nya* resembles an article in English or Dutch, in that it makes an NP definite, without specifying its location in time or space. *Nya* is therefore unmarked with respect to both *ni* and *tu*, because of which it is formulised as:

nya: [ØPROX/Es]Pn, the narrated participant is not located in time with respect to the moment of speech.

In MM, demonstratives and anaphoric markers may co-occur in the NP. When the NP does not refer to one of the speech participants, demonstratives combine with any anaphoric marker. As can be seen in the following examples, Opel, being marked with *itu* allows each d-marker.

(2d) Ocep bli itu Opel ni di Vaassen.
Joseph buy D2 Opel d1 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys that Opel I am talking about now in Vaassen.'

- (2e) Ocep bli itu Opel tu di Vaassen.
Joseph buy D2 Opel d2 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys that Opel I talked about in Vaassen.'

- (2f) Ocep bli itu Opel nya di Vaassen.
Joseph buy D2 Opel d3 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys that Opel mentioned before in Vaassen.'

As has been explained above, demonstratives follow the noun when used contrastingly³. Anaphoric markers, however, always occupy the final determiner slot, as is exemplified below by anaphoric *ni*.

- (2g) Ocep bli Opel itu ni di Vaassen.
Joseph buy Opel D2 d1 LOC Vaassen

'Joseph buys that Opel I am talking about now in Vaassen (I do not mean the other one).'

Thus far, we discussed the semantics of the anaphoric markers in NPs that referred to narrated participants and not to one of the speech participants. In the following example the first singular pronoun *aku* is marked. In this sentence, the hearer is construed as being a participant in the narrated event.

- (3a) Kamaring⁴ dia mau bakupukul deng ose ni.
yesterday he want fight with you(sg) d1

'Yesterday he wanted to fight with you (in the condition you are in now).'

In the context of the sentence above, the hearer suffers from the flu for several days already. By referring to the state the hearer is in by means of *ni*, the speaker evaluates it with the situation designated in the clause's core: the intention of being involved in a fight. In other words, the referent of the NP is perceived to participate on both levels, in the narrated matter and in the event of speech. In a case like this, the anaphoric marker is construed rather to make reference to the physical or psychological condition of the referent in relation with the moment of speech. Parallel to its use in NPs referring to narrated participants, *tu* in NPs of speech participants indicate a physical or psychic condition before the moment of speech, as is exemplified in the following sentence.

³ To be more precise, demonstratives fill the determiner slot at the end of a NP, for example: *apel enak ini ni* 'this delicious apple I am talking about now'.

⁴ Endophora at the end of the predicate may refer to either the narrated participant or the narrated event (see the discussion on endophora and pronominal subjects). The time adjunct is used here, so that the endophora unambiguously refers to the narrated participant.

- (3b) Kamaring dia mau bakupukul deng aku tu.
yesterday he want fight with I d2

‘Yesterday he wanted to fight with me (in the condition I was in).’

In both *ni* and *tu* the link to the cognition of speaker and hearer is obvious. *Nya* actually refers to something beyond their perception. Although the referent cannot be localized by either speech participant, *nya* indicates their awareness of its existence. This implies that *nya* in combination with a pronoun of the first or second person would refer to some unknown state of one of the speech participants, which is not logical and thus not construable. Indeed, replacing *tu* in (3b) by *nya* achieves an ungrammatical construction:

- (3c) *Kamaring dia mau bakupukul deng aku nya.
yesterday he want fight with I d3

ENDOPHORA AND SUBJECTS

In the paragraph above we found that endophoric marking refers either to the moment of introduction or to the condition of the phrase’s referent, when the head of the NP is respectively nominal or pronominal. The following sentence, however, requires a modification of this interpretation.

- (4a) Jacky curi a pung apel ni!
Jacky steal I POS apple d1

I ‘Jacky stole my apple which I am talking about now!’

II ‘Jacky steals my apple now!’

As can be seen from the translations, endophoric marking on clause-final NPs is ambiguous. In the first reading, the apple has been introduced during the present conversation, which agrees with the definition elaborated in the paragraph above. In the second reading, however, the endophoric marker rather signals that the stealing of the apple is taking place while the speaker utters the sentence. This can be disambiguated lexically, for example by means of adding *kamaring* ‘yesterday’. This time adjunct takes the time-span between sun rise and sunset as a unit and localizes the narrated event in the time-span precedent to the one of the speech event.⁵

⁵ This definition, which coincides with the meaning of the Dutch *gisteren* ‘yesterday’, was unanimously accepted by all informants in the Netherlands. In the Indonesian setting, however, *kamaring* rather means ‘time before the last sunrise’, as in most Southwest Malukan languages. Therefore, *kamaring* in the Indonesian setting may equally refer to last year. Similarly, the Malay word *beso* ‘tomorrow’ may also refer to next year, conform the scope of Letinese *lepra* ‘time after the next sunset’. In the Dutch setting, however, *beso* is confined to the time between the next sunrise and the following sunset, after the Dutch *morgen* ‘tomorrow’. Kaswanti Purwo (1984) signals an identical semantic transfer in colloquial Indonesian as spoken by Javanese, where Indonesian *besok* rather means ‘later’ as in Javanese *besuk* (Kaswanti Purwo 1984: 101, note 36).

- (4b) Kamaring Jacky curi a pung apel ni!
 yesterday Jacky steal I POS apple d1

'Yesterday Jacky stole my apple which I am talking about now!'

The second reading of (4a), where the event described in the clause is localized relative to the speech event, requires a modification of the semantic definition of the endophora in clause-final position. Here, the endophoric marker *ni* signals that the entire event described by the clause - the stealing of the apple - is located prior to the speech event. So, it is the narrated event rather than the narrated participant that is localized, formulized below as:

ni: [+PROX/Es]En, the narrated event is located in time near the moment of speech

In first instance, this formula seems to imply a problematic polysemy of the endophoric markers anaphorically referring to both context and time. However, the analyses in the previous paragraph exclusively considered constructions where endophoric markers modified predicate or complement constituents that were not in clause-final position. The second reading of (4a) indicates that the endophoric marker is not construed as a modifier of the clause-final predicate constituent *a pung apel*. *Ni* rather signals an enclitic "tail" or extra-clausal constituent of which Dik (1997: 401) says:

[...] (a clause) may be followed by loosely adjoined constituents which add bits of information which may be relevant to a correct understanding of the clause. [...] To such constituents we assign the pragmatic function Tail, defined as characterizing constituents which present information meant to clarify or modify (some constituent contained in) the unit to which they are adjoined.

The following example reveals that extra-clausal *ni* is in fact an incomplete tail anaphorically referring to the subject constituent Jacky.

- (4c) Jacky curi a pung apel, dia ni!
 Jacky steal I POS apple he d1

'Jacky is stealing my apple now!'

In this sentence, *ni* unambiguously indicates that the narrated and speech events are construed as either near to each other or even coinciding, conveyed in the English translation by the gerund.⁶ Notice that "full" tails are prosodically severed from the clause by means of a pause, indicated in (4c)

⁶ A complete repetition of the subject NP in the tail slot, instead of an anaphoric pronoun, yields an extremely emphatic proposition, as in the context of a quarrel or an argument: *Jacky curi a pung apel, Jacky ni!* 'Jacky does steal my apple now!'

by means of a comma. As can be seen in the following example, the temporal location of the narrated event is a typical function of endophoric markers with pronominal subjects.

- (4d) Dia tu curi a pung apel.
 he d2 steal I POS apple

‘He has stolen my apple.’

Here, the endophoric marker *tu* signals that the entire event described by the clause is located prior to the speech event. Since its reference is inherently anaphoric, as we explained in the previous paragraph, we now can formulate *tu* as:

tu: [-PROX/Es]En, the narrated event is not located in time near the moment of speech

Unlike pronominal predicate or complement constituents, pronominal subjects do allow modification by the neutral marker *nya*, as is shown in the following example:

- (5) Aku nya tukang ruk-ruk.
 I d3 craftsman chagrin

‘I am always cantakerous (I have a cantakerous personality).’

Its incapacity to refer back in time contextually implies it cannot locate a narrated event in time either. *Nya* is here equally unmarked with respect to *ni* and *tu*, which allows it being formulized as:

nya: [ØPROX/Es]En, the narrated event is not located in time with respect to the moment of speech.

In (5) the narrated ‘event’ of being cantankerous is perceived as a continuous situation through time. As such, *nya* is aspectual rather than temporal and its meaning closely corresponds to Comrie’s definition of habitual aspect:

The feature that is common to all habituals, whether or not they are also iterative, is that they describe a situation which is characteristic of an extended period of time, so extended in fact that the situation referred to is viewed not as an incidental property of the moment but, precisely, as a characteristic feature of the whole period. (Comrie 1981: 27-28).

The following sentence shows that endophoric marking on nominal subjects yields an ambiguous construction.

- (6a) *Tukang ikan tu main mata deng nona manis.*
 fish.peddler d2 play.eye with miss sweet
 I 'The fish peddler I talked about then winks at the nice girl.'
 II 'The fish peddler winked at the nice girl then.'

In the first reading, *tu* signals that the fish peddler has been introduced earlier. As such, endophoric marking conveys similar meanings on nominal subjects and predicate constituents. The second reading, however, disengages the narrated event from the speech event, locating the first mentioned prior to the latter. This temporal reference has been attested above for pronominal subjects. Whereas the ambiguity in clause-final position was explained there as an interpretation of the endophora as a 'weakened' reflection of an extracausal tail referring to the subject NP, (6a) suggests it to be inherent to NPs at the edge of a clause, whether they be predicate constituents or subjects.

In turn, more factors appear to determine the semantic load of *nya* when marking a nominal subject. On predicate constituents we learned that *nya* achieves definite NPs without reference to space or time. Whereas it is disallowed with pronominal predicate constituents, it may occur with pronominal subjects, and pronominal tails referring to subjects. Here, the non-specific character of *nya* evokes a habitual aspect interpretation, which, however, is confined to the subject position. In clause-final position it is always perceived as a genuine definite marker of an NP. The following two examples show that lexical semantics interfere in the interpretation of *nya* with nominal subjects.

- (6b) *Tukang ikan nya main mata deng nona manis.*
 fish.peddler d3 play.eye with miss sweet
 'The fish peddler winks at the nice girl.'
- (7) *Opel nya lari cepat, des Ocep pi bli Opel.*
 Opel d3 run fast therefore Joseph go buy Opel
 I 'Opels run fast, therefore Joseph went to buy an Opel.'
 II 'The Opel ran fast, therefore Joseph went to buy an Opel.'

In (6b), *nya* clearly signals definiteness and brings back the set of possible referents to a single appropriate one, which is known to the speaker and hearer. Conform the analyses above, it does not specify 'when-and-where' it was introduced in the discourse. In (7) *nya* allows for two interpretations. The second reading is contextual, as in sentence (6b), and merely testifies that the referent of the NP Opel is present in the frames-of-reference of the speech participants. The event described in the predicate, the fast running, is perceived as a specific one, because its subject, or its 'effector' (Van Valin and Wilkins 1999) is specific. In the first reading, however, the subject is generic.

Here, we need to take in consideration that Opels are a brand of cars and that cars are an intrinsic element of 'manhood' or 'manliness' in the cultural frame-work, at least in Western Europe. It is therefore understandable that in the cognition of speaker and hearer, 'speed' is one of the semantic minimums (Ebeling 1962) that make up the meaning of "car". It is only logical that the fast running is here recognized as an instance of 'speed'. Consequently, the predicate is perceived rather as describing a characteristic feature of all Opels. In the same line of thought one obviously cannot construe winking at nice girls to be typical for fish peddlers. The following sentence was rejected by informants of Southwest Malukan origin and reveals that the semantics of the subject and the predicate codetermine the endophoric function of *nya*.

- (8a) *Tanta Lies nya ganti konde.
 aunt Lies d3 change knot.of.hair

The occurrence of a proper name in the subject NP immediately narrows down the set of possible referents to that one referent carrying the name Lies, which may explain the ungrammaticality of a context-tied *nya*. The telic aktionsart implied by changing a knot of (false) hair equally disallows for a habitual interpretation of *nya*. This semantic conflict can be precluded, for example, by means of an adverb like *trus* 'continuously'. The described action can now be conceived as an iterative event, which enables the speech participants to perceive changing knots of hair as a typical feature of Aunt Lies.

- (8b) Tante Lies nya ganti konde trus.
 aunt Lies d3 change knot.of.hair continuously

'Aunt Lies uses to put on another knot of hair all the time.'

TOPICS AND ENDOPHORIC STACKS

Above we have shown that endophoric marking of nominal subjects is implicitly ambiguous. The following sentence shows fronting of the NP and coreferential insertion of a pronoun in the subject slot as one of the strategies to disambiguate endophoric marking.

- (9) Ana muda ni, dorangnya seng tau kerja.
 child young d1 they d3 no know work

'These youngsters I talk about now, they do not know what work means.'

The endophoric marker *ni* signals that the youngsters are recently introduced in the discourse. *Nya* on the other hand indicates that not knowing how to work is characteristic for them. Adding an endophoric tail is another strategy. However, as the next example shows, coreferential pronouns require human referents.

- (10) Ini bunga minum air banya (*,dia) tu!
 D1 flower drink water much he d2

'This flower drank a lot of water then!'

This restriction would imply that a so-called 'weakened' tail is the only option to endophorically mark non-human effectors unambiguously.⁷ In this special context, MM may combine two endophora in a so-called 'stack' (Van Engelenhoven 1993), as can be observed in (11).

- (11a) Cox tu ni tukang pait.
 Cox d2 d1 craftsman bitter

'The Cox I talked about then tastes bitter now.'

Above we already came across the lexical strategy to combine *tukang* 'craftsman' with a state verb like *ruk-ruk* 'chagrin' (example 5) to describe a continuous situation or a permanent state. (11a) mentions a situation in which the speaker experiences that one specific Cox, a kind of apple, has a bitter taste at the moment he pronounces the sentence. The endophora that is nearest to the predicate (whose position will be referred to as 'second position' from now on), *ni*, thus functions as a temporal marker as has been attested for pronominal subjects earlier. Preceding *tu* (whose position is referred to as 'first position'), which is nearest to the noun, functions as a regular anaphoric marker that sets off the NP's referent against the background of a previous discourse in which both speaker and hearer participated.

The following example shows that reversing the order of the endophora in (11a) yields an equally acceptable sentence for the informants and reveals that it is the position of the endophora, which determines whether they refer to the narrated participant or the narrated 'event'.

- (11b) Cox ni tu tukang pait.
 Cox d1 d2 craftsman bitter

'The Cox I am talking about now tasted bitter.'

Similar observations can be made for *nya*. In first position, *nya* merely indicates that the referent is known to both speech participants without specifying whether it has been newly introduced or not.

⁷ At this point I like to point out that the exclusive use of pronouns for human effectors reasonably suggests that the analysis of clause-final endophora as 'weakened' tails may turn out to be erroneous. Clause-final endophora also occur with non-human subjects, in which case there cannot be an underlying (deleted) coreferential pronoun. This is a topic, which requires further research and is hoped to be dealt with elsewhere.

- (11c) Cox nya ni tukang pait.
 Cox d3 d1 craftsman bitter
 ‘The Cox tastes bitter now.’

In second position, it conveys that what is described in the predicate is characteristic for the subject referent. The Cox in (11d), which has been introduced earlier, can therefore only be conceived to be of a special kind that has a typical bitter taste.

- (11d) Cox tu nya tukang pait.
 Cox d2 d3 craftsman bitter

‘The Cox I talked about then always tastes bitter.’

The observation that the referential function of the endophora marking subjects is determined by their position, explains the inherent ambiguity that we attested with single endophora. It also implies that a stack may contain similar endophora. This is confirmed by (11e) where the first *nya* functions as a definite marker and the second *nya* characterizes the information in the predicate as typical for the subject’s referent and its fellow-members of that particular Cox species.⁸

- (11e) Cox nya nya tukang pait.
 Cox d3 d3 craftsman bitter

‘The Cox apples always taste bitter.’

From all the examples above it can be concluded that the reference to the narrated event is an exclusive function of endophora that mark subjects. Together with the distinct functions of both endophora in a stack, this explains why endophoric stacks are not attested on predicate constituents whether they are in clause-medial or final position. Construction (12a) was consequently rejected by all informants.

- (12a) *Oma minta jeruk tu ni.
 Granny ask orange d2 d1

The suggestion to front the object *jeruk* as a topic left of the subject *Oma* was unanimously adopted by all informants. Nevertheless an endophoric stack was still felt awkward (indicated in (12b) by a question mark) and spontaneously resuggested as a construction of an emphatic demonstrative plus an endophoric marker, as in (12c).

⁸ In order to convey this particular last element in the paraphrase, the English translation renders the subject in plural. The reader is reminded of the fact that Malay does not have any formal features to indicate plurality.

- (12b) ?Jeruk tu tu Oma minta ni.
orange d2 d2 Granny ask d1
- (12c) Na, jeruk itu tu Oma minta ni!
EXC orange D2 d2 Granny ask d1

'Ah, those oranges, which I talked about then are the ones that Granny is asking for now!

Notice the absence of a prosodic break, unlike the fronted human subject in (9) and the full pronominal tails as in (4c). From a cognitive point of view, the prosodic unity of the subject, the predicate and the topicalized object imposes the conception of the latter's referent - 'those oranges' - as an intrinsic participant of the narrated event - the asking by Granny. In other words, notwithstanding it being fronted to a precore position, the NP is still being conceived of as an object argument, because of which it consequently disallows endophoric stacking.⁹

Constituents that are prosodically separated from the clause sometimes do allow endophoric stacking. The following example displays an object *itu barang tu* 'that stuff I talked about then', of which additional information is provided in the subsequent detached phrase, *kukis tu tu* 'those cookies'.

- (13a) Nyong bli itu barang tu, kukis *ni/tu *ni/tu?
boy buy D2 thing d2 cookie d1/d2 d1/d2

'Did you buy that stuff I talked about then, those cookies?'

As can be seen in the example, the informants rejected the use of *ni*, whether in combination with *tu* (*ni tu, tu ni*) or as a doublet (*ni ni*). The double endophoric *tu* in *kukis tu tu* therefore seems to be an echo of the endophoric marker on the preceding object. Observe the next sentence, where the same constraint applies when the tail *kukis tu tu* 'those cookies' is encoded in the clause as a parenthetical insertion (Dik 1997: 401).

- (13b) Nyong bli itu barang tu, kukis tu (tu), di toko?
boy buy D2 thing d2 cookie d2 d2 at store

'Did you buy that stuff I talked about then, those cookies, at the store?'

This principle of endophoric agreement between this type of Extra-Clausal Constituents (ECC) and the predicate constituent which they are added to is easily explained when we consider their respective referential functions. In

⁹ The use of the postnominal, emphatic, demonstrative *itu* can be explained as an exponent of the pragmatic focus function, which can be assigned to constituents in the precore slot (Van Valin 1993: 6, or Dik 1981: 21, where it is labelled P1 or First Position).

both (13a) and (b) it is the object *itu barang tu*, which designates a participant of the narrated event. The Extra-Clausal Constituent, whether it be after or inside the clause, additionally specifies the referent of the NP in the object slot itself, without reference to the narrated event. Using the same endophora enables the speech participant to conceive both NPs as ‘converging’ (Ebeling 1994: 13) to the same entity.

The brackets in (13b) indicate that a single endophora would suffice. I analyse its double occurrence here as a means to emphasise the pragmatic function of the Extra-Clausal Constituent *kukis*. The emphatic force of endophoric duplication is best seen in elliptical, curt speech as it is attested in quarrels, in which case one may find up to three same endophora.

(13c) Kukis tu tu tu!
 cookie d2 d2 d2

‘The cookies (I talked about then)!’

Pre-clausal constituents, or themes, on the other hand only allow one endophoric marker. Observe the following sentence, where *air tawar* freshwater is detached from the clause by a comma-intonation.

(14a) Air tawar nya, disitu paling sulit, des mandi
 water flat d3 there SUPER difficult thus bathe

 pake air laut saja.
 use water sea only

‘As for freshwater, it is extremely difficult there, so when they bathe they just use sea water.’

This type of Extra-Clausal Constituent, labelled theme, ‘presents a domain or universe of discourse with respect to which it is relevant to pronounce the following Predication’ (Dik 1981: 19). This definition points out that themes do not need to relate to narrated participants as is done by clause constituents and their supplementary tails. Freshwater has nothing to do directly with the narrated event of bathing with sea water. The endophora *nya* therefore merely anchors the introduction of ‘freshwater’ somewhere before the actual speech event without specifically localizing it. A specification of the theme, as exemplified in (14b), is provided by a subsequent parenthetical insertion that does allow endophoric disagreement (*ni ni* instead of *nya*).¹⁰

¹⁰ The distinct endophoric marking of these theme-specifying insertions awaits further research. One alternative to look at them is to analyse the first *ni* in (14b) as a comprised demonstrative in subject position. In this perception, this type of Extra-Clausal Constituent is clausal. The second *ni* can then be conceived as an endophoric marker on a subject that locates its referent with respect to the speech event.

- (14b) Air tawar nya, di Tomra ni ni, paling
 water flat d3 at T. d1 d1 SUPER
- sulit, des mandi pake air laut saja.
 difficult thus bathe use water sea only

'As for freshwater, in Tomra that is, it is extremely difficult there, so when they bathe they just use sea water.'

III THE DEICTIC SYSTEM COMPARED WITH TWO INDIGENOUS SW MALUKAN LANGUAGES

SUMMARY

Table 1 recapitulates the findings in the preceding paragraph. Observe that contrastive postposed demonstratives do allow endophoric marking (the two leftmost columns), but that they have not been attested in combination with endophoric stacks (the two rightmost columns).

marker	deictic contrast		unmarked			endophoric stacks non-human subject NP		
demonstrative	ND1	ND2	D1N	D2N				
endophora	ND1d1 ND1d2 ND1d3	ND2d1 ND2d2 ND2d3	D1Nd1 D1Nd2 D1Nd3	D2Nd1 D2Nd2 D2Nd3	Nd1 Nd2 Nd3	Nd1d1 Nd2d1 Nd3d1	Nd1d2 Nd2d2 Nd2d2	Nd1d3 Nd2d3 Nd3d3

Table 1. Deictics in the Malay of Southwest Malukan migrants

This use of the deictics is attested mainly in the Malay speech of so-called 'first' and 'second generation' speakers who originally came from the Southwest Malukan islands of Kisar and Leti. In order to understand better whether the deictic system described above has been motivated by substrate influences, the following subparagraphs contain concise descriptions of the deictic systems in Meher (North-Kisar) and Leti.

MEHER

Meher is the Austronesian majority language that is spoken on the north-side of the island of Kisar. Its large amount of speakers (10.000 according to Taber et al. 1996) ensures its solid position among the other indigenous languages in the region. In the Netherlands, the Meher families make up 20 % of all Southwest Malukan migrants. The following preliminary discussion is based on the data in J. Christensen, S. Christensen, and Blood 1991, which is also the source of all examples given here.

Meher has a three-term system (Anderson and Keenan 1987: 282) that in principle signals the relative distance in space between the referent and the

speaker. NPs whose referents are close to the speaker are marked with *eni* (D1). NPs whose referents are farther away are marked by *onne* (D2), which is glossed in Christensen's (1991) grammatical sketch as 'that'. NPs whose referents are remote and out of reach of both speaker and hearer are marked with *enne* (D3). This demonstrative is not mentioned in Christensen's sketch. In the texts it has been only attested once. Christensen (1991: 8) notifies two deictic stacks that always have *eni* as a second member.

- (15) E, leke eni-eni nin wanakunu mehe?
or village this-this POS language alone

'Or only the language of this village here¹¹?

- (16) In'am onn-eni ai naru-m hoo la hi-yeni
in'am D2-D1 we.ex relative-1plexP marry go they

"In'am" that's when a relative of us marries to them.¹²

The context of (15) is the inquiry whether also the other dialects on Kisar island are studied by the researchers. The double deictic adds pragmatic emphasis to the NP *leke* 'village'. In (16) *In'am* functions as a theme constituent that presents the domain 'with respect to which it is relevant to pronounce the following Predication' (Dik 1981: 130).

Table 2 summarizes the deictic combinations attested in the Meher texts, based on Christensen (1991: 132). The labels 'unmarked deictic' and 'pragmatic emphasis' relate respectively to the terms 'specific' and 'non-specific' in Christensen's analysis.

unmarked deictic	ND1	ND2	(N)D3
pragmatic emphasis	ND1D1	ND2D1	-

Table 2. Deictics in Meher

¹¹ 'Here' has been added on suggestion by informants but is absent in the original English translation (p. 9).

¹² To convey the focusing function of the demonstrative stack, J. Christensen, S. Christensen, and Blood (1991: 99) translated this sentence into English by means of a cleft construction: 'This "In-Am" is a relative of us who marries with them.'

LETI¹³

The Leti language is spoken on the island with the same name by about 7000 people. 18% of all Southwest Malukan families in the Netherlands are of Leti origin. Leti has a very complex deictic system of nine terms that can only be outlined here, due to lack of space and time. For a more elaborate discussion I refer to Van Engelenhoven 1993 and 2004.

Leti has three sets of deictics, attitudinal deictics, demonstratives and endophora. Attitudinal deictics¹⁴ are a type of personal pronoun that signal the speaker's attitude towards the referent. *Sai* (A1) signals the speaker's acceptance or recognition of a perceptible referent. *So* (A2) signals that the speaker rejects or is unfamiliar with the referent that he perceives. *Se* (A3) indicates that the referent is an imperceptible entity that is known to the speaker but imperceptible. As pronouns, only attitudinal deictics can occur as arguments in the clause. However, they can also function as determiners on NPs.

Demonstratives are tonic enclitics that function as determiners on an NP or as head of a locational or directional phrase. In the NP they are complementarily distributed with the attitudinal deictics. Demonstratives indicate the spatial distance between the speaker and the referent. *Di* (D1) signals that the referent is within reach of the speaker. If it is not within reach, but still within call of the speaker, this is indicated by *dó* (D2). The third term, *dé* (D3), signals that the referent is within sight of the speaker but not necessarily within reach or call.

Endophora are atonic enclitics that are confined to the NP and refer to the introduction of the referent in relation to the actual moment of speech. The NP is marked with *di* (d1) when the referent is newly introduced in the speech event. If it is introduced in a previous speech event of the actual speech participants, this is indicated by *do* (d2). The referents of NPs that are marked with *de* (d3) have been introduced in an other speech event that was not necessarily performed by the actual speech participants.

Deictic stacking is a salient feature of the Leti language, which is made possible by the clear semantic distinctions of the three sets. 'Real stacks' (Van Engelenhoven 1993: 120-122) display an endophoric marker and either an attitudinal deictic or a demonstrative. The reason for the complementary distribution of the latter two is found in their respective semantic definitions. Although attitude ('psychological space') and physical space are different settings, they directly involve the cognition of the speaker. Endophora ground their referent in time ('discourse space'), which is related with the moment of speech rather than with the speech participants. Endophora thus provide supplementary information. 'Real stacks' can mark any nominal constituent in the clause. This is exemplified in the following sentence, where the object

¹³ Because it is of no effect on the Malay speech by Leti speakers, the indexer, which can be suffixed to both NPs and VPs is omitted from the following discussion. In the glosses of the Leti examples, therefore, the indexer nor the clause-final suffix with which it is in complementary distribution is indicated.

¹⁴ Labelled Mental demonstratives in Van Engelenhoven 1993.

and the head of the directional phrase feature an attitudinal-endophoric stack and a spatial-endophoric stack, respectively.

- (19) Mu-kenmièke potal-so-di ma mme-dí-de.
2sg-place.just bottle-E2-d1 come table-D1-d3

‘Just put this bottle I am talking about now, which I find deficient, onto the table here that has been talked about before.’

Table 3 summarizes the deictic combinations found in Leti. Not included are the so-called ‘fake stacks’ (Van Engelenhoven 1993: 122-125) that are displayed on constituents that function pragmatically as topics or ECCs. These are mostly ‘real stacks’ to which up to three additional deictics can be cliticized.

marker	attitudinal deictic			demonstrative			endophora		
	NE1	NE2	NE3	ND1	ND2	ND3	Nd1	Nd2	Nd3
‘real stack’	NE1d1	NE2d1	NE3d1	ND1d1	ND2d1	ND3d1			
	NE1d2	NE2d2	NE3d2	-	ND2d2	-	-		
	NE1d3	NE2d3	NE3d3	ND1d3	Nd2d3	ND3d3			

Table 3. Deictics in Leti

Observe that *dó* (D2) cannot combine with the endophora *di* (d1) or *de* (d3). This implies that NPs whose referents are within call but not within reach of the speaker cannot be located in time, unless it has been introduced in a previous discourse between the participants of the present speech event.

IV DISCUSSION

THE SEMANTIC INTERFACE BETWEEN MM AND THE SPEAKER’S FIRST LANGUAGE

The prenominal position of demonstratives in MM is observed too in many Malay vernaculars throughout Indonesia that are considered to have derived from Pidgin Malay, for example Ambonese Malay (Van Minde 1997) and Betawi Malay (Ikranegara 1980). Also the reduced forms of the demonstratives that function as endophora in MM are typical PMD features according to Adelaar et al. (1996: 675). The position of these markers, however, seems language-dependent. Whereas in MM and other Malay variants they are in NP-final position, *ni* and *tu* are precliticized to the noun in Manado Malay (Schmitt 1979). Even deictic stacks that are so abundantly displayed in MM seem to have formal counterparts in Standard Indonesian (Zainuddin 1956) and Kelantan Malay (Brown 1956).

Formal resemblances in distinct dialects, however, do not necessarily imply semantic correspondences. Elsewhere (Van Engelenhoven 2002b) I elaborated that Southwest Malukans in Indonesia copy those constructions in their Malay

speech, labelled Melayu Tenggara Jauh that resemble the ones in their first language. For example, the comitative and instrumental constructions in Melayu Tenggara Jauh display *sama* from Colloquial Indonesian¹⁵ and *pake* from East Indonesian PMD, respectively. Notwithstanding their prepositional quality in the model structures, both loans function as verbs in Melayu Tenggara Jauh in correspondence with the verbal character of these items in the regional languages.

A comparison of the deictic systems in Malay and the two Southwest Malukan languages that have been analysed above, reveals that Malay only has two demonstratives where the other have at least three terms. This implies that at the very moment he wants to communicate in Malay, a speaker of Meher or Leti needs a strategy with which he can compensate the 'gap' or 'gaps' that he experiences in the Malay deictic system. In principle there are two options. Either 1) he simply discards one or more deictic meanings that his first language provides, or 2) he projects distinct deictic meanings from his first language onto one Malay term. Most probably Meher speakers opt for the first scenario and dismiss the referential potential of the third marker D3, of which the data suggest a tendency towards disuse.

For Leti speakers, however, the choice is less straightforward. They manage nine terms categorised in three sets that relate to three different domains in the frame of reference: empathy, space and discourse. In other words, each domain, which is a '[...] cognitively irreducible [...] field of conceptual potential' (Langacker 1993: 280) correlates with an individual set of forms.

Notwithstanding their different theoretical and methodological approaches, both Kaswanti Purwo (1984) and Stokhof (1986) identify the proximity of the referent to the speaker as a main feature in the semantic composition of Indonesian Malay *ini* (D1). Stokhof's definition specifies *ini* in detail as 'temporally, spatially and/or psychologically relatively proximate to the Speaker' (p. 326). This definition shows that the three domains mentioned above coincide here in a single set.¹⁶ From this it can be concluded that a Leti speaker, who wants to communicate in Malay, will naturally opt to formally amalgamate the two cognitive domains empathy and space that are encoded by the Leti attitudinal deictics and demonstratives, respectively.

In doing so, he is inevitably lead by the grammatical properties of the Leti sets. The complementary distribution between the attitudinal deictics and the demonstratives certainly is one motive that may underlie his exercise. Another one will be the fact that only the attitudinal markers can be used predicatively since Leti demonstratives are confined to the NP's determiner slot. Predicative *ini* (D1) in the Malay speech of a Leti speaker as in (20a) can therefore only reflect attitudinal *sai* (E1), which is its only Leti correlate in this syntactic circumstance (20b).

¹⁵ Labelled Jakartan Indonesian in Adelaar et al. (1996: 678).

¹⁶ This explains the grammatical and deictic polyfunctionality of the determiners that Dardjowidjojo (1983) observed in Indonesian Malay.

(20a)	Ini	pake	layar. (Malay)
	D1	wear	sail
(20b)	Ha ¹⁷	n-odi	laare. (Leti)
	D1	3sg-carry	sail

'This (type of boat) uses a sail.'

Kaswanti Purwo's and Stokhof's conceptions of the Indonesian *itu* (D2) seem incompatible. Kaswanti Purwo (1984) points out that, notwithstanding its two demonstratives, Indonesian Malay does have three locative deictics, which are anchored to the location of respectively the speaker and the hearer, and to 'locations that are far from the Hearer'¹⁸ (p. 13). He suggests that the 'remoteness' notion of the absent third demonstrative has been transferred onto the second term, *itu* (D2), which originally was meant to relate to the location of the hearer only. Stokhof (1986), on the other hand, explicates that *itu* is 'neutral as to proximity' (p. 330) and that it is exactly this semantic feature that distinguishes *itu* from *ini*. This definition automatically neutralizes the three cognitive domains mentioned in his semantic definition of *ini*. The only semantic feature that can be detected in his view is that *itu* is 'identifiable given the frame of reference and/or the speech event' (p. 326). This feature, however, which he abbreviates as ID, correlates with the formal element /i/ in the initial syllable of both demonstratives, and as such is also available for *ini*. Consequently, he analyses *itu* as the indeterminate or unmarked term.¹⁹ Whatever position one takes, both authors agree that *itu* allows more interpretations than *ini*. Both in Meher and Leti, however, the interpretational scope of the second term (D2 and/or E2) is evidently narrower than that of the first term (D1 and/or E1). In Leti at least, the second term is always used in opposition to the first term, because of which it can be paraphrased as 'not proximate to the Speaker' (Van Engelenhoven 1993). As a result of this, Leti *sai* (E1) appears more often in texts than its opponent *so* (E2). This is the reverse of what Stokhof (1986) reports and Dardjowidjojo (1983) suggests for Indonesian Malay, where *itu* (D2) exceeds *ini* (D1) in number. Further research may reveal whether the frequency of *ini* in the Malay speech of Leti speakers agrees with

¹⁷ This is an allomorph of *sai*, see Van Engelenhoven (1993, 2004).

¹⁸ This label has been chosen for reasons of terminological harmony. Kaswanti Purwo uses the term *Si lawan bicara*, which is better translated as 'Addressee'.

¹⁹ The disagreement between Kaswanti Purwo (1984: 100, note 23) and Stokhof (1986: 330) thus seats in the differences of the respective theoretical frameworks, rather than in the respective perceptions of the linguistic data. Kaswanti Purwo's approach leans on Charles Fillmore's early cognitive linguistic work, which propounds that speaker-relatedness implies the lowest degree of explicitness and thus unmarkedness (see also Svorou 1993). Stokhof's semiotactic approach also attaches great importance to the speaker's frame-of-reference. The Jakobsonian principle of binarity and markedness which he adheres to, automatically leads to a perception in which D2 is unmarked. In fact, it does not challenge Kaswanti Purwo's post-structuralist or Dardjowidjojo's (1983) generative analyses, but amplifies their findings by explaining the grammatical phenomena that have been left open by their respective theories.

the frequency of its counterparts *sai* (E1) or *dí* (D1) in Leti speech.

Upon closer inspection, the only double demonstrative combination in Standard Indonesian is *itu-itu* (D2-D2) that occurs in the NP as an attribute. It is therefore better analysed as a derivational reduplication of *itu*²⁰, to which Zainuddin (1956) adds an implicit negative connotation. The deictic clusters in MM and the Southwest Malukan languages on the other hand are real determiners.

Above we concluded that the cognitive domains of empathy and space, which were encoded in Leti in separate deictic sets, conflate in the Malay demonstrative set because it only has two terms. The endophoric system in MM does have three terms that are encliticized NP-final position: *ni* (d1), *tu* (d2) and *nya* (d3). The formal difference between the prepositive demonstratives and the postpositive endophora enables the Leti speaker to disassociate the time domain from the original Malay determiner to the enclitic marker. The above definition of endophoric *ni* (d1) in MM, 'the narrated participant is located in time near the moment of speech', is thus actually a Leti interpretation of the 'temporal relative proximity to the Speaker' (Stokhof 1986: 326). In Stokhof's line of thought, our semantic definition for *tu* (d2) in MM - 'the narrated participant is not located in time near the moment of speech' - is only a contextual variant of the neutrality that he identifies for Indonesian *itu* (D2) (Stokhof 1986: 330).

In Indonesian Malay, *nya* is an enclitic allomorph of the third person singular pronoun *dia*. The most important observation in Stokhof's analysis for our presentation is that *nya* specifically indicates that its referent does not participate in the speech event, which in our terminology implies it refers to a narrated participant. *Nya* in MM, is the third endophoric marker (d3). It is opposed to both the above mentioned endophora in that it does not specifically locate the referent in time. It merely signals the existence of its referent and thus pragmatically notifies the hearer that he is assumed to be acquainted with the referent. This property has been identified by Stokhof in Indonesian *nya* also.²¹ In other words, *nya* was implicitly available for a speaker of Leti, because it fully parallels Leti *de* (d3). Notwithstanding its composition from diverse pronominal elements, the Malay endophoric system appears to have a one to one relationship with the Leti system.

Recall that the endophoric markers in MM in first instance relate to the introduction of the referent in the discourse. The location of the narrated event

²⁰ The translation of the construction reported for Kelantan Malay by Brown (1956) seems to indicate plurality or diversity of the referent, which suggests it is a pronominal reduplication as in Standard Malay:

berapa	tahun	'dah	besar-besar	'tu-'tu?
how many	year	already	RED-big	RED-D2

'How old are they (those trees) that they have that size?'

²¹ Stokhof's structuralist approach forces him to distinguish two *nya*'s. *Nya*1 is purely pronominal and occurs as argument in predicates, prepositional phrases or possessive constructions. *Nya*2 parallels the demonstratives and functions as topic marker or verb-nominalizer (Stokhof 1986: 331). In my opinion the differences in grammatical application are only exponents of the separate semantic features within one sign.

with respect to the speech event only occurs when the endophora marks an NP functioning as or coreferring to the subject. This grammatical role is formally encoded in Meher and Leti by means of pronominal agreement markers on the verb. In MM, which lacks this property, its fixed position immediately preceding the predicate may indicate the subject argument. In a cognitive framework, subject role assignment reflects that the speaker conceptualizes the referent as the principal entity around which the narrated event or situation emanates. It is therefore understandable that the scope of endophora, in first instance relating to narrated participants, metaphorically extends to the entire narrated event in which the subject's referent is the 'conceptual reference point' (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 132).

Time reference is not implied in the semantic structures of Malay and Leti. Meher, on the other hand, does feature a perfect tense marker on the verb²², although we are not aware of a genuine tense inflection in this language. The phenomenon of deictic stacks in Leti apparently gave way to their construction in MM, although the temporal aspect is not available in the first mentioned. This element will be elaborated below.

WHENCE AND WHITHER OF TANGSI MALAY

Tangsi Malay, the speech of the autochtone soldiers in the Dutch colonial army in the Netherlands-Indies, is often indicated as the progenitor of the Malay speech as it is produced by the Malukan migrants in the Netherlands. Informants stress the fact that all ethnic groups in the army shared the same lodgings, except, perhaps, for the Dutch and the mestizos who were placed higher on the social ladder.

Van Engelenhoven (2002a) reports that the Malukan community members have a very prescriptive image of Malay, which is identified by the Dutch authorities and the Malukan exile government as its official medium. The term Tangsi Malay is used as a derogatory label, which rather signals a person's incapacity to speak 'good' Malay.

Informants who were confronted with examples of deictic stacks in Malay recognized them without exception. Central and Southeast Malukans who were questioned usually acknowledged stacking as a typical Tangsi Malay feature. It nevertheless was very insignificantly attested in their own speech. The ones in whose speech it was really abundant, the Southwest Malukans, dismissed them. One informant explained that its occurrence in her speech was an exponent of her incapacity to speak 'good' Malay.

Inquiries about the form and structure of Tangsi Malay reveal that Malukan migrants in the Netherlands are pre-occupied with lexical items rather than with grammatical prerequisites. This is conceivable in a scenario, where there are only second language speakers who confine speech in their mother tongue to the house and the family. The Southwest Malukan soldiers have been reported not to speak their indigenous language to their children, because of which the latter only had a passive knowledge that they received

²² Indicated by means of the suffix *-edi* (Christensen 1991).

through overhearing (Van Engelenhoven 2002a).

The deictics in MM show that they are essentially polyinterpretable and depend on the speaker's conceptualization endorsed by the schemata in his first language. That they have not been 'standardized' in the speech of all Malukan migrants is easily explained. Its internal ethnolinguistic diversity, its strategy of adaptation through cultural concealment and its numerical insignificance (3% of the entire Malukan community) ruled out a possible model role for the Southwest Malukan group.

Although it is primarily done by speakers in whose first language it is displayed, it is due to the respective meanings of the deictics themselves that they emerge as stacks in the speech of Southwest Malukans. The derogatory conception of stacking has nothing to do with the grammatical possibilities in Malay, but rather with the speaker's biased perception on Malay as a language.

The speaker's interpretation of deictic stacking in MM shows that both the 'standard' and its negative rival Tangsi Malay are but constructs in the mind of the speaker. As I see it, Tangsi Malay was an accidental accumulation of individual variants that differed per barracks and per region. Looking for origins of grammatical constructions in these Pidgin Malay Derived dialects therefore is futile, unless we focus on the meanings that these constructions convey.

ABBREVIATIONS

d	endophora
D	demonstrative
E	attitudinal deictic
ECC	Extra-Clausal Constituent
En	narrated event
Es	speech event
ex	exclusive
EXC	exclamatory particle
LOC	locative particle
MM	Malay speech of Southwest Malukan migrants in the Netherlands
N	noun
NP	noun phrase
RED	reduplication
P	possessive suffix
pl	plural
Pn	narrated participant(s)
PMD	Pidgin Malay Derived Dialect
POS	possessive linker
PROX	proximate
Ps	speech participant(s)
sg	singular

SUPER superlative particle
 VP verb phrase

1, 2, 3 first, second or third person or term

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, K. Alexander, D.J. Prentice (compilers) with contributions by C.D. Grijns, H. Steinhauer, A. van Engelenhoven. 1996. "Malay: its history, role and spread", in: Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler, and Darrell T. Tryon (eds), *Atlas of languages of intercultural communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*, pp. 673-693. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. (Trends in Linguistics Documentation 13).
- Anderson, Stephen R. and Edward L. Keenan. 1987. "Deixis", in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, pp. 259-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, C.C. 1956. *Studies in Country Malay*. London: Luzac.
- Christensen, John. 1991. 'Summary of Kisar (Meher) grammar', in: John Christensen, Sylvia Christensen and Cindy Blood (eds), *Wanakunu Yotowawa akilere, percakapan Bahasa Kisar, Kisar daily conversation*, pp. 131-138. Ambon: Universitas Pattimura, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Christensen, John, Sylvia Christensen and Cindy Blood (eds). 1991. *Wanakunu Yotowawa akilere, percakapan Bahasa Kisar, Kisar daily conversation*. Ambon: Universitas Pattimura, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1981. *Aspect*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1983. "A classifier, *itu*, *-nya*, or none of the above: the way the Indonesian mind operates", in: Soenjono Dardjowidjojo and John M.W. Verhaar (eds), *Miscellaneous studies of Indonesian and other languages in Indonesia; Part VII*, pp. 27-40. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya. (NUSA 15).
- Dik, Simon C. 1981. *Functional grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris. (Publications in Language Sciences 7).
- Dik, Simon C. 1997. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 2: Complex and derived constructions*. Edited by Kees Hengeveld. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ebeling, C.L. 1962. *Linguistic units*. The Hague: Moutin and Co.
- Ebeling, C.L. 1994. *Een inleiding tot de syntaxis*. Leiden: The Hakuchi Press.
- Ikranagara, Kay. 1980. *Melayu Betawi grammar*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya. (NUSA 9).
- Jakobson, Roman. 1957. *Shifters, verbal categories and the Russian verb*. Cambridge: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University.
- Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1984. *Deiksis dalam bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. "Cognitive grammar", in: Flip G. Droste and John E. Joseph (eds), *Linguistic theory and grammatical description*, pp.273-306. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 75).
- Mulder, Walter de. 1996. "Demonstratives as locating expressions", in: Martin Pütz and René Dirven (eds), *The construal of space in language and thought*, pp. 29-48. Berlin: Moutin de Gruyter. (Cognitive Linguistics Research 8).
- Schmitt, Shirley. 1979. "Manado Malay". MA Thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1999. "Applicatives and benefactives: a cognitive account", in: Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson (eds), *Grammatical constructions, their form and meaning*, pp. 157-194. Oxford: O.U.P.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi and Sandra A. Thompson (eds). 1999. *Grammatical constructions, their form and meaning*. Oxford: O.U.P.
- Stokhof, W.A.L. 1986. "A note on some deictic elements in Indonesian", in : C.M.S. Hellwig and S.O. Robson (eds), *A man of Indonesian letters; Essays in honour of Professor A. Teeuw*, pp. 324-333. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Svorou, Soteria. 1993. *The grammar of space*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin. (Typological Studies in Language 25).
- Taber, Mark et al. (eds). 1996. *Atlas bahasa tanah Maluku*. Ambon: Pusat Pengkajian dan Pengembangan Maluku, Universitas Pattimura, Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Tahitu, Egbert. 1989. *Melaju sini: het Maleis van Molukse jongeren in Nederland*. PhD Thesis, Leiden University.
- Tahitu, Egbert. 1993. *Studieschrift Moluks Maleis, achtergronden*. Utrecht: Landelijk Steunpunt Edukatie Molukkers. (Alasan 7).
- Van Engelenhoven, Aone. 1993. "On determiners in the Leti of Tutukei (Leti, Maluku Tenggara, Indonesia)", in: Ger P. Reesink (ed.), *Topics in descriptive Austronesian linguistics*, pp. 106-129. Leiden: Vakgroep Talen en Culturen van Zuid-Oost Azië en Oceanië/Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. (Semaian 11).
- Van Engelenhoven, Aone. 2002a. "Concealment, maintenance and renaissance: language and ethnicity in the Moluccan community in the Netherlands", in: David Bradley and Maya Bradley (eds), *Language maintenance for endangered languages: an active approach*, pp. 272-309. London: Curzon Press.
- Van Engelenhoven, Aone. 2002b. "Verb sequences in *Melayu Tenggara Jauh*: the interface of Malay and the indigenous languages of Southwest Maluku", in: K.A. Adelaar and R. Blust (eds), *Between worlds; Linguistic papers in memory of David John Prentice*, pp. 177-191. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. (Pacific Linguistics 529).

- Van Engelenhoven, Aone. 2004. *Leti: a language of Southwest Maluku*. Leiden: KITLV Press. (KITLV, Verhandelingen 221).
- Van Minde, Donald. 1997. *Melayu Ambong, phonology, morphology, syntax*. Leiden: Research school CNWS.
- Van Valin Jr., Robert D. 1993. "A synopsis of role and reference grammar", in: Robert D. Van Valin, Jr. (ed.), *Advances in role and reference grammar*, pp. 1-164. Amsterdam: John Benjamin. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 82).
- Van Valin Jr., Robert D. and David P. Wilkins. 1999. "The case for 'effector': case roles, agents and agency revisited", in: Masayoshi Shibatani and Sandra A. Thompson (eds), *Grammatical constructions: their form and meaning*, pp. 289-322. Oxford: O.U.P.
- Zainuddin, Batuah S. 1956. *Dasar-dasar tata bahasa Indonesia*. Djakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Kebudayaan.