IJLLT

On the Cognitive Statuses of Sasak Demonstratives

Sutarman[1] ✉ , **Zainudin Abdussamad[2]** , **Abdul Muhid[3]** , **Diah Supatmiwati[4]** and **Wiya Suktiningsih[5]**

[1]Universitas Bumigora, Farmacy Department, Faculty of Health, Mataram, Indonesia
[2345]Universitas Bumigora, English Literature Department, Faculty of Social Science and Humaniora, Mataram, Indonesia
✉ **Corresponding Author**: Sutarman, **E-mail**: sutarman@universitasbumigora.ac.id

ARTICLE INFORMATION	ABSTRACT
	This study examines the cognitive statuses of the Givenness Hierarchy on Sasak demonstratives, particularly in Menu-Meni dialect of the Sasak language. This study is qualitative research in nature. The data were collected via the field-linguistic method by utilizing three techniques: elicitation, semi-structured interview and intuition. The results of the study revealed that Menu-Meni dialect implements the pronominal demonstrative for "activated" status and adnominal demonstratives are used for the status of "referential", "uniquely identifiable", and "familiar". Beyond demonstratives, zero articles is applied in the status of "type identifiable" and the pronoun ie (it/she/he) is used in the status of "in focus". Thus, demonstrative has a prominent role in most of the cognitive statuses in the Givenness Hierarchy theory.

1. Introduction

Sasak language is the local language of the Sasak ethnic group on Lombok Island. According to Austin (2004), the Sasak language includes in the Malayo-Polynesian language. Sasak language has five dialects and each dialect has its own speech community as one variation may not be understood by another speech community. Mahyuni (2006) as the native speaker of Sasak, divided the Sasak language into seven dialects but he is in doubt because Sasak language seems to be very complex in terms of dialects. Meanwhile, Sutarman (2010) proposes that the Sasak language may be divided into six dialects- *Meno- Mene, Ngeno-Ngene, Meriaq – Meriqu, Nggetó-Nggeté, Kuto-Kute*, and *Menu-Meni*.

Demonstratives in the Sasak dialect are subtly divided into seven categorizations (Sutarman and Hanafi, 2020): pronominal, adnominal, identificational, adverbial, verbal, quantifier, and referential. All Sasak dialects mostly adopt these categorizations. Adverbial demonstrative like here and there in English is subdivided into three in Sasak language: manner demonstrative, locational demonstrative, and direction. Pronominal demonstrative takes an argument position of the verb while adnominal demonstratives co-occur with nouns as noun modifiers. Identificational demonstratives may be identical to demonstrative pronouns, but it stresses its function to attract the hearer's attention to entities in the speech situation. Verbal demonstratives behave like a verb in the Sasak language. It can be used as a verb of a sentence. Referential demonstrative in this language implies identical characteristics of things that the speaker has in mind, while demonstrative quantifier is another type of demonstrative referring to the amount of something.

As the dialects of the Sasak language are varied, this paper examines the implementation of the Givenness Hierarchy theory developed by Gundel (1999) in one of the Sasak languages, particularly in the *Menu-Meni* dialect which is mostly spoken in West Lombok and in some areas in central Lombok. The implementation of the Gundel's theory aims at discovering the cognitive statuses of Sasak demonstratives, especially in *Menu-Meni* dialect.

2. Theoretical Framework
2.1 Pragmatic aspects of demonstratives
As a deictic word, demonstratives have, of course, pragmatic uses in interactions. Manfredi (1999) states that some linguists such as Fillmore (1997), Himmelmann (1997), and Diessel, (1999a,1999b) are in the same opinion on distinguishing two pragmatic functions: the 'exophoric' function, which is ordained by demonstratives for referring to non-linguistics entities in the speech situation, and the 'endophoric' function which is instead enacted by demonstratives referring to elements of the ongoing discourse.

Diessel (1999) said that the exophoric demonstratives concentrate the hearer's attention on entities in the interlocutors' situation. He furthermore claims that exophoric demonstrative uses have three distinctive features; *1) they involve the speaker or other person as deictic center, 2) they indicate a deictic contrast on a distance scale minority of demonstratives that are distance-neutral, 3) they are accompanied bya pointing gesture*.

Fillmore (1997 in Diessel, 1999) distinguishes the exophoric demonstratives into the gestural and the symbolic use. The gestural use needs controlling the speech event in order to recognize the object, whereas the symbolic use includes stimulating our knowledge about the communicative situation and the object. These uses are exemplified as the followings

      [1]   English[2]

      a.   ***This*** *finger hurts*

      b.   ***This*** *city stinks*

In these examples, [1a] is considered the gestural use of demonstrative because this sentence is accompanied by a pointing gesture, while [1b] is symbolic use since it draws knowledge on a larger situational context and does not need it pointing gesture. However, the sentences above involve the speaker as the deictic center.

Additionally, Diessel (1999) uses the term *endophoric use* for all other functions of demonstratives. He then subdivides *endophoric uses* into *anaphoric, discourse deictic* and *recognitional* uses. Anaphoric demonstratives serve as a language –internal function for pointing to a NP in the surrounding discourse (see Manfredi, 1999). It is referential with a noun or a noun phrase in the previous discourse (Diessel, 1999). Based on this function, Diessel states that anaphoric demonstratives have specific tracking devices such as personal pronouns, definite articles, zero anaphors, and pronominal affixes on the verb. Some studies[3] claim that anaphoric demonstratives are often used to indicate a referent that is to a certain extent unexpected and not currently in the focus of attention. In 54a below, the referent of the third pronoun *er* is the subject of the preceding sentence. The pronoun *er* continues the topic of the previous discourse. In contrast, *der* can only be co-referential with the non-topical NP *einen Klienten*.

      [2]   German

      a.   *Der Anwalti sprach mit einem Klientenj. Da **eri/derj***
The lawyer talked with a client since he/this.one

      Nicht viel Zeit hatte, vereinbarten sie ein weiteres
Not much time had agreed.on they a further

      Gespräch nächste Woche.
Conversation next week

'The lawyer talked to a client. Since he didn't have much time, they agreed to have another meeting next week.'

Discourse deictic refers to 'propositions' in which they connect the clause where they are implanted to the proposition they refer to (see Diessel, 1999). It refers to the ongoing discourse. Additionally, Diessel said that this demonstrative focuses the hearer's attention on aspects of meaning in the clause, a sentence, a paragraph or an entire story. Consider the following example;
      [3]   [4]English
      A: Hey, management has reconsidered its position. They've
  promoted Fred to second vice president.

---

[2] This examples are taken from Levinson (1983) by Diessel (1999)
[3] Linde 1979,Ehlich 1979, 1982;Givon 1983, Sinder 1983; Ariel 1988; Gundel et al. 1993; Lichtenberk 1988, 1996;Himmelmann 1996; (these studies are mentioned in Diessel's book, 1999)
[4] This example was taken by Diessel (1999) in Webber (1991:111-2)

    B: a. **That***'s false.* (Reference to proposition)
  b. **That***'s a lie.* (Reference to illocution)

In the above example, demonstrative in [3a] relates to the propositional content of the preceding utterance, whereas [3b] focuses the addressee's attention to its illocutionary force (Webber, 1991 in Diessel, 1999).

The last one, *recognitional use*, refers to the cognitive uses of demonstratives. According to Diessel (1999), the recognitional uses have two properties; 1) *it is only used adnominally* and 2) *it does not have a referent in the preceding discourse or the surrounding situation*. Compared to other uses of demonstratives, the recognitional uses have received less attention in the literature. The first linguist who provides a systematic account of this use is Himmelmann (1996, 1997) (see Diessel, 1999)

2.2 Givennes Hierarchy

In pragmatic function, this paper concentrates on the recognitional uses of demonstratives. These uses have been discussed by Gundel *et al.* (2003) by proposing six cognitive statuses which he calls as *Givenness Hierarchy*. Besides that, Amfo has also discussed Akan language using Gundel's theory, so it would be interesting to specifically discuss the pragmatic functions of demonstrative in Sasaks in the Givenness Hierarchy.

Gundel at el. (2003) proposes six cognitive statuses called *Givenness Hierarchy*. These statuses are organized hierarchically from the most restricted to the least restricted one. Amfo (2007) defines *Givennes Hierarchy* as a set of allegedly universal implicationally related statuses correlated with different types of referring expressions. The statuses are arranged from the most restricted to the least restricted one, where every status is related to each other. However, not all languages may be appropriate for these statuses. Jones (1993), in his article entitled *'identifiable indefinites and the Givennes Hierarchy'* said that as Givennes Hierarchy is an implicational scale, the status of 'familiar' may entail the status of 'uniquely identifiable, referential and type identifiable'.

Givenness Hierarchy	(Amfo, 2007)		
In focus	*it*		>
Activated		*this;this* N;*that*	>
Familiar	*that* N		>
Uniquely identifiable	*the* N		>
Referential		indefinite- *this* N	>
Type identifiable	*a* N		

Type identifiable refers to the interlocutor's capability to represent the type of object expressed by the nominal expression but not to identify the specific thing (see Gundel, 1993; Amfo, 2007;Jones,1993).In English, the use of article *a/an* is assumed appropriate for this status.

    [4]   I couldn't find a taxi to take me home after the party. (Amfo, 2007)

The noun phrase *a taxi* in [4] is considered appropriate for the status 'type identifiable' because the interlocutor is assumed to know the type of the word *taxi* and understand what type of thing the noun phrase refers to.

The status '*referential*' relates to a particular referent which the speaker intends to. According to Amfo (2007), in this status, the interlocutor should either retrieve an existing representation or construct a new representation by the time the sentence has been processed. Gundel et al. (1993) suggest that this status is appropriate for the use of indefinite *this* in colloquial English.

    [5]   Have I told you about this man I met on my way here? (Amfo, 2007)

In this example [5], this man's noun phrase is considered appropriate since the speaker intends to both type and particular object. Unlike the 'type identifiable' where the addressee is directed to the type of the object only.

Uniquely identifiable asks the addressee to identify the speaker's intended referent based on the nominal alone (Gundel, 1993). This status may be based on familiarity, but if the nominal expression has enough descriptive content, familiarity is not necessary. The use of definite articles *the* is considered appropriate in this type. However, the researcher does not find a clear explanation for this type.

    [6]   I couldn't sleep last night. The dog (next door) kept me awake (Gundel, 1993)

In [6] the addressee is only expected to construct the object based on the expression alone. He does not need to know the existence of the dog. See another example below

[7]   The new man in my life gave me this beautiful sweater for Christmas (Amfo, 2007)

In [7], the addressee may not know the man, but he just needs to construct the intended referent by the speaker. So the addressee uniquely identifies the referent based on the statement.

The type '*familiar*' relates to the object which the interlocutor has a representation of. If the object is mentioned in the statement, then it is in short term memory. Otherwise, the interlocutor has a representation of the object in his long term memory. Amfo (2007) states that this status is necessary for all personal pronouns and the use of demonstrative *that* in English.

[8]   That man is really frustrating me   (Amfo, 2007)

In [8], the noun phrase *that man* is felicitous because the interlocutor already has the representation of the man refers to either in short or long term memory.

The type '*activated*' is in current short term memory. Amfo (2007) claims that this type may have immediate linguistic or extra-linguistic context. It is necessary for the use of demonstrative pronouns *that* and *this, and* all stressed pronouns. The use of *this letter* in [9] is felicitous since the letter may be visible in the communicative situation. In [10], the addressee has already seen the dog so he really knows the dog.

[9]   This letter has really frustrated me   (Amfo, 2007)

[10]   My neighbor has a dog. This dog kept me awake last night.

The referent in the last status '*in focus*' is in both short term memory and at the current center of attention. It may be a topic of discussion at that time. According to Amfo (2007) and Gundel et al. (1999), this type is appropriate for using all unstressed pronouns. The use of *it* may be felicitous since the referent is in the current center of attention.

[11]   a. My neighbor's bull mastiff bit a girl on a bike   (Gundel, 1999)

           b. It's the same dog that bit Mary Ben last summer

3. Research Method
This research is qualitative in nature. According to Berg (2001) qualitative research tries to answer questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit who inhabit these setting. From Berg's view, the researcher will try to investigate demonstratives from the pragmatic use of demonstratives in Sasak.

3.1 Participants
All dialogues, sentences and utterances made by Sasak native speakers of Menu-Meni dialects are collected as the primary data of the research. Written data are obtained from any books or documents related to the Sasak language which is used as the supporting data. The informants are selected through the following criteria:

1. They are native speakers of the dialect.
2. Their ages are at least 25 to 70 years old with consideration that older people are assumed to have better comprehension on the language.
3. They are well educated at least elementary school
4. They have good memory and good articulation so they can give clear oral data.
5. They are mentally prepared to be informant

3.2 Data Collection
In this research, the data is collected by using the field linguistic method and documentary method. According to Sukerti (2013) the field linguistic method involves the informants in the direct conversation since the researcher is also a native speaker of the Sasak language. In relation to this method, there are three techniques used by the researcher in collecting the data

1. Elicitation. The researcher uses interpretive elicitation in the form of syntactic questions and Discourse Completion Test (DCT). According to Kasper and Dahl (1991 in Sukerti, 2013) DCT (Discourse Completion Test) is written questions containing a short description of particular expressions arranged to lead the informants to express the related expressions based on the situation given.
2. Semi- Structured Interview. This interview is conducted along with elicitation but when the researcher finds a problem with the data, the researcher can recheck to get clarification or new information.

3. Intuition. This technique is used as the researcher is a native speaker of *Menu-Meni* dialect. By using intuition, the researcher can interpret the data obtained from other informants.

3.3 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed through the following steps: a) the data are firstly classified and distributed to each cognitive status, b) the data are then identified to which cognitive statuses they are appropriate, c) the data are verified, and d) the data are finally elaborated to describe the application of Sasak demonstratives in cognitive statuses.

4. Results and Discussion

In relation to Givenness Hierarchy in dialect Menu-Meni, here are the alignments for Menu-Meni

Cognitive statuses Forms

In focus	Ie/ng	↓
Activated	Ning EMP(wah) N sak	↓
Familiar	N senuq (sak)	↓
Uniquely identifiable	N senuq/setieq/seniq	↓
Referential N Nuqng		↓
Type identifiable N	Ø	

Type Identifiable

In this type, the hearer is assumed to get to a representation of the sort of question depicted by the expression. The speaker often employments indefinite articles to express the intended object. In *Menu-Meni* dialect, the speaker makes use of zero articles to express the identifiable type status. The sentence (12) indicates that *manok* (chicken) is type identifiable because the hearer is assumed to have the representation of *manok* in his mind.

> [12]   *manok rebut gati ubian muk ures tengak malem*
> Chicken noise very last night so wake up mid night
> " **a** chicken was very noise last night so I woke up in the midnight"

Referential type

The speaker in *Referential* status extraordinarily alludes to specific objects. It is not sufficient for the interlocutors to be able to get to a suitable sort of representation. The hearer, in this case, must be able to recover an existing representation or build a modern representation by the time the sentence has been handled. In English, it is adequate for the utility of uncertain "this" in colloquial English. In Menu-Meni dialect, a specific object can be accessed by the word "*sopok or sekek*" as in the example below. The object *manok* in this sentence (13) does not refer to other chickens but particular object mentioned by the speaker. Thus, the distal adnominal demonstrative *nuqng* is appropriate to describe this object because the object is far from the interlocutors.

> [13] *uahq ceritak sopok manok sak uresan-q ubian nuk?*
>   *Fast .1sg story.VM one chicken which woke me up last night that?*
>   " Have I told you that chicken which woke me up last night?"
>
>   *Manok **nuqng** girang rebut kemalem*
>   Chicken that   often noise night
>   "that chicken often makes noise at night"

Uniquely identifiable

In this type, the listener can recognize the speaker's aiming referent on the basis of the referent alone and if the listener does not have any representation of the object in his memory, he/she will build his own representation. In *Menu-Meni* dialect, this type is appropriate for the use of distal adnominal demonstrative *senuq* (that one). This demonstrative retrieves from the *sak niq* (this one) which consists of the stress on the object. In sentence (14), The listener has to have the representation of the intended object *manok,* if he does not have, he/she has to build a unique representation of *manok* (chicken).

> [14] *manok senuq uresan-q ubian*
>   Chicken that one wake me up last night
>   " That chicken woke up.1sg last night"

Familiar

In this type, the recipient can interestingly distinguish the intended object since he currently features a representation of it in his memory. The speaker employs distal demonstrative in English because he accepts that the recipient has the intended object in his long or short memory. In Sasak *Menu-Meni* dialect, this status can be appropriate filled with distal – adnominal demonstrative *senuq* (that one) as similar to Uniquely identifiable status with a different context. In familiar status, the speaker assumes that the hearer already represents the intended object in his memory.

[15] *manok sak nuqng (senuq) uresanq ubian.*
     Chicken which that   wake up.1sg last night
     " that chicken woke me up last night"

Activated

The referent here is expressed in current brief –term memory. In incorporates the discourse members in a genuine communicative setting or substances in a running speech situation by which the recipient is working in his running memory.

The status of "activated" in *Menu-Meni* dialect is expressed by the proximal demonstrative pronoun *ning* (this). This demonstratives indicates that the intended object may be available in the speech situation because it is represented in the current short- term memory. In sentence (16), demonstrative pronoun *ning* (this) indicates that the intended object involves in the speech situation so the listener can observe it.

[16]   *ning   manok   uresan-q   ubian*
        This   chicken wake up.1sg last night
        " This chicken woke me up last night"

In focus

In this status, the referent is not brief-term memory but is also at the current center of consideration. In this case, the intended object may be as the topic of the conversation. The status of *in focus* in *Menu-Meni* dialect can be expressed with the third person singular *ie* (it) as in English. Usually, to stress the object, the speaker of Menu-Meni dialect utilises the emphasis *wah* (it is) after the pronoun *ie*. However, the existence or inexistence of the object in the speech situation does not become a priority because the listener has it in his long-term memory or has already been familiar to the listener. Sentence (17) gives a clear example that the intended object has become the focus of the topics. It is mentioned much time as the argument of the verb.

[17]   *ures-q sik manok nik ubian.* **Ie** *doang ribut tiap malam.*
        Wake up.1sg by chicken this last night. It always noise every night
        " I woke up because of this chicken last night. It always makes noise every night"

 Badek jak arak **ie** *engat endih?*
Probably part there is it see yes
" probably it sees something right?"

5. Conclusion

This study applies the theory of Givenness Hierarchy to Sasak demonstratives developed by Gundel *et al.* (2003) in which he proposes the cognitive statuses of English demonstratives. Similar to English demonstratives, *Menu-Meni* dialect of Sasak language mostly implements the nominal demonstratives to fulfil the cognitive statuses; pronominal demonstrative is used in "activated" status while adnominal demonstrative is used in the status of "uniquely identifiable"," familiar" and "referential" with the additional description. In addition, the status of "in focus" also implements the pronoun "*ie*"as in English does. Contrastively, the status of "type identifiable" in *Menu-Meni* dialect uses zero articles. Overall, this research is limited to *Menu-Meni* dialect in Sasak language, so other researchers can explore other dialects of the Sasak language in particular and other languages because every language has different systems and forms of demonstrative.

References

[1]   Amfo, N. A. A. (2007). Akan demonstratives. In *Selected proceedings of the 37th annual conference on African linguistics* (pp. 134-148). Sommerville: Cascadilla Press.

[2]   Austin, K. (2004). *Clitic in Sasak, Eastern Indonesia.* Available at http: www.hrelp.org/aboutus/staff/peter-austin/austin sasak. accessed on Wednesday, Nov,20,2009.11.30 a.m.

[3]   Berg, L. (2001). *Qualitative Research methods for the Social Sciences.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon. A Pearson Education Company

[4]   Diessel, H. (2003). *Demonstratives in Language Use and Grammar.* A lecture handout. Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

[5]   Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammatization*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia. John Benjamis Publishing Company.

[6]   Gundel, J. (2003, July). Information structure and referential givenness/newness: How much belongs in the grammar. In *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on head-driven phrase structure grammar* (pp. 122-142).

[7]   Gundel, J. K., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language*, 274-307.

[8]   Jones, K. (1993). *Identifiable Indefinites and the Givennes Hierarchy: a case of Unders and Overspecification?*. School of English, Communication and Philosophy. Cardiff University, Colum Drive, Cardiff, CF!) 3 EU. UK

[9]   Mahyuni. (2006). *Speech Styles and Cultural Consciousness in Sasak Commuinty*. Mataram: Yayasan Cerdas.

[10] Manfredi, S. (1999). *Demonstratives in a Bedouin Arabic dialect of western Sudan*. Universita degli Studi di Napoli 'L 'Orientale' available at http://www.academia.edu/4680000/Demonstratives_in_a_Bedouin_Arabic_dialect_of_western_Sudan accessed on Friday, 24th of January, 2014

[11] Sukerti, G. N. A. (2013). *Relasi gramatikal bahasa Kodi: Kajian tipologi sintaksis* (Doctoral dissertation, Tesis. Denpasar: Program Pascasarjana Universitas Udayana).

[12] Sutarman. (2010). *Demonstratives in Sasak: A study on Menu-Meni Dialect In Tebao, Narmada Sub district.* [Unpublished Thesis]. Mataram University

[13] Zaki, Mai. (2011). *The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstratives in English and Arabic*. [Unpublished thesis] Middlesex University