

TWO PATHWAYS TO IDENTIFIABILITY IN CIREBON JAVANESE¹

Michael C. Ewing
University of California at Santa Barbara

Speakers of Cirebon Javanese have at their disposal two kinds of morphological marking that can indicate that a referent in discourse is to be taken as identifiable. These are the demonstrative determiners and the erstwhile possessive suffix *-é*. While these morphemes share the function of indicating that a referent is identifiable, they are distinct in that they indicate different means by which this identification is achieved. After a brief discussion of identifiability, I will discuss examples from a corpus of naturally occurring language that illustrate the functional difference between these two types of morpheme. Finally I suggest that the findings about *-é* represent an example of one way that Cirebon Javanese differs from the Standard Javanese of Central Java.

1. Identifiability Pathway

A speaker's understanding of his or her interlocutor's cognitive state and of the interactional context informs the way ideas are packaged in discourse. The study of how language is shaped by such cognitive and interactional factors is called the study of Information Flow, and one important aspect of information flow is the notion of identifiability (Chafe 1994). An identifiable referent is one whose identity is shared by speaker and hearer. Referents can be identifiable through a variety of means. These have been called Identifiability Pathways by Du Bois and Thompson (1991) who propose the following taxonomy:

- A. Speaker and hearer are identifiable by virtue of their role in the interaction.
- B. Entities in the speech situation are identifiable by virtue of their presence.
- C. Referents or propositions previously mentioned are identifiable. This is the classic case in which subsequent mention of a referent is marked by a definite article, such as *the* in English.
- D. A referent may be anchored by another referent. A referent is anchored (Prince 1981) when another, already identifiable, referent is mentioned in the same NP as the referent in question.

- E. A referent may be identifiable by association through cognitive frame or cultural knowledge evoked in the discourse.

Pathways A, B, and C are similar in that identifiability is based on knowledge that speaker and hearer both have about a referent; that is, the referent is what Chafe has called directly shared. In contrast, D and E are pathways through which knowledge is indirectly shared by association with some other shared knowledge (Chafe 1994:96). In the following I will show that in spoken Cirebon Javanese, identifiable NP's marked with demonstrative determiners have an identifiability pathway based on their existence within either the speech setting or within previous discourse; that is, demonstratives mark directly shared referents. Identifiable NP's which are marked as such with the suffix *-é* are identifiable either through anchoring or through frame evoked association; that is, *-é* marks referents that are indirectly shared through association with some established entity or idea.

Cirebon Javanese is spoken by about 1.5 million people in the city of Cirebon and surrounding countryside, near the border of West and Central Java on the north coast of the island. The following examples are taken from transcripts of naturally occurring conversations and oral narratives recorded in the Cirebon region. In Cirebon Javanese, as in Standard Central Javanese, Indonesian, and many languages of the area, identifiability is not obligatorily marked; bare NP's may represent identifiable referents in their contexts. A very important and interesting question would be to ask when identifiability is and is not explicitly marked by speakers in discourse. This is however beyond the scope of the present study, which looks instead only at those cases where identifiability is explicitly marked, in order to demonstrate the difference in discourse function between the use of demonstratives and the suffix *-é*.

2. Demonstratives

Cirebon Javanese has a set of demonstratives showing three degrees of egocentric proximity. These can be used as pronouns, as determiners, and as adverbials. These each have three variants.

(1)	iki	kien	ki ²	'this'
	iku	kuen	ku	'that'
	ika	kaen	ka	'that DISTAL'

When the demonstratives are used pronominally, there is a discourse patterning differentiation between these forms; however, there is not a clear difference between them when used as determiners. Long and short forms will be treated as a single class for the purposes of this paper.

2.1. Calling attention to something in the physical context

When used as determiners, demonstratives can indicate that a referent is identifiable from the context in which the interaction is taking place, a function which would seem to derive naturally enough from their pointing nature. In example (2), Niti sells snacks door to door and this recording was made while a family sat on their front porch, sampling her wares and chatting with her.

- (2) Bi Niti kiené **sambel** **ku**, .. sedurungé,
Aunt N. now hot.sauce that before
'Aunt Niti now the hot sauce, before,
... lagi kang kaen dipai kaen beli?'
when REL that PASS.give that NEG
at that time (you) put in some of that didn't you?'
(BINITI:977-979)

The speaker starts to ask about the hot sauce that is sitting with the snacks that Bi Niti is selling. He makes this referent identifiable by pointing verbally, if not physically, with the demonstrative *ku* to the hot sauce in the speech setting.

2.2. Calling attention to a previously mentioned referent

Demonstratives can also be used to indicate that a referent is identifiable from previous mention. In example (3), the referent 'motorcycle' has already been introduced and so occurs with a demonstrative determiner indicating that the referent is identifiable because it is the same as that previously mentioned.

- (3) Kaya-kaya ya, beli bisa mandheg **motor** **kuen** Ci.
like-REDUP yes NEG can stop motorcycle that Ci
'It was like, the motorcycle couldn't stop Ci.'
(NGEREM:336-338)

A second example of identifiability from previous mention is (4) in which C has been lamenting that his family doesn't have a television and thus he doesn't have much exposure to the rest of Indonesia or the world.

- (4) W: Lamun wis manjing **listrik** sih,
if already enter electricity PRT
'When (the village) gets electricity,
kaya-kaya bisa Ci.
like-REDUP can Ci
it's like (they) could Ci.'

Wong tuwa énté usaha,
 person old 2SG try
 Your parents could try,

nganunang TV konon Ci
 WORD.SEARCH television like.that Ci
 you know [to get] a TV like that Ci.'

C: Iya=. Kuen sih, bisa-bisa baé.
 yes that PRT can-REDUP only
 'Yes. That, (they) could just (do).

Tapi listrik iki kang suwé.
 but electricity this REL long.time
 But the electricity is what takes a long time.'

(NGEREM:2068-2075)

Speaker W introduces the notion of electricity into the discourse at the first line in the example. In his response in the last line of the example, C repeats the idea of electricity, here marking it as identifiable with a demonstrative, essentially pointing back to W's previous use of the word. The use of demonstratives to mark identifiability as illustrated here is, of course, a common phenomenon in languages throughout the world. Of more interest is the use of a possessive for indicating general identifiability, as discussed in the next section.

3. The Suffix -é

In this section I will first discuss the possessive use of -é in Cirebon Javanese and give examples which also illustrate identifiability through anchoring. I will then discuss how -e is also used more generally to indicate indirect, frame evoked identifiability in contexts where possession is no longer a relevant interpretation.

3.1. Possessives and Identifiability through Anchoring

The suffix -é in Javanese is generally taken to be a marker of possession. It is affixed to the NP representing the thing possessed. The possessor, if mentioned explicitly, then follows the -é suffixed NP.

- (5) Berarti kuen ku na- -- nari ning umahé Érwin.
 mean that that dance at house-É Erwin
 'That means they are dancing at Erwin's house.'

(BINITI:956-957)

In example (5) the possession of *umah* 'house' is indicated with the suffix -é,

followed by the possessor, indicated with the unmarked form *Érwin*.

In Standard Central Javanese *-é* is generally thought of as the third person possessive. First and second person possession, in the common speech level, are marked by the suffixes *-ku* and *-mu* respectively. The suffixes *-ku* and *-mu* do not occur in Cirebon Javanese and *-é* is used for all persons. In the following example *umahé* 'the (possessed) house' is used with both second and first person possession, each explicitly indicated with a free, unmarked, pronominal form.

- (6) J: Luru manuk. .. Ning **umahé** **ira** ta?
hunt bird at house-É 2SG QU
'(so we'll go) hunting birds. At your house is it?'
- A: .. Iya, ning **umahé** **kita**.
yes at house-É 1SG
'Yes, at my house.'

(DEMENAN:1223-1226)

The referents of the NP's in bold face in examples (5) and (6) above are all identifiable through anchoring to another, already identifiable referent, explicitly mentioned within the NP. The house discussed in (5) is anchored by the presence of the proper noun *Érwin*, while the house discussed in (6) is anchored first by *ira* '2SG', then by *kita* '1SG'. Notice here that the anchoring is done by the NP's that are referring to the possessors, not by the suffix *-é* itself. Because of the very general nature of this possessive suffix there arises the question of whether *-é*, in Cirebon Javanese, is in fact in any sense referential. The evidence so far suggests that it may not be, given that it is used with all persons and with lexical and pronominal forms alike. In these cases reference is clear from the explicitly mentioned possessor. The suffix *-é* could be seen as indicating possession, but not performing any referring function.

An NP affixed with *-é* can also stand alone, without an explicitly mentioned possessor. In this case, the hearer is invited to make an appropriate inference as to the possessor's identity. This is illustrated in (7).

- (7) Kuen anak pertama,
that child first
'She is the first child,

Ya berarti,
yes mean
So that means,

disayang pisan ning **ibué** ya Dod?
PASS.love very by mother-É yes Dod
(her) mother really loves (her) right Dod?'

(DEMENAN:3862-3864)

Here the possessor is not explicitly marked following *ibué* 'my, your, his, her, the mother'. Nonetheless, this is clearly understood from the context to mean the mother of the girl described as the first child at the beginning of the example.

As with any instance of inferencing, the appropriate conclusion may not be immediately obvious, and sometimes interactional repair or clarification may take place. This is illustrated in example (8).

- (8) K: **Alamaté** ning endi Tin.
 address-É at where Tin
 'What's the address Tin.'
- T: .. Sapa.
 who
 'Whose.'
- K: **Alamaté** énté.
 address-É 2SG
 'Your address.'

(DEMENAN:1158-1160)

When speaker K mentions 'the address' in the first line, whose address is not explicitly stated. For whatever reason, T either cannot or chooses not to try to infer whose address is intended and asks for clarification. K responds with an explicitly specified possessive.

As mentioned above it does not seem necessary to assume that *-é* does any referring work in expressions with explicit possessors. But does *-é* do referring work when no explicit possessor is mentioned? While our understanding of possessive constructions in other languages might lead us to assume *-é* would be a referring, pronominal expression, I do not believe there is clear evidence that this must be the case in Cirebon Javanese. Participants in a predication are commonly not explicitly mentioned in Javanese. In such cases the hearer must infer the referents of such participants from context and world knowledge. I suggest that a similar situation obtains when *-é* is used with no overt possessor. The hearer is invited to infer the possessor. The suffix *-é* itself only indicates that some sort of possessive relationship obtains, without doing any actual referring work itself. *Ibué* in example (7) and the first occurrence of *alamaté* in example (8) then are not clear instances of anchoring. Like anchoring constructions, these are examples in which identifiability arises through a connection to some other identifiable referent. However, the possessing, identifying referent is not contained within the NP referring to the possessed, identified referent. In cases that do not include an overt mention of the possessor, it is hard to say that a strict form of anchoring occurs, although there is clearly a cognitive relationship established between two referents which leads to identifiability.

3.2. Frame evoked identifiability

Possession is one type of association that can obtain between referents and that can be exploited by speakers to make referents identifiable to their interlocutors. More general associations that are evoked from a cognitive frame and based on world knowledge can also be used to make a referent identifiable. In Cirebon Javanese the possessive suffix *-é* is also used to indicate an identifiability pathway of cognitive frame. As we saw, *-é* can be used not only with clearly specified possessors, but also when a possessor is only implied. The suffix *-é* is also used more generally when no specific possession can be inferred, but rather the referent is associated with a general set of ideas or knowledge evoked within the discourse. This is illustrated in (9), taken from a discussion about the detrimental effects of being too specialized in one style of music.

- (9) Coba koé kapan nyanyi wadon.
 try later when sing woman
 'Just think if a woman sings.
- kang nembang umpamané lagu Élvi.
 REL sing for.example song Elvi
 who's singing let's say a song by Elvi.
- Ya **melodié** beli apal.
 Yes melody-É NEG memorize.
 Well (you) won't understand the melody.'

(NGEREM:86-88)

In example (9) the referent 'melody' has not been previously mentioned, yet is identifiable as the melody that one would need to know in order to accompany the woman mentioned in the first line of the example. The identifiability of 'melody' is accomplished through the frame evoked by mention of 'singing.' The notion of possession, even in a very abstract sense, does not seem relevant here. The melody is not necessarily being associated specifically with either Elvi (the original recording artist) or the current singer. Rather, the point is that from the frame evoked by mention of someone singing, we can infer the existence of a melody, which can then be taken as identifiable, even when first mentioned. It is because identifiability is evoked though this association between the already identifiable context of singing and the idea of melody that the NP *mélodi* is marked with the suffix *-é*.

The next example is taken from a conversational narrative about a man who was in a motorcycle accident.

- (10) Dadi a- nanjakan, diga- --
 so go.up.a.grade
 'So (he) was going up the grade,
 ditambahi **gasé** thithik ya.
 PASS-increase gas-É a.little yes
 then (he) accelerated a little right.'

(NGEREM:251-253)

In this example, the gas has not been previously mentioned, but is clearly inferable from knowledge about how motorcycles work and how we ride them. It is the association evoked by our knowledge of motorcycles and how they work that is the pathway for the identifiability of the referent of *gas*, rather than a notion of possession of gas either by the motorcycle or by the driver.

In the following example the referent of *endhas* 'head' is identifiable from the interlocutors' understanding of the nature of snap-shots.

- (11) Poto semono jelasé,
 photograph that.much clear
 'Pictures that are that easy [to take],
 bisa, .. **endhasé** buntung kabéh Ér.
 can head-É cut.off all Er
 can [end up with], the heads all cut off Er.'

(JOKOKAN:1261-1263)

While we understand that the heads in question belong to people presumably pictured in some photographs, it is not this possessive relationship which makes the referent 'heads' identifiable: these possessing people are themselves unidentifiable, indeed hypothetical, and can not be serving to anchor and identify *endhas* 'head'. The identifiability comes from general cultural knowledge of photographs: that they have content, and in the popular Javanese context in which this conversation took place this content almost always includes people, and thus presumably there will, or should be, heads in the photographs as well. It is these inferred heads that can be cut off with a cheap camera, and which are indicated as identifiable by the use of the suffix *-é*. These examples illustrate that *-é* can be used by speakers to indicate identifiability, without there being an anaphoric link to any previously mentioned or otherwise identifiable referent. In these cases it is indirect identifiability, based on cognitive frames and world knowledge, that is signalled by the use of *-é*.

The way identifiability is played out in interaction can be very subtle and complex. Du Bois and Thompson (1991) point out that the pathways to identifiability are by no means mutually exclusive. Speakers and hearers have many resources available to them to achieve understanding and they frequently make use

of multiple resources. It is not surprising then that the two types of identifiability marking in Cirebon Javanese that I have been discussing are not in some sort of complementary distribution. They can, and frequently do co-occur. This is illustrated in (12), taken from an oral narrative:

- (12) Mung, ... nembé sedina rong dina,
 only just one.day two day
 'Only, just one or two days later,

 lagi kangen-kangené Mas Krébét ning bojoné.
 when long.for-REDUP Mas Krebet to wife-É
 While Mas Krebet longed for his wife.

 ... ning **garwané**. ... Ya?
 to wife.HON-É yes
 for his wife. Right?

 ... () Bo- -- .. Anu.
 HESITATION
 Um.

Garwané ki=, séda.
 wife.HON-É this died.HON
 His wife, died.'

(TEDENG:560-508)

In this example the referent of Mas Krebet's wife, *garwané*, is first successfully introduced in the third line.⁴ Here the referent, even when first introduced, is identifiable through association with Mas Krebet, an example of typical anchoring through possession. As we would expect, this is indicated with the suffix *-é*. In the next mention, in the last line of the example, the referent is identifiable both through her relationship to Mas Krebet and through previous mention. In this example then, the use of *ki* 'this' helps to establish the discursual continuity of the referent, while *-é* maintains our understanding of the semantic relationship of the referent to another referent in the story. We see here that two separate types of identifiability can be operating simultaneously, and that these different pathways are reflected in the different morphological marking of the NP in Cirebon Javanese.

4. Conclusion

In Cirebon Javanese the suffix *-é* indicates possession as well as more abstract relationships which make referents identifiable through an evoked cognitive frame. Unlike the cognate suffix in Standard Central Javanese, *-é* in Cirebon cannot be taken to indicate person, number, or any other cross-referenced

information. Nor does *-é* in Cirebon seem have a function of anaphoric reference. The central function of *-é* is to indicate identifiability through indirect association, either to another referent or more generally to a cognitive frame evoked in the discourse. This suffix *-é* seems to be in a process of grammaticization toward becoming a definite determiner signaling indirectly shared identifiability. As such a determiner, *-é* complements the demonstrative determiners, which indicate directly shared identifiability. That referents can be identifiable for multiple reasons, based for example on direct and indirect pathways, has been discussed in the literature, but in many languages these different pathways are often subsumed under a single type of definite morphology (e.g. *the* in English). The Cirebon Javanese data I have discussed here help confirm the cross-linguistic importance of the distinction between different pathways of identifiability and indeed highlight it by showing that languages can indicate these two different pathways with distinct morphology.

NOTES

1. The data used in this study were collected during field work in Cirebon conducted between March 1993 and August 1994, with funding from Fulbright-Hayes and from the Wenner-Gren Foundation, with institutional support from the Indonesian Academy of Sciences and Atmajaya Catholic University. I would like to thank Wally Chafe, Susanna Cumming, Marianne Mithun, Danae Paolino, and Sandy Thompson for their helpful comments on this paper.
2. The monosyllabic forms of the demonstrative also occur with a variety of initial consonants for example *li*, *lu*, *la*, and *gi*, *gu*, and *ga*.
3. For ease of readability I have employed Standard Central Javanese spelling conventions in the orthography used here for Cirebon Javanese. These two varieties of Javanese are different enough that certain caveats are in order. In many parts of Cirebon final /a/ is still pronounced [a] rather than [ɔ]. An orthographic distinction between pairs of dental and retroflex stops is maintained although these have converged for most Cirebon speakers to a single pair: a voiceless dental or interdental stop, and a voiced alveolar stop. I have used the grapheme <e> to represent the phoneme /ə/ and the grapheme <é> to represent the phoneme /e/. There is a wide range of geographic and individual variation in the phonemic realization of /e/, which differs also from Standard Central Javanese; I have, therefore, not followed the Central Javanese convention of representing two allomorphs of this single phoneme with two separate graphemes.

4. The first vocalization referring to Mas Krevet's wife appears as *bojoné*, in the common form. The speaker then corrects himself, using the honorific *garwané*. It is this second, repaired vocalization that I am taking as the actually introduction of the referent.

ABBREVIATIONS

1SG	First person singular	PASS	Passive
2SG	Second person singular	QU	Question particle
HON	Honorific	REDUP	Reduplication
NEG	Negative	REL	Relative clause particle
PRT	Discourse particle		

TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS

Following Du Bois et al. (1993).

..	Short pause
...	Long pause
.	Final intonation contour
,	Continuing intonation contour
?	Appeal intonation contour
--	Truncated intonation unit
=	Lengthening
-	Truncated word

REFERENCES

- Chafe, Wallace. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Du Bois, John W., Stephan Schuetze-Coburn, Danae Paolino, and Susanna Cumming. 1992. Discourse Transcription. Santa Barbara Papers in Linguistics, vol. 4. Santa Barbara: UCSB Linguistics Dept.
- Du Bois, John W. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1991. Dimensions of a theory of information flow. MS: University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Prince, Ellen. 1981. Toward a typology of given-new information. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.