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1 INTRODUCTION

This paper grew out of a classroom situation at the University of Hawaii where English speakers learning Indonesian applied what they thought was logic only to find that the Indonesian sentences they generated turned out to be unacceptable. When an English speaker wants to make a statement about dogs in general and their well-known fondness of bones, he will express it by making the nouns indefinite or plural: A dog likes bones, Dogs like bones, A dog likes a bone, or even, among certain speakers, Dogs like a bone. However, when he applies this English logic (let's assume that there is such a thing!) to Indonesian and comes up with

(1) *Seekor anjing suka tulang-tulang.
   class, dog  like bone  plural
(2) *Anjing-anjing suka tulang-tulang.
(3) *Seekor anjing suka sebuah tulang.
   class, dog  like class, bone
(4) *Anjing-anjing suka sebuah tulang.

he finds that none of the Indonesian sentences are acceptable.

A related situation, this time with the use of a definite article, is illustrated below. Suppose that this same speaker has just bought a house and he wants to describe the condition of the kitchen, he can say in English The kitchen is good where kitchen is preceded by a definite article, even when the concept of kitchen has not been previously introduced. Now when he switches to Indonesian, he does not come up with the correct sentence, (5), but with the wrong one, (6).

(5) Dapur nya bagus.
   kitchen DM good
(6) @Dapur itu bagus?
   kitchen DM  good
   'The kitchen is good.'

Suppose that this house is the most expensive in the area and the new owner wants to say so in Indonesian. After his bad experience with (6) he decides to use -nya this time and produces the sentence below

(7) *Rumah ini paling mahal di daerah-nya.
   house this most expensive in area DM

He later learned that he should have used itu and not -nya after daerah.

Finally, when he is in his house and going to the kitchen to get something to drink, he is told that he can verbalize his activity by saying (8), where no itu nor -nya is used after dapur.

(8) Saya pergi ke dapur untuk ambil minum.
   I go to kitchen to get drink
   'I went to the kitchen to get some drink.'

If we look at all of the sentences above, we will see that we are in fact dealing with the concepts of generic vs nongeneric, given vs new, definite vs indefinite, and entailment vs nonentailment.

The present paper is an attempt to investigate this complex matter. I do not pretend that I will be able to present the final solution, but I do hope that I will have at least aroused your interest to pursue the matter further. Since English is the language spoken by all the conference here, I will use it as our stepping stone by presenting very briefly what people have said about this subject matter. I rely rather heavily on the works of Wallace Chafe and Laurie Karttunen.

2 THE CASE IN ENGLISH

Wallace Chafe believes that basically the total conceptual universe can be initially dichotomized into two major areas,
namely, the area of the verb and the area of the noun (Chafe, 1970, 96). Each of these can be specified in terms of three semantic units: inherent, lexical, and contextual. The inherent feature acts as the first filter to narrow down the areas of conceptual space. When all the inherent features have been identified, we can identify the lexical unit which usually appears in the form of a root. Contextual specification on the root can be made only through derivation. Thus, if a noun, for instance, has been inherently specified as /+count/, /+potent/, /+animate/, /-human/, it can be lexicalized only as cat, dog, tiger, etc., but not as Mary, window, or bone. Further semantic specification, that is, contextual specification, can only be made on the basis of the environment in which the lexical item occurs. This being the case, it is the most complex problem that linguists have to face.

Limiting ourselves to the contextual features of the nouns, we can say that one of the factors which contributes to the complexity of the matter is that we are dealing with linguistic as well as extralinguistic environments. The only reason why sentences such as /Play me to the moon/, /The sky is bright have the ill/ that we all agree that nouns such as /moon/ and /sky/ are unique and, therefore, must be expressed, in English, with a definite article, even if these are the first sentences that one utter.

While we can agree that certain nouns are universally unique, as is the case with the moon and the sky above, we also realize that for a given group of speakers there are well-known, uniquely salient objects that are referred to by a definite noun. Thus, sentences such as /The president will not run for re-election and We have to use the king/ do not create any ambiguity as far as the identity of the president and the king is concerned.

Another extralinguistic environment which is not as universal as the moon and not as salient as the president is illustrated below. In a classroom situation a teacher may ask one of his students to clean the blackboard. The sentence he uses can be /Please erase the blackboard/, where the noun /blackboard/ is made definite by the definite article /the/. The only explanation to the use of this definite article is that the speaker must assume that the listener knows the identity of the referent, even when the concept of the blackboard has not been introduced before.

Quite often this type of extralinguistic environment, which I will label as relative environment, varies in time and space. For instance, the sentence /Let's go to the beach/ spoken in Hawaii or on the Riviera will very unlikely elicit responses such as /what beach?/. This very reaction may be exactly what we would hear, if the sentence were spoken in Washington, DC, or in Bandung where beach-going is not part of the people's normal activity.

A third extralinguistic environment can be deliberately set. In a novel, for instance, the author may begin his story by using such sentences as /The waitress brought him another cup of coffee without introducing first who the waitress and him are/.

Unlike extralinguistic environments, linguistic environments are found within the discourse. The most obvious, and perhaps also the most often cited, environment is that of prior mention. After producing the sentence /Once there was a widow who owned a cow/, we have to consider the noun /cow/ definite from here on, if we are talking about the same object.

Note, however, that the verb in the relative clause is nongeneric. The status of the verb seems to play an important role in determining whether a discourse referent has been established or not. It seems that a discourse referent is established only if the verb is nongeneric. If the introductory sentence had been /Once there was a widow who owned a cow/, where the verb in the relative clause is generic, we cannot go on saying, for instance, /The cows were all black/.

Another constraint that we must observe here is that prior mention and the nongenericness of the verb alone may not be sufficient to establish a discourse referent. The truth value of the proposition must be first established positively, before a referent can be assumed to exist. Thus, sentences such as /Bill doesn't have a car/ do not establish a discourse referent for the car. This is evidenced from the unacceptability of the following sentences as part of the total discourse: /The car is black, It is black, Bill's car is black/ (see Karttunen, 1968, and 1976).

If the verb of the sentence which is supposed to establish the discourse referent is what Chafe calls random (1970, 199: 1972, 60), an ambiguity arises. Given the sentence /I'm looking for a friend, we are not sure whether the speaker is looking for some particular friend or any friend at all. The former interpretation allows us to say sentences such as /When I find him the man or The man is six feet tall/. The latter interpretation can be followed by such sentences as /When I find one or He must be friendly and young/.

The presence of a modal in the predicative verb seems also to play a very important role, Karttunen claims that "nonspecific indefinites do not establish discourse referents when they appear in a complement of a modal verb" (1976, 369). He gave the following examples: /Bill can make a kite, The kite has a long string, where the second sentence cannot be accepted as a continuation of the first. While the two sentences above certainly support Karttunen's claim, we find that his statement is applicable only if the second sentence does not contain a modal.
Otherwise, a referent is indeed established. After saying the first sentence, we certainly can say The kite can be large or small.

The second linguistic environment which influences the definiteness or indefiniteness of a noun is commonly referred to as presupposition. Common knowledge tells us that there are objects which entail the existence of obligatory parts. Objects such as houses, for instance, entail the existence of obligatory parts such as kitchen, windows, doors, roofs, etc. The relationship between an object and its obligatory parts, on the one hand, and definite and indefinite, on the other, is that once the object is introduced, the parts become definite. This is the reason why, after saying Yesterday we bought a house, we can say The kitchen is good, The roof is new, But we have to replace the windows, etc.

As is the case with the relative environment we mentioned before, entailment can also be a relative term. What exactly can be included under the obligatory parts are not always easily determined. Factors such as geographic locations, cultural awareness, and time span may interfere in this matter. As an example, in an area where houses are supported by poles, one can indicate the situation of a house by saying The poles are made of teak logs. This very sentence, however, will very likely elicit a surprised reaction such as Oh, it's constructed on poles, if the houses in the area are built directly on the ground.

The importance of cultural awareness is illustrated in Chafe's sentence I saw the letter that Harry Truman wrote to the music critic of the Washington Post (1972, 67). Unless we are aware of an incident where former President Harry Truman wrote a strong letter reacting to the music critic Paul Hume's unfavorable comments on Truman's daughter's recital, we will not think that the use of the definite article before letter is appropriate.

In addition to parts, objects also have properties which we may want to call innate. These include size, color, weight, price, length, etc. Just like obligatory parts, innate properties become definite once the object is introduced. After we say, for instance, I bought a book yesterday, we can say The color is red, The price was $15, and The size is 6" by 11".

That objects and their parts or innate properties are related in some important way can be seen from the situation below. Knowing that kitchens, windows, doors, etc. are obligatory parts of a house, it is tautologous for us to say My house has a kitchen, His house has windows, etc. On the other hand, if the parts are not obligatory, no tautology will arise. Since baskets are not normally part of a bike, the sentence My bike has a basket sounds natural.

Although the boundary that separates the obligatory and the optional parts of an object is often hard to draw, the need to keep the distinction seems necessary. This is evidenced by the fact that after saying I have a bike, we can say The tires are new, but The basket is new without arousing an unusual feeling.

Entailments are found not only in nouns, but also in verbs. While the exact nature of the relationship is still not fully known, there is reason to believe that what makes a noun in a sentence definite is determined by the presence of a certain verb in the discourse. Selling and buying, for instance, entail an exchange of money, while killing and dying the presence of a corpse. This is why money and corpse are preceded by a definite article in the sentences We will sell our house and use the money to buy a farm; Mr. Snoopy died yesterday, but the corpse will not be buried until next week.

From the description above it is clear that there is a relationship between definiteness and indefiniteness, on the one hand, and what is now known as given vs new information, on the other. There is a strong tendency for a definite noun to be also given, and an indefinite noun to be new. In the latter case the speaker assumes that the identity of the referent is not known by the listener. Thus, when we say A dog stepped on my toe, we are assuming that our listener cannot identify which particular dog we are talking about. This is in contrast with The dog stepped on my toe in which we assume that the listener knows the referent of the dog.

Although a dog in A dog stepped on my toe is indefinite, it is nonetheless non-generic, that is, it refers to a specific animal. This is to be differentiated from a dog in A dog likes bones, in which we are talking about any dog at all. The relationship between genericness and indefiniteness can be stated as follows: genericness refers to the whole class or substance, whereas indefiniteness to particular instance of class or substance (Chafe, 1970, 188).

Comparing A dog stepped on my toe and A dog likes bones we can see that the generic or non-generic status of the dog is not inherent within the noun itself. The status is determined automatically by the verb to which the noun is juxtaposed. The acquisition of the nongeneric status of the dog in the first sentence is determined by the nongeneric nature of the verb step. Likewise, the generic verb like in the second sentence compels the genericness of the noun dog. The conclusion we can draw is that an indefinite noun is generic, if it accompanies a generic verb; otherwise, nongeneric (Chafe, 1970, 189).

Obviously, when a generic verb compels its accompanying noun to be generic, it does not necessarily mean that the noun must appear with an indefinite article.
Pluralizing the noun is also very common: 
Dogs like bones.

3 THE CASE IN INDONESIAN

3.1.0 THE CLASSIFIERS

With regards to classifiers, the trend in contemporary Indonesian is not only to reduce the number from approximately sixty to three (seorang for human, seekor for animal, and sebuah for the rest) but also to make them optional in certain contexts. Thus a sentence such as Dia mau beli mobil means 'He wants to buy a car,' although the classifier sebuah has been deleted before mobil.

3.1.1 IN RELATION TO GENERIC VERBS

Despite the above trend, however, there are cases where the presence or absence of a classifier is crucial. The rejection of sentences (1), (3), and (4) in Section 1 is partly due to the presence of the classifiers seekor and sebuah. It seems that if the verb is generic, the accompanying nouns must also be generic. Unlike English, the surface manifestation of this same phenomenon in Indonesian is different. Whereas in English we can use an indefinite article, we cannot use a classifier (which is the closest equivalent to the indefinite article) in Indonesian. Therefore, besides sentence (3) the following sentences

(9) Seekor anjing suka tulang.
    class. dog  like bone

(10) Anjing suka sebuah tulang.
    dog  like class. bone

are also unacceptable simply because the generic verb suka precludes the possible presence of a classifier in the context above.

The question that comes to our mind now is why sentences (1), (2), (4), and (11) as generic sentences is not based, among other things, on the plural status of the nouns per se but rather on the fact that the nouns appear in reduplicated form. If this is indeed correct, we should be able to accept (11a-c) below where the plural form is indicated by the marker para

(11) a. Para pelacur suka para
    pl. prostitute like pl.
    pengunjung,
    visitor

b. Para pelacur suka pengunjung.

c. Pelacur suka para pengunjung.

Native speakers from other regions confirm our earlier statement. They reject sentence (11a) but are divided on (11b-c). Those who feel that (11b-c) are acceptable, however, indicate that the nouns para pelacur and para pengunjung do not refer to prostitutes and visitors in general but rather to a specific group of people. In other words, (11b) and (11c) are not generic sentences, at least not in the same way as (12) is.

Our observation of the sentences exemplified by (1-14) leads to our first
hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: In a generic sentence a generic verb (1) prohibits the presence of a classifier and/or a plural noun and (2) converts a nongeneric verb in the embedded sentence to generic.

3.1.2 IN RELATION TO NONGENERIC VERBS

While a generic verb does not take a classifier or a plural noun, a nongeneric verb does just the opposite. One important thing to note immediately here is that while a classifier or a plural form may occur with a nongeneric verb, its position within a sentence is not free. A nongeneric verb requires the presence of a classifier, if the noun which the classifier accompanies is subject; otherwise, it is optional. This is the reason why we can accept (15) and (16), but not (17) and (18).

(15) Seorang murid sedang membaca buku.

'A student is reading a book.'

(16) Seorang murid sedang membaca (sebuah) buku.

'A student is reading a book.'

(17) *Murid sedang membaca semua buku.

(18) *Murid sedang membaca buku.

Note that seorang is obligatory, but sebuah is optional in (15) and (16). While we can see that the obligatory presence of a classifier with a subject signifies the nongenericness of the noun, we may find it hard to understand that the optional presence of a classifier with an object still carries the same nongeneric status. But this is exactly what we find in (15) and (16) above. The explanation for this is that the nongeneric nature of the verb overrides any other semantic feature in the accompanying nouns.

In the case of a plural noun occurring with a nongeneric verb, we must also say that the position of the noun within the sentence must be observed. Let us take sentence (19) below:

(19) Murid-murid sedang membaca buku.

baca buku, book

'The students are reading a book.'

We see that as a subject the noun murid can be pluralized. This noun is nongeneric, referring to a specific referent. The object noun, buku, is not preceded by a classifier nor does it appear in plural form. While a classifier may indeed precede this noun, its presence brings about a difference in meaning. The patient noun buku as it now stands in (19) is nongeneric and refers to more than one copy, with the same or different titles. If a classifier occurs, however, this noun remains nongeneric but there can be only one copy we are referring to; hence, one title also.

Even when the referents are plural, as we have just discovered, the object noun does not appear in plural form. Thus, sentence (20) is rejected.

(20) *Murid-murid sedang membaca buku-buku.

While a more satisfactory explanation may be needed here, we may venture to say that the pluralizing of buku nullifies its nongeneric status. One cannot perform a specific activity on something non-specific. This is further supported by the fact that if the plural noun is specified, that is, if the noun is made nongeneric, the sentence becomes acceptable. See (21a) and (21b) below.

(21) a. Murid-murid sedang membaca buku-buku agama.

read book pl. religion

'membara baku-buku agama, read book pl. religion

'The students are reading (some) religious books.'

b. Murid-murid sedang menunggu para pembesar.

wait for pl. VIP

'The students are waiting for the VIPs.'

Notice that agama in (21a) and para in (21b) narrow down the areas of conceptual space, reducing the choice from all possible books and VIPs in the world into something more specific.

That the presence or absence of a classifier brings about a meaning difference can also be seen in sentences where the verbs are / vague generic/. The verb menggonggong 'to bark!', for instance, can refer to a habitual or specific action. In its former sense this verb requires that the agent be without a classifier. In its
latter sense, the classifier must be present.

(22) Anjing menggonggong
dog bark
'Dogs bark.'

(23) Seekor anjing menggonggong.
'A (certain) dog barks.'

Although in general we agree with Chafe's assumption that the generic or nongeneric nature of a noun is automatically determined by the verb to which the noun is attached (Chafe, 1970, 189), we see from the Indonesian examples that the reverse can also be true. As we can see here the change from generic to nongeneric of menggonggong is determined by the presence of the classifier. Without the classifier, the sentence refers only to dogs in general and their habitual action of barking.

As expected, if a nongeneric sentence is subordinated to another sentence with a nongeneric verb, the nongenericness of the noun in the subordinated clause will be maintained. The classifier, however, becomes optional. Witness sentences (24) and (25).

(24) Saya dengar anjing menggonggong,
I hear dog bark
'I heard a dog/some dogs barking.'

(25) Saya dengar seekor anjing menggonggong.
'I heard a dog barking.'

One might argue here that (24) is not derived from the subordination of (23) but of (22) to saya dengar. This argument is rejected on two grounds. First, one possible paraphrase of (24) is (25) where the classifier is present. Therefore, as it now stands (24) can refer to a specific dog doing a specific action. Second, if (24) were derived from (22), we would have to say that a nongeneric verb overrides the generic status of the sentence it dominates. This, as we will see below, is not true.

Let us take the sentences

(26) Saya dengar dia suka perempuan.
I hear he like female
'I heard he likes women.'

(27) 'Saya dengar dia suka seorang perempuan.
The nongeneric verb dengar dominates
Hypothesis 2: The genericness of a verb in the main clause overrides the nongenericness of the verb of the embedded clause, but the reverse is not true. A classifier can occur only if the verb sharing the same VP as the noun is nongeneric and is not under the dominance of a generic verb of a higher node.

In addition to the feature of the verb, the presence or absence of a classifier is also determined by the type of sentence in which the noun occurs. Consider the sentences below.

(28) Seekor anjing menggigit kaki class. dog bite leg saya.
     my
     'A dog bit my leg.'
(29) 'Anjing menggigit kaki saya,
     (30) Kaki saya digigit seekor leg my be+bitten class.
     anjing,
     dog
     'My leg was bitten by a dog.'
(31) Kaki saya digigit anjing,
     'My leg was bitten by a dog.'

The presence of the nongeneric verb menggigit requires the presence of a classifier for the agent; hence, the acceptance of (28), but not (29). If (28) is made into passive, the classifier becomes optional. Thus, we can have (30) or (31) as our passive form for (28).

In brief we can say

Hypothesis 3: A classifier for an agent is obligatory in an active sentence with a nongeneric verb but optional in its passive counterpart.

3.2.0 THE MARKER ITU

Itu can function either as a demonstrative pronoun indicating that the object is not close to the speaker or as a nominal marker. As a demonstrative pronoun it is similar to English that. While in general we can say that itu as a nominal
3.2.1 IN RELATION TO GENERIC-NONGENERIC FEATURES

As stated before, a generic verb in a general statement requires the presence of a generic noun which, in Indonesian, is indicated by the absence of a classifier. But certainly a generic verb permits also the presence of a nongeneric noun as can be seen from (32) and (33) below.

(32) *Beruang itu suka ikan kami.
        bear  DM like fish our
'The bear likes our fish.'

(33) *Beruang itu suka ikan.
        bear  DM like fish

Chafe contends that the generic power of a verb does not penetrate into the accompanying nouns, if the nouns have been specified as definite (Chafe, 1970, 206). Thus, in *The elephants like peanuts, the noun elephants does not refer to all and any elephants, but rather to a specific group identifiable by the listener. We notice also that peanuts occurs without a definite marker.

In the case of Indonesian this seems to be true only if all the accompanying nouns are definite. There is no doubt that *beruang itu in (32) is nongeneric and definite, but that is because *ikan kami is also nongeneric and definite. Thus, (32) can only mean 'The bear like our fish.' If ikan is not definite, as in (33), an ambiguity arises. One possible interpretation is that we are talking about a class of objects as an undifferentiated whole. Since this is the case, there is really no difference between (33) and (12) in that both sentences are general statements. In this context itu does not have to occur.

The second interpretation is that we are referring to a bear whose identity we assume our listener knows. Without any additional context, itu here is no longer a definite article, but a demonstrative pronoun.

If the verb is nongeneric the requirement that all the noun be definite no longer holds. Witness the sentence below.

(34) *Beruang itu menguri ikan.
        bear  DM steal fish
'The bear stole fish.'

The fact that the verb is nongeneric brings about certain interesting things. First of all, the agent can only be interpreted nongenerically. Consequently, the definite marker itu is no longer optional as in (33). Second, the definite status of the bear is still maintained, even when the second noun ikan is unmarked. And third, the unmarkedness of the second noun does not prevent it from maintaining a nongeneric status. Ikan here refers to a specific object, as evidenced by our ability to insert a classifier before the noun. We cannot do this to (33).

The phenomena found in (32-34) lead us to hypotheses 4 and 5:

**Hypothesis 4:** The agent marker itu in a sentence with a generic verb must be considered nongeneric only if the other noun is explicitly marked nongeneric. Otherwise, the sentence is ambiguous.

**Hypothesis 5:** The agent marker itu in a sentence with a nongeneric verb must be considered nongeneric even if the other noun is unmarked.

Indonesian is one of the languages of the world where a sentence can be constructed without a verb. We will call sentences of this type equative sentences. Witness the unstarred sentences below.

(35) Harimau itu binatang liar.
        tiger  DM animal wild

(36) *Harimau binatang liar itu.
        tiger  animal  wild DM

(37) *Harimau itu binatang liar itu.
        tiger  DM animal  wild DM

(38) Harimau binatang liar.
        tiger  animal  wild
'Tigers are wild animals.'

(39) Binatang liar itu harimau.
        animal  wild tower

(40) *Binatang liar harimau.
        animal  wild tiger

(41) *Binatang liar harimau itu.
        animal  wild tiger  DM

(42) *Binatang liar itu harimau itu.
        animal  wild DM  tiger  DM

The lack of a verb necessitates the use of such terms as subject and predicate. From (35) we can see that the predicate binatang liar refers to all species under the category of animals.
It is, therefore, generic. We have seen before, in (33), that the co-occurrence of a generic verb, which also acts as a predicate, and a definite noun brings about an ambiguity. This situation is also true in verbless sentences.

The genericness of the predicate in (35) creates two possible interpretations: (i) a reference to tigers as a whole, and (ii) a reference to a specific instance of the whole. With the first interpretation, (35) is the same as (38). Although we can accept (35) and (38), we must reject (36) and (37). While to a certain extent the rejection may be influenced by the generic-nongeneric distribution in the two predicative nouns in that the nongeneric feature of these nouns automatically nullifies the possibility for the two sentences to be acceptable, there may be a stronger reason for this. Perhaps what is more relevant is the distinction that we must make with regards to the semantic scope of all the nouns involved. Simply by following our common sense we will agree that tigers are a proper subset of animals. They constitute an instance of a whole. With respect to a whole, an instance may represent the entire subset or only a definite number of the subset within the whole. By the same token, with respect to an instance, a whole represents necessarily the entire set, including the subset within the set. An instance can be predicated by a whole, but the whole must be without a definite marker. This explains why we can accept (35) and (38), but not (36) and (37).

If a whole must be predicated by an instance, the only acceptable way is to make the whole "lose" its wholeness and be "pulled down" into a status narrower than the predicate. This is why sentence (39) is acceptable. We have added in (39) the marker itu to eliminate the wholeness of the subject. The result is the binatang liar itu no longer represents all and any wild animals but rather a specific animal assumed to be identifiable by the listener. Very likely this is in the form of a pointed object. Unless the above requirement is met, no equative sentence of this type can be accepted. See (40), (41), and (42).

The relationship between a subject and its predicate, on the one hand, and the presence or absence of the marker itu, on the other, can be stated as hypotheses 6 and 7:

**Hypothesis 6:** In a stative sentence if the semantic scope of the subject is narrower than that of the predicate, the subject can be /+itu/ but the predicate must be /-itu/. If the subject is /+itu/, it can be interpreted as /generic/; if it is /-itu/, it can only be /-generic/.

**Hypothesis 7:** In a stative sentence if the semantic scope of the subject is wider than that of the predicate, the subject must be /+itu/ and the predicate /-itu/.

### 3.2.2 IN RELATION TO EXTRALINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENTS

Unlike English, unique or uniquely salient objects are not always expressed with a definite marker in Indonesian. Observe the following sentences.

(43) Terbangkanlah aku ke bulan,
fly me to moon

'Fly me to the moon.'

(44) Bulan itu indah,
moon DM beautiful

'The moon is beautiful.'

(45) Kami harus menghadap raja,
we must go to see king

'We must see the king.'

(46) Raja itu pelindung rakyat,
king DM protector people

We see here that the unique noun bulan in (43) and the uniquely salient noun raja in (45) occur without the definite marker itu, and yet the referents are specific. If we compare these sentences with (44) and (46), we notice that these same nouns are indeed marked with a definite marker. Obviously, this situation calls for further scrutiny.

It is common sense to say that there is only just one moon and that there can be more than one president. That this distinction is important is substantiated by the fact that a classifier can occur with a uniquely salient, but not a unique noun. Thus, adding seorang before raja still makes (45) acceptable, although a different meaning emerges. If we add sebuh before bulan in (43), the sentence becomes at best strange.

If a unique noun occupies a subject position, a definite marker can occur. The referent is still specific and the marker is optional. Thus, (44) means the same without itu. In the case of a uniquely salient subject, the status of the referent is determined by the status of the predicate or the verb. In an equative sentence such as (46), we must treat the referent of the subject in the same way we treated...
(35), that is, to consider it /+generic/. In other sentence types, the referentiality of the noun is dependent on the nature of the verb.8

3.3.0 THE MARKER -NYA

There are several meanings and functions of -nya: (i) a third person possessive pronoun as in Koeswata dari Bandung dan istri-nya dari Cianjur 'Koeswata is from Bandung and his wife from Cianjur,' (ii) a topic-comment marker as in Rumah itu atapnya bocor 'As for the house, the roof leaks,' (iii) an object replacement as in Dia membelinya kemarin 'He bought (whatever it is) yesterday,' (iv) a prepositional object as in Berikan ini kepada-nya 'Give this to him/her,' and (v) a verb nominalizer as in Membeli-nya di mana? 'The buying is where (-Where did you buy (whatever it is)?)' The -nya to be discussed in this paper is a definite marker, apart from the five meanings above.

3.3.1 IN RELATION TO EXTRALINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENTS

The nongenericity of the noun which is due to what we called relative environment in Section 2 poses a rather complex problem. Karttunen only says that "anything in the immediate environment of the speaker and the hearer towards which their attention is directed becomes a discourse referent whether it has been explicitly mentioned or not" (June, 1968, 16). This is why in a classroom situation we can say Please erase the blackboard, where the noun is marked definite by a definite article.

Looking at our Indonesian data, we see that the matter is more complex. Consider the sentences

(47) Tulislah di papan tulis. write on blackboard

'Please write on the blackboard,'

(48) Tolong papan tulisnya dihapus. Imp. blackboard DM be+erased

'Please erase the blackboard.'

(49) Besok saya harus cuci mobil. tomorrow I must wash car

'I have to wash the car tomorrow.'

In the immediate environment of a classroom the nouns papan tulis in (47) and (48) refer to nongeneric and definite objects despite the fact that in (47) the noun is marked. In (48) the noun is indeed marked, but the definite marker is not itu as we might expect, but rather -nya. In the immediate environment of a home the noun mobil in (49) is nongeneric and definite, and yet unmarked.

The question that we must raise is why, within the same immediate environment, some nouns are marked while others are not and those which are marked must take -nya and not -itu? The answer seems to be related to two things: (i) a distinction that we must make between nuclear and nonnuclear (e.g., prepositional) positions of the nouns, and (ii) the type of sentence in which the nouns occur. Papan tulis is nonnuclear in (47) but nuclear in (48). Mobil is nuclear in (49). Sentence (48) is passive with the noun as subject, while (49) is active with the noun as object. Our observation enables us to postulate hypothesis 8:

Hypothesis 8: If the speaker and the listener share the same immediate environment, a noun in a nonnuclear position is nongeneric and definite but unmarked and in a nuclear position it is also nongeneric and definite but must be explicitly marked by -nya, if the sentence is passive; otherwise, unmarked.

This also explains why dapur in (8) at the beginning of this paper bears no -nya or itu.

Hypothesis 8 should not be taken to mean that the definite marker itu cannot occur at all. Of course, itu can occur after papan tulis in (47), after mobil in (49), and it can replace -nya in (48), but these changes alter the original meanings intended. With itu a contrastive meaning emerges, thus making the definite marker a demonstrative pronoun.

That the distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear positions is relevant is further illustrated below. In a family where there is an aquarium, for instance, we will often hear sentences such as Apa ikannya sudah dikhawati? 'Is the fish been fed?'. If the family also owns a cat, we may often hear Kucingnya di mana? 'Where is the cat?' These and other similar sentences require the definite marker -nya. On the other hand, no definite marker can occur before kamar and jendela in the following situation, unless, of course, a contrast is intended. In describing what the family members were doing when the burglar entered, we may say Naktu itu ayah tidur di kamarnya tengah 'At that time father was sleeping in the middle room,' and Dan
saja sedang baca-baca di dekat jendela
'And I was doing some reading near the window.'

The scope of the immediate environment is not limited to narrow concepts such as classrooms or homes. In places where beach-going is part of a normal activity, for instance, the sentence Mari kita ke pantai 'Let's go to the beach,' rather than Mari kita ke pantai itu or Mari kita ke pantainya is the only acceptable sentence.

3.3.2 IN RELATION TO ENTAILMENTS

We recall that prior mention in a nongeneric sentence with a positive proposition establishes a discourse referent. After we say We bought a house yesterday, we can say The house is beautiful. This situation is also true in Indonesian. After (50) we can say (51).

(50) Kemarin kami beli rumah.
yesterday we buy house
'We bought a house yesterday.'

(51) a. Rumah itu bagus sekali.
    house DM good very
    'The house is very beautiful.'

b. Rumahnya bagus sekali.
    house DM good very
    'The house is very beautiful.'

Notice, however, that the definite marker used can be either itu (51a) or -nya (51b). This is possible because what is involved in the two sentences above is only prior mention. The concept of a house was first introduced in (50). Since the verb, beli, is nongeneric and since (50) has a positive proposition, the referent for the house is, therefore, established. From this time on the noun rumah must be considered /given/. In Indonesian this is indicated by either itu or -nya.9

If entailment is involved, there is only one marker that can be used, namely, -nya. This is the reason why after (50) we can say (5) but not (6) (repeated below).

(5) Dapurnya bagus.
    kitchen DM good
    'The kitchen is good.'

(6) @Dapur itu bagus.
    kitchen DM good

Entailment as exemplified in (5) is perhaps related to possessiveness. Comparing (50) and (51) we can see that the nouns in (51) have the same referent as that in (50). Comparing (50) with (5), however, we will see that the noun dapur in (5) has no referent in the discourse. It is marked definite simply because the concept of a house entails the presence of obligatory parts such as kitchen. In other words, what we talk about in (5) is the dapur "belonging to" the rumah. That this kind of possessive relationship, rather than pure anaphoric (Kridalaksana, 1970), occurs is also supported by the fact that (5) can be paraphrased as (5a)

(5a) Dapur rumah itu bagus.
    kitchen house DM good
    'The kitchen of the house is good,'

where -nya is replaced by the referent itself.

Other factors such as geographic locations must also be observed. Since virtually all houses in Indonesia are without attics, sentence (52), spoken after (50), will raise eyebrows,

(52) @Lotengnya cukup besar.
    attic DM enough big
    'The attic is large enough.'

Upon hearing (50) and (52) we will very likely say O, ada lotengnya 'Oh, it even has an attic,'

In the case of entailments, innate properties of an object also become definite once the object is introduced. The definiteness is also marked by -nya. Thus, since a house has, among other things, a size, price, and color, we can say the sentences below after (50).

(53) Ukurannya 7 kali 11 meter.
    size DM time meter
    'The size is 7 by 11 meters.'

(54) Harganya sepuluh juta rupiah.
    price DM ten million rupiah
    'The price is ten million rupiah.'

(55) Warnannya putih.
    color DM white
    'The color is white.'

Entailments are also found among certain verbs. Menjual 'to sell' and meninggal 'to die', for instance, entail the presence of money and corpse respectively. Therefore, after we say (56) and
we can say (57) and (59) respectively.

(56) Kami mau jual sawah.
    we want sell rice-field
    'We want to sell our rice-field.'

(57) Uangnya akan kami belikan mobil.
    money will we buy car
    'We will use the money to buy a car.'

(58) Bu Blo'on meninggal kemarin.
    Mrs. die yesterday
    'Mrs. Blo'on died yesterday.'

(59) Jenazahnya akan dimakamkan.
    corpse be-buried
    tomorrow
    'The corpse will be buried tomorrow.'

Again, the definiteness of the nouns must be marked by -nya, and not itu.
Our last hypotheses are postulated below:

Hypothesis 9: Prior mention in a nongeneric sentence with a positive proposition establishes a discourse referent, and the definite marker to be used is either itu or -nya.

Hypothesis 10: In a sentence in which entitlement is involved, the noun under consideration is nongeneric and definite, and the definite marker to be used is -nya.

4. OPERATION OF THE MIND

One important by-product of our investigation of the roles of the classifiers, itu, and -nya is that there is a marked tendency for us Indonesians not to state explicitly what we feel is obvious. We have seen from our foregoing analysis that once the nature of the verb is determined or once the context is clear, there is no need for us to be explicit in what we say. The absence of the definite markers after dapur, bulan, raja, papan tulis, and mobil in (8), (43), (45), (47), and (49) respectively, and the absence of a classifier before buku in (15) and before rumah in (50) are cases in point. In the case of sentence (8), for instance, why should we mark dapur with a definite marker explicitly, if we (the speaker and the listener) are in the same house and, therefore, know which dapur we are referring to?

Another piece of evidence can be found in the use of singular form to express a plural concept. We humans know that animals such as elephants have two ears, two eyes, four legs, and one tail. This common knowledge brings about the acceptance of (60a+b) and the rejection of (60a+c) as part of a discourse.

(60) a. Kemarin saya beli gajah.
    yesterday I buy elephant
    'I bought an elephant yesterday.'

b. Telinganya lebar.
    ear wide
    'The ears are big.'

(60) c. Telinga-telinganya lebar.
    ear plural wide

As far as our conception of the universe is concerned, telinga in b refers to both ears. To us this is only logical and there is no need to indicate it by making the noun appear in plural form.

A third evidence for our inexplicitness or indirectness can be seen in our preponderous use of passive sentences, despite the fact that their active counterparts are available. To cite an example, if a husband wants to ask his wife whether or not she has fed the fish in the aquarium, very likely he will come up with (61) and not (62), although there is nothing wrong whatsoever with the latter sentence.

(61) Apa ikan-nya sudah dikaesih
    QW fish DM already given
    makan?
    food
    'Have the fish been fed?'

(62) Apa kamu sudah kasih makan
    QW you already give food
    ikan?
    fish
    'Have you fed the fish?'

Within the situational context under consideration, what may be wrong with (62) does not lie in the grammatical structure of the sentence but in the explicit mentioning of the second person to whom you direct the question and the
activity you expect her to perform. It is immaterial to the questioner whether or not the wife is the one to do the feeding, although it is very probable that he assumes that she would be the one to do it. By using (61) he is interested more in the state of affairs resulting from an activity which someone — in this case, perhaps his wife — has performed than on someone doing an activity which then results in the state of affairs. From the wife's point of view, (61) is a much softer request in the form of a question with no explicit reference to her having to do the feeding, although she knows that her husband may have her in mind when uttering the sentence. The state of affairs is achieved with no one feeling "to have given an order" or "to be ordered".

To a certain extent the absence of tense markers in Indonesian can also be considered a way to avoid this redundancy phenomenon. The presence of the temporal adverb kemarin 'yesterday' in (60a), for instance, is more than sufficient to indicate that the activity of buying must have taken place in the past. Why should we bother marking, for example, the verb?

While the observation above is admittedly scanty and at best speculative, there is reason to believe that it is not an isolated case. On the contrary, it may even be the underlying pattern of our total culture which considers explicitness and frankness to be kasar 'rough; impolite.' The whole concept of wangsalan among the Javanese and pantun among the Malays, for instance, is based on our desire to be inexplicit and indirect.

Naturally, the way the mind of a nation operates cannot possibly be viewed from a single discipline such as linguistics, and, what is more, cannot be presented in a page or two. The suggestion given here is to be taken purely as food for thought.

5. Unless otherwise indicated, all nouns in this paper exclude pronouns.
6. This is what Chafe calls aggregative which can be considered as a subset of the generic set.
7. Sentence (41) can be accepted with a short pause after liat and an extra pitch on this word. (41) seems to be a permutation of (35).
8. See 3.3.1. for cases where the nouns are not unique or uniquely salient and yet no definite marker is used.
9. This is a more accurate statement than that found in Dardjowidjojo, 1978, pp. 191-192.
10. This has been stated many times, most recently by Khalid M. Hussain, Dewan Bahasa, Vol. 23, No. 12, Desember, 1979.
11. Wungsalan is a set of phrases or sentences whose meaning cannot be deduced from the componential parts of the whole, nor from the totality of the whole, but rather from the association that the parts and/or the whole have with other phenomena in society on the basis of their phonological or other similarities.
12. This is especially true for forms such as Sudah gahar cendana pula, Tu tu keladi where the speaker expects the listener to continue the expressions himself.
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1. This paper was read in absentia at the International Conference on Malay Culture, Kuala Lumpur 1979. It was reportedly to be published by the Committee, but there has been no news so far.

2. The symbol Θ is used to indicate that the sentence is unacceptable only within the discourse under consideration.

3. M. Soemarmo (1975) treats two of the three topics discussed here.

4. Thanks to Jeff Dreyfuss, University of Michigan, for raising the issue.
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