

1. Introduction

In this chapter, I make a first attempt at typologizing basic aspects of definiteness marking in the Austronesian languages of the Indo-Malaysian region with a view towards elucidating the context of the Indonesian alternations discussed in Chapter 7.

I organize the discussion around the diachronic developments that form this typology: (i) the use of syntactic prominence to indicate definiteness (§2.1), (ii) the development of definite determiners from demonstratives (§2.2), (iii) the development of the third person genitive pronoun into a marker of referentiality (§2.3), (iv) the development of relativizers into definite markers (§2.4), (v) the use of the distributive mode to indicate an indefinite object and finally (vi) agreement based strategies.

2.1 Voice alternations without case marked NPs

The vast majority of Philippine languages, which are generally understood to be historically conservative from a grammatical perspective, possess NP case markers with referential properties; referentiality in these languages is typically indicated through a combination of case marking and voice alternations (McFarland 1978). South of the Philippines, however, case markers with a referential function become exceedingly rare. Nonetheless, we find many languages that maintain a link between Philippine-type voice alternations, which typically select a discourse familiar or unique NP to become nominative/absolute argument, and referentiality. For instance, in many South Sulawesi languages, exemplified here by Mamuju, the (absolute) argument selected by an undergoer voice clause is interpreted definitely, as in (1a), while the undergoer of an actor voice or antipassive verb is typically interpreted as an existential indefinite or a generic, as seen in (1b).

- (1) *Mamuju*
- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. ku-kapiya lopi | b. mang-kapiya=a' lopi |
| 1S.ERG-make boat | ANTIP-make=1S.ABS boat |
| ‘I made the boat.’ | ‘I made a boat.’ or ‘I make boats.’ |

In some but not all languages of this type, constructions like (1b) show signs of pseudo-incorporation. But in Mamuju, there is no adjacency requirement on the verb and indefinite undergoer, as seen in (2), which is atypical of (pseudo-)incorporation.

- (2) *Mamuju*
- mang-kande ia bau
 ANTIP-eat 3s fish
 ‘S/he eats fish.’

Another exemplar of this type is Pangutaran Sama (Walton 1986), a Sama Bajau language of the southern Philippines. In (3) and (4), the (a) examples contain undergoer voice and, consequently, a definite reading for the undergoer, while the (b) examples contain actor voice (similar, if not identical to antipassive) and a concomitant indefinite reading for the object.

- (3) *Pangutaran Sama* (Walton 1986:120)
- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| a. Ø-bonoʔ sultan bantaʔ na | b. m-bonoʔ sultan bantaʔ na |
| UV-kill Sultan enemy 3S.GEN | AV-kill Sultan enemy 3S.GEN |
| ‘The king killed his enemy.’ | ‘The king kills/fights some of his enemies.’ |

- (4) *Pangutaran Sama* (Walton 1986:7)
- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| a. Ø-tauʔ-ku kahawa ma siliʔ | b. nauʔ aku kahawa ma siliʔ |
| UV-put-1SG.GEN coffee OBL teapot | AV:put 1S.NOM coffee OBL teapot |
| ‘I put the coffee in the teapot.’ | ‘I put some coffee in the teapot.’ |

Remnants of this correspondence are occasionally found in western Indonesia, as well. In Gayo, a language of north Sumatra, a plain matrix clause with an actor voice verb, a bare noun object can only obtain an existential indefinite or generic reading, as shown in (5).

- (5) *Gayo* (Eades 2005:166)
- Munos penan wè
 AV:make cake 3
 ‘She is making cakes/*the cake.’

In imperatives, the referentiality of the undergoer determines the voice of the predicate, as shown in (6), where an indefinite undergoer requires an actor voice verb and a definite undergoer requires an undergoer voice verb.

- (6) *Gayo* (Eades 2005)
- | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| a. Mangan penan renyel! | b. I-pangan renyel penan=ni! |
| AV:eat cake then | UV-eat then cake=this |
| ‘Eat cakes!’ | ‘Eat the cakes!’ |

Madurese and Balinese show an identical pattern in imperatives and hortatives, where the actor voice is used for indefinite undergoers but the unmarked voice is required with definite ones.

- (7) *Madurese* (Davies 2010:165)
- | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| a. Mara maca buku! | b. Mara baca buku reya! |
| HORT AV.read book | HORT read book this |
| ‘(Come on,) Let’s read a book!’ | ‘Let’s read this book!’ |

- (8) *Balinese* (Artawa 2013:18)
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| a. Nyemak {tiuk/*tiuk-e} kema! | b. Tiuk-e jemak! |
| AV:take knife/knife-DEF there | knife-DEF take |
| ‘Take a knife there!’ | ‘Take the knife!’ |

The formerly strict correspondences between case and interpretation appear to break down across a wide range of languages in Indonesia. Specifically, we find a widespread licensing of definite objects in the actor voice (analyzed by Aldridge 2011 as the transitivization of a historical antipassive), a process which is still ongoing under the influence of Indonesian and Malay varieties. For instance, Toba Batak as described by Van der Tuuk (1971:92) strongly favors the

actor voice for introducing indefinite undergoers. But in the Toba Batak of the late 20th century, as described by Nababan (1981), it seems that definite objects could appear rather freely as actor voice undergoers, as in ‘his credit’ in (9).

- (9) *Toba Batak* (Nababan 1981:122)
 di na sadari, di-tòpòt amaddórap ma musé si jonáha manùngu **sinjir-na í**
 at PRT one_day PV-visit amaddorap PRT again PN Jonaha AV:demand credit-3S.GEN DEF
 ‘One day Amaddorap again went to Jonaha to demand his credit.’

We find erosion in the other direction as well; nominative/absolutive pivots, which must typically be definite in conservative Philippine languages, can be indefinite in Toba Batak and Gayo, shown in (10) and (11), respectively.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(10) <i>Toba Batak</i> (Nababan 1981)
 Di-surat ibana do buku
 PV-write 3SG PRT book
 ‘He has written a book.’</p> | <p>(11) <i>Gayo</i> (Eades 2005:169)
 I-geléh=è kôrô
 UV-slaughter=3.AGT buffalo
 ‘He slaughtered a buffalo.’</p> |
|---|---|

2.2 Demonstrative > definite determiner

Dahl (1951:256) traces the Malagasy determiner *ny* to the PMP proximate demonstrative **ini*, following a cross-linguistically common grammaticalization path. As Manaster-Ramer (1992) shows, bare indefinite NPs in Malagasy serve better as actor voice objects than definitely determined ones, as seen in (12a) and (b). Conversely, in the typical case, nominative arguments selected by verbal morphology require the determiner *ny* and must be interpreted as definite, as seen in (12c) and (d), as per the Philippine-type pattern.¹

- (12) *Malagasy* (adapted from Manaster-Ramer 1992:276)
- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>a. Mamono akoho aho
 AV:kill chicken 1S.NOM
 ‘I kill chickens.’</p> | <p>b. ?Mamono ny akoho aho
 AV:kill DET chicken 1S.NOM
 ‘I kill the chickens.’</p> |
| <p>c. *Vonoiko akoho
 kill:PV-1S.GEN chicken
 (For, ‘I kill chickens.’)</p> | <p>d. Vonoiko ny akoho
 kill:PV-1S.GEN DET 1S.NOM
 ‘I kill the chickens.’</p> |

Manado Malay shows a similar grammaticalization of a definite marker from a demonstrative but in this case, the source is the distal **itu*, which gives rise to a preposed *tu*. Its semantic bleaching is evident in its ability to co-occur with both distal and proximate demonstratives, which follow the head noun, as shown in (13).

- (13) *Manado Malay* (Shiohara and Jukes 2018)
- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>a. tu ruma itu</p> | <p>b. tu parkara ini</p> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|

¹ Certain exceptions to this pattern are discussed by Paul (2009), who concludes that *ny* signals familiarity but that this is defeasible when *ny* is required for independent reasons. In later work, Paul (2016) shows that Standard Malagasy differs from other Malagasy dialects in this respect.

DEF house that
'that house'

DEF issue this
'this issue'

In Manado Malay, unlike Malagasy, definiteness marking is completely independent from grammatical function; it appears on both subjects and objects regardless of predicate type.² Furthermore, unlike Jakarta Indonesian, identifiability is often obligatorily marked in Manado Malay, having developed into a canonical tracking strategy from its previous recognitional use, following the classification of Himmelmann (2006). While both varieties share a similar grammaticalized function of the third singular possessive to mark associative anaphora, Manado Malay, and eastern varieties more generally, have grammaticalized the demonstrative into a true definite marker, which Jakarta Indonesian lacks.

Baba Malay, a variety of Malay associated with the Hokkien speaking population of Melaka, is, in one respect, a mirror image of Manado Malay. Here, *ini* 'this' and *itu* 'that' function as demonstratives in *pre*-nominal position but as definite articles in *post*-nominal position. In (14), we find post-nominal *itu* modifying 'sun', signaling uniqueness in a way that is unattested in Standard Indonesian as well as the Jakarta dialect.

(14) *Baba Malay* (Thurgood 2001:479)

tengok [matahari **itu**] chahya-nya merah lagi, tetapi dia sudah turun di-seblah kanan
see sun that glow-3S.GEN red more but 3s already descend on-side right
'did you see the sun glowing red, but it has already set on its right side.'

Kratochvíl et al (2018:64) suggest that the post-nominal distal demonstrative (but not the proximate one) in the Singapore Malay variety they examine also operates as a tracking strategy and further support their claims with data from English code-switching where *itu* appears to alternate with *the*.

2.3 Third singular genitive > definite determiner

As discussed in Chapter 7, there is no clear definite determiner in Indonesian, as the Indonesian facts are more subtle than suggested by the literature. Nonetheless, a number of previous works identify *-nya*, the historical third genitive singular pronoun, as a definite marker, which appears more plausible for colloquial Jakartan than the more formal language.³ While *-nya* does not appear to signal uniqueness in any variety, it does at least appear to mark identifiability (Englebretson 2003:161, Sneddon 2006:34), typically via associative anaphora, in Jakartan. In simple contexts like (15), the difference between a bare noun and one marked with *-nya* translates straightforwardly into English as a definiteness distinction.

(15) Aku lihat {tikus/tikus-nya} tadi pagi
1SG see rat rat-NYA earlier morning
'I saw a/the rat earlier this morning.'

² I would attribute this more to the increased transitivity of the Malay actor voice verb rather than to any differences in the determiner system.

³ As Sneddon (2006:34) remarks with regard to Jakartan Indonesian, "The functions of *-nya* are many and varied and are not entirely well-understood. For some functions there is considerable variation in usage between different people."

For present purposes, we thus put aside our reasons for not treating *-nya* as a canonical (i.e., type <<e,t>,e>) definite determiner (but see Chapter 7 for details), and broaden our definition to include general markers of identifiability.

Semantic bleaching of a third singular genitive pronoun to become a general marker of associative anaphora takes place in a wide yet geographically contiguous zone across the southernmost islands of Indonesia, from Sumatra in the west to Balinese in the east, including Javanese (Ewing 1995) and Sundanese (Müller-Gotama 2001). Examples from south Sumatra and the island of Madura, adjacent to eastern Java, can be seen in (16) and (17).

- | | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------------|
| (16) | <i>Lampung</i> (Walker 1976:16) | (17) | <i>Madurese</i> (Davies 2010:110) |
| | Kaci-ni xayang nihan | | Sengko' senneng dha' guru-na. |
| | dog-DEF skinny very | | 1sg happy to teacher-DEF |
| | 'The dog is very skinny.' | | 'I like the/my teacher.' |

Balinese represents an interesting case, as the third singular genitive pronoun *-ne* (< PMP *=niya) appears to have grammaticalized into a further reduced form *-é*, which is described as a canonical definite determiner. The wide distribution of Jakarta Indonesian *-nya* is thus split in Balinese between the anaphoric function, shown in (18a) and the genitive function, in (18b).

- | | | |
|------|--|----------------------------------|
| (18) | <i>Balinese</i> (Shiohara & Artawa 2015:141) | |
| | a. jemakang uyah-é | b. jemakang uyah-né! |
| | take salt-DEF | take salt-3SG.GEN |
| | 'Take the salt (e.g., on the table).' | 'Take his/her/its/their salt.' |

As shown by Shiohara & Artawa (2015) in (19), the associative (“bridging”) function is still obligatorily indicated by the genitive, as in Indonesian. Here, the definite *-é* is infelicitous.

- (19) *Balinese* (Shiohara & Artawa 2015:147)
- Umah icang-é resem. Kakus{-né/*-é} uwug, raab{-né/*-é} bolong
house 1SG-DEF shabby. toilet-3.GEN/-DEF broken, roof-3.GEN/-DEF have.hole
‘My house is shabby. The (lit. its) toilet is broken and the (lit. its) roof has a hole.’

On the other hand, uniqueness must be signalled by *-é* and not *-né*, as seen in (20).

- (20) *Balinese* (Shiohara & Artawa 2015:145)
- Bulan-é galang magladaran ibi peteng
moon-DEF bright very yesterday night
‘The moon was very bright last night.’

The stages in the grammaticalization of the third singular genitive pronoun (PMP *=niya) are posited schematically in (21):

- (21) 3SG.GEN > GENERAL POSSESSIVE > ASSOCIATIVE > DEFINITE ARTICLE

This progression can be accounted for by semantic bleaching and has close cross-linguistic parallels in Uralic (Gerland 2014), as well as Ethiopic languages (Rubin 2010). Ewing (1995) sees the definite marking function of Cirebon Javanese third singular genitive pronoun as an

extension of its possessive function, indicating that, “the referent is associated with a general set of ideas or knowledge evoked within the discourse.” In other words, the genitive pronoun has extended its function of indicating possession by a sentient being to indicating that an argument belongs to a discourse situation. As belonging to a discourse situation implies identifiability in the normal case, the historical pronoun now approximates a definite determiner in its function.

2.4 Relativizers as definiteness markers

Relative markers appear to overlap systematically with definite readings in a number of languages, although it is unclear whether an Austronesian relativizer has ever been fully grammaticalized into a canonical definite article. Mayani (2013) gives a minimal pair in which the lack of relativizer correlates to a generic reading while its presence relates to a specific or definite interpretation, as seen in (22).

(22) *Tajio* (Mayani 2013:160)

- | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|---------------------|-----------------|
| a. | siia seelu=nya | te=vevine | ne-lenda | te=vuvut=nya |
| | 3SG like=3SG.GEN | NM=woman | ST.RLS-long | NM=hair=3SG.GEN |
| | ‘He likes long-haired women.’ | | | |
| b. | siia seelu=nya | te=vevine | to =ne-lenda | te=vuvut=nya |
| | 3SG like=3SG.GEN | NM=woman | RELT=ST.RLS-long | NM=hair=3SG.GEN |
| | ‘He likes the/a woman with long hair.’ | | | |

Similarly, Dili Tetun, which has no obligatory marking for (in)definiteness, employs *mak* in contexts like (23).

(23) *Dili Tetun* (Williams van-Klinken et al 2002:69)

- | | | | |
|----|--|----|-----------------------|
| a. | Hau mestri | b. | Hau mak mestri |
| | 1SG teacher.MSC | | 1SG FOC teacher.MSC |
| | ‘I am a teacher.’ | | ‘I am the teacher.’ |
| c. | Nia kík liu | d. | Nia mak kík liu |
| | 3s small more | | 3s FOC small more |
| | ‘He is very small’ or ‘He is smaller.’ | | ‘He is the smallest.’ |

While *mak* is glossed as a focus marker by Williams van-Klinken et al. (2002) it appears to descend from a relative marker, and still functions as such in other varieties of Tetun. Note that Indonesian behaves identically in this regard, as seen in the parallel examples in (24).

(24) *Indonesian*

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------|----|---------------------|
| a. | Saya guru | b. | Saya yang guru |
| | 1SG teacher | | 1SG RELT teacher |
| | ‘I am a teacher.’ | | ‘I am the teacher.’ |

However, both Tetun *mak* and Indonesian *yang* appear restricted to predicates in this function and cannot be easily applied to arguments without additional context, as shown by (25), as discussed further in Chapter 7.

(25) *Indonesian*

Saya lihat yang anjing
 1SG see RELT dog
 *‘I see the dog.’ OK ‘I see the one that’s a dog.’

Superlative predicates, as in (26) and (27), typically require a relativizer in Indonesian languages and may thus function as a bridge to more general definiteness marking.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(26) <i>Mualang</i> (Tjia 2007:121)
 Ia ti panay da ntara sida’ menyadi’
 3S RELT smart LOC between 3P sibling
 ‘He is the smartest among those siblings.’</p> | <p>(27) <i>Nias Selatan</i> (Brown 2001:455)
 S=a-lawa-ra ndrao
 RELT=ST-tall-3P.GEN 1S.MUT
 ‘I am the tallest of them.’</p> |
|--|---|

Sri Lankan Malay Creole (SLM) appears to have gone the furthest in reanalyzing the relativizer as a definite determiner although it does double duty as an object marker, much like accusative case markers in Hebrew, Turkish and other languages.⁴

- (28) *Sri Lankan Malay* (Slomanson 2006:149)
- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>a. Ali obat makang
 Ali obat eat
 ‘Ali takes medicine.’</p> | <p>b. Ali obat-nya/yang makang
 Ali obat-DEF.ACC eat
 ‘Ali takes the medicine.’</p> |
|--|---|

Relativization is thus only a weakly attested strategy for definiteness marking in Austronesian, although Van Minde (2008) and the sources cited therein suggest that it applied more widely in historical varieties of Malay. This may be due to the composition of the relativizer, which includes both a pronominal element as well as a linker (Kaufman 2018).

2.5 Verbal distributive > indefinite object

Muna displays a nominative-accusative alignment with little trace of the Austronesian voice distinction in main clause predications. Despite its typological distance from Philippine languages, undergoer definiteness is still of crucial importance to Muna verbal morphosyntax. As van den Berg (1995) shows, Muna verbs fall into several semantically motivated classes that determine their choice of prefix when used intransitively, as in (29). With transitive verbs, as in (30), however, we find that the definiteness of the object correlates with the verbal prefix employed.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(29) <i>Muna</i> (Van den Berg 1995:164)</p> <p>a. a-losa
 ‘I emerge, come through’</p> <p>b. ae-lobhi
 ‘I hit, cut’</p> | <p>(30) <i>Muna</i> (Van den Berg 1995:162)</p> <p>a. a-uta kalei-no
 1S.RL-pick banana-his
 ‘I pick(ed) his banana(s).’</p> <p>b. ae-uta kalei</p> |
|---|---|

⁴ The definite accusative suffix surfaces as *nya*, *yang* and *nyang* in different dialects of SLM and its origins are debated (see Slomanson 2006, Ansaldo 2009, Nordhoff 2009 for different proposals). Because both the relativizer *yang* and the genitive marker *nya* overlap with definiteness in Malay varieties it is not simple to trace the SLM suffix to one or the other source. Note though that the presence of *nyang* in SLM, which is a variant of the relativizer *yang* in other varieties of Malay, suggests strongly that the relativizer had a role, as argued by Slomanson (2006).

signal undergoer definiteness via object agreement rather than by voice or case marking, as seen in the comparison in (33).

- (33) *Tobelo* (Holton 2003:67)
- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|----|-------------------------|
| a. | o-pine t-a-ija | b. | o-pine to-ija |
| | NM-rice 1-3-buy | | NM-rice 1-buy |
| | 'I bought the rice.' | | 'I went rice-shopping.' |

3.0. Conclusion

It was noted in Chapter 7 that Indonesian *-nya*, despite being widely considered a definite article in the previous literature, is far from typical in this function. First, it seems that any time one of the two demonstratives (*ini* PROXIMATE and *itu* DISTAL) can be used felicitously, it becomes infelicitous to use *-nya*. For instance, Dardjowidjojo (1983) notes the unacceptability of (34), where the definite referent *daerah* can only take a demonstrative modifier as opposed to *-nya*.

- (34) *Indonesian* (Dardjowidjojo 1983:197)
- | |
|---|
| Rumah ini paling mahal di daerah[%-nya / ini] |
| house this most expensive PREP area-3S.GEN / this |
| 'This house is the most expensive in the area.' |

Second, Dardjowidjojo also notes a difference in grammatical relations in which definite subjects tend strongly to be marked by *-nya* but other ("non-nuclear") relations avoid *-nya*, despite having a definite referent, as seen in the comparison in (35).

- (35) *Indonesian* (Dardjowidjojo 1983:233)
- | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------------|
| a. | Tolong, tulis-lah di papan tulis(%-nya) | (<i>papan tulis</i> = oblique) |
| | please write-EMPH PREP blackboard-3S.GEN | |
| | 'Please write on the blackboard.' | |
| b. | Tolong, papan tulis%(-nya) di-hapus | (<i>papan tulis</i> = subject) |
| | please blackboard-3S.GEN PV-erase | |
| | 'Please erase the blackboard.' (Lit. 'Let the blackboard be erased.') | |

Finally, Chapter 7 notes that *-nya* may appear on pronouns, as in (36), and thus cannot be consistently analyzed as a (type <<e,t>,e>) definite determiner even when it is felicitous.

- (36) *Indonesian*
- | |
|-------------------------------|
| Kamu-nya yang salah. |
| 2s-3S.GEN RELT wrong |
| 'You're the one who's wrong.' |

Although we have not attempted a formal account of this pattern, we have seen that the languages of interest here have innovated a variety of strategies for indicating definiteness after the loss of the original Austronesian case marking determiners with each strategy still carrying a trace of its grammatical source. In the case of Indonesian *-nya*, whose origin can be traced clearly to a third person genitive pronoun, we find that definiteness is perhaps a side-effect of flagging a referent as belonging to the scenario at hand, which may begin to explain some of the behavior in

(34)-(36) above (especially if subjects require more discourse linking than non-subjects, as is cross-linguistically typical). Further study may reveal a larger diachronic typology wherein demonstrative-type determiners indicate identifiability through discourse anaphora (see, for instance, Shiohara and Jukes 2018: 133) while other strategies display yet other paths to identifiability. To the extent that these different strategies can be delineated by semantic diagnostics, they will provide especially rich material for the cross-linguistic study of definiteness. Regardless of whether an evolutionary approach best explains this diversity, it is clear that a more nuanced approach should be taken in the analysis and labeling of determiners in the languages of this region.

References

- Aldridge, Edith. 2011. Antipassive in Austronesian alignment change, in *Grammatical Change: Origins, Nature, Outcomes*, Dianne Jonas, John Whitman, and Andrew Garrett (eds.). Oxford: OUP.
- Ansaldo, Umberto. 2009. *Contact Languages: Ecology and Evolution in Asia*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Artawa, I Ketut. 2013. The Basic Verb Construction in Balinese, in Alexander Adelaar (ed.), *Voice Variation in Austronesian Languages of Indonesia*. Special of *NUSA* 54: 5-27.
- Brown, Lea. 2001. *A Grammar of Nias Selatan*. PhD Dissertation, University of Sydney.
- Dahl, Otto Christian. 1951. *Malgache et Maanyan. Une comparaison linguistique*. Avhandlingertuttet av Instituttet 3, Oslo: Egede Instituttet
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1983. "A classifier, *itu*, *-nya* or none of the above: the way the Indonesian mind operates," in Soenjono Dardjowidjojo and John M.W. Verhaar (eds.), *Miscellaneous studies of Indonesian and other languages in Indonesia, Part VII*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA, Universitas Katolik Indonesian Atma Jaya. (NUSA 15).
- Davies, William D. 2010. *A Grammar of Madurese*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Eades, Domenyk. 2005. *A Grammar of Gayo: A language of Aceh, Sumatra*. Canberra: RSPAS, Australian National University.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2003. *Searching for Structure: the Problem of Complementation in Colloquial Indonesian Conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ewing, Michael. 1995. Two pathways to identifiability in Cirebon Javanese. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 21(2):72. DOI: [10.3765/bls.v21i2.3389](https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v21i2.3389)
- Gerland, Doris. 2014. Definitely not possessed? Possessive suffixes with definiteness marking function. In Thomas Gamerschlag, Doris Gerland, Rainer Osswald & Wiebke Petersen (eds.), *Frames and concept types*, 269–292. Cham: Springer.
- Hemmings, Charlotte. 2021. When an antipassive isn't an antipassive anymore: The Actor Voice construction in Kelabit. In *Antipassive: typology, diachrony and related constructions*, Katarzyna Janic and Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.), p.579-620. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 1997. Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur. Number 362 in *Linguistische Arbeiten*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2006. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In *Studies in Anaphora*, Barbara A. Fox (ed.), 205-254. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. 2016. Notes on "noun phrase structure" in Tagalog. In *Explorations of the Syntax-Semantics Interface*, volume 3 of *Studies in Language and Cognition*, 319–341. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press.

- Hopper, Paul J and Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2):251-299.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2009. Inner causatives and the reconstruction of the Proto-Austronesian affixes *pa-, *pa<R>- and *pa<ŋ>-. International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics XI, Aussois, France
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2018. Austronesian predication and the emergence of biclausal clefts in Indonesian languages. In Perspectives on information structure in Austronesian languages, ed. Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara, and Atsuko Utsumi, *Studies in Diversity Linguistics*, 207–245. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Kratochvíl, František, Nur Izdihar Binte Ismail and Diyana Hamzah. 2018. Stance, categorisation, and information structure in Malay. In Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara and Atsuko Utsumi (eds.), *Perspectives on Information Structure in Austronesian Languages*, 41-80. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayani, Luh Anik. 2013. *A Grammar of Tajio: A Language Spoken in Central Sulawesi*. PhD Dissertation, University of Cologne.
- McFarland, C. D. 1978. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. In Studies in Philippine Linguistics, ed. C. Edrial-Luzares and A. Hale, volume 2, 139–182. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Mead, David. 1998. *Proto-Bungku-Tolaki: Reconstruction of its Phonology and Aspects of its Morphosyntax*. PhD Dissertation, Rice University.
- Müller-Gotama, Franz. 2001. *Sundanese*. Munich: LINCOM.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1981. A grammar of Toba-Batak. Pacific Linguistics, Series D. Canberra: Dept. of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, ANU.
- Nordhoff, Sebastian. 2009. *A Grammar of Upcountry Sri Lanka Malay*. Utrecht: University of Amsterdam.
- Paul, Ileana. 2009. On the presence versus absence of determiners in Malagasy. In *Determiners: universals and variation*, eds. Jila Ghomeshi, Ileana Paul and Martina Wiltschko, 215-242. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Paul, Ileana. 2016. When bare nouns scope wide. The case of Malagasy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(1):271-305.
- Riesberg, Sonja. 2014. *Symmetrical Voice and Linking in Western Austronesian Languages*. Boston/Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 2002. The History and Transitivity of Western Austronesian Voice and Voice Marking, in Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 17–62.
- Rubin, Aaron D. 2010. The development of the Amharic definite article and an Indonesian parallel. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 55(1): 103–114.
- Shiohara, Asako and Ketut Artawa. 2015. The definite marker in Balinese. Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Information Structure of Austronesian Languages, 25 December 2015.
- Shiohara, Asako and Anthony Jukes. 2018. Two definite markers in Manado Malay. In Sonja Riesberg, Asako Shiohara and Atsuko Utsumi (eds.), *Perspectives on Information Structure in Austronesian Languages*, 115-135. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Slomanson, Peter. 2006. Sri Lankan Malay Morphosyntax: Lankan or Malay? in Ana Deumert and Stephanie Durrleman-Tame (eds.), *Structure and Variation in Language Contact*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 135–58.

- Sneddon, James. 2006. *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian*. Canberra: RSPAS, Australian National University.
- Thieberger, Nicholas. 2006. *A Grammar of South Efate: An Oceanic language of Vanuatu*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Thurgood, Elzbieta. 2001. The development of articles in Baba Malay. *Anthropological Linguistics* 43(1): 471-490.
- Tjia, Johnny. 2007. *A Grammar of Mualang: An Ibanic Language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. PhD Dissertation, Leiden University.
- Walker, Dale F. 1976. *A Grammar of the Lampung Language: the Pesisir Dialect of Way Lima*. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA.
- Walton, Charles. 1986. *Sama Verbal Semantics: Classification, Derivation and Inflection*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Williams-van Klinken, Catharina, John Hajek and Rachel Nordlinger 2002. *Tetun Dili: A Grammar of an East Timorese Language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Van den Berg, René. 1989. *A Grammar of the Muna Language*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Van den Berg, René. 1995. Verb classes, transitivity, and the definiteness shift in Muna: a counterexample to the Transitivity Hypothesis. *Oceanic Linguistics* 34: 161-189.
- Van den Berg, René. 2010. Elusive Articles in Sulawesi: Between Syntax and Prosody, in Niclas Burenhult, Arthur Holmer, Anastasia Karlsson, Håkan Lundström and Jan-Olof Svantesson (eds.), *Language Documentation and Description, Volume 10: Special Issue on Humanities of the Lesser-Known: New Directions in the Description, Documentation and Typology of Endangered Languages and Musics*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 208-27.
- Van Minde, D. 2008. The Pragmatic function of Malay yang. *Journal of Pragmatics* 40: 1982-2001.
- Van der Tuuk, Herman Neubronner. 1971. *A Grammar of Toba Batak*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. [Original Dutch version 1864-1867].
- Zobel, Erik. 2002. The Position of Chamorro and Palauan in the Austronesian Family Tree: Evidence from Verb Morphology and Morphosyntax, in Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross (eds.), *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 405-34.