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### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Axis (the object of a preposition in a prepositional phrase, i.e., the object of a Director in an endocentric construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>act.foc.</td>
<td>action focus marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjn.</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv.</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag.</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag.foc.</td>
<td>agent focus marking prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag.m.</td>
<td>Agent marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allt.</td>
<td>allative suffix (indicates that the action of the verb moves toward or onto the object of the verb, or is directed toward or onto it, or is applied to it (cf. Macdonald and Soenjono 1967:90))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act.</td>
<td>definite Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def.Art.</td>
<td>Definite Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defoc.</td>
<td>defocused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elab.</td>
<td>Elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encl.</td>
<td>Enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESM</td>
<td>Event Sequence Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.indef.</td>
<td>indefinite verbal prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon.</td>
<td>Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef. Act</td>
<td>indefinite Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indef.art.</td>
<td>indefinite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.m.</td>
<td>location marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.Cl.</td>
<td>Nominalized Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part.</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past m.</td>
<td>past marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pred.</td>
<td>Predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pref.</td>
<td>prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro.</td>
<td>protoform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron.</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop.N</td>
<td>Proper Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt.</td>
<td>Patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pt.foc.</td>
<td>patient focus marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTP</td>
<td>Paya Tu Naqpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punct.</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.Part.</td>
<td>Question Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Referential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rel.pron.</td>
<td>relative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rt.</td>
<td>Root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Speech Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spec.</td>
<td>specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Str.</td>
<td>Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Topicalized Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Topic Marker (on the sentence level: pun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM'</td>
<td>Topic Marker (on the phrase level: ng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEStr.</td>
<td>Unmarked Embedded Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vb.Pref.</td>
<td>Verbal Prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd.pers.pron.</td>
<td>third person pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The data under analysis is taken from the first story of Hikayat Patani (HP) as is found in *Hikayat Patani - The story of Patani*, edited by Andries Teeuw and David K. Wyatt, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970, pages 68 to 71. This first story is an account of the founding of the town of Patani; it is comprised of 45 sentences in total. My main interest in writing this study is basically an attempt to discover the strategies that the reporting narrator and the reported narrators used in building up this particular text. Many of these strategies are not used in either modern Indonesian or modern Malay.

Prior to coming out with the findings and the generalizations that I include in this work, I started out with a thick description of the whole text. Basically what it is is a thorough description of the whole text from discourse down to word level and sometimes down to morpheme level when it seemed relevant, illuminating, and necessary. The description was presented in the form of tree diagrams and the nodes of the diagrams are labelled using Pike and Pike's (1976) four-cell tagmeme analysis as can be seen in section 2.6.4. (Chapter 2). The purpose of this thick description was for me to get a thorough understanding of how the system of the text and its units work before making any inferences or generalizations. The following is sentence 13 in the Malay text of the first story of HP, as an illustration of this thick description. It is broken down into four tree-diagrams (Displays 1.1.1.-1.1.4.).

Malay with morpheme gloss

(13) Arakian setelah datang=lah pada conn. after this then come=CM to
kehōsan hari=nya maka baginda pun tomorrow day=the conn. his majesty TM
berangkat=lah dengan segala menteri depart=CM with all minister
huñubalang=nya di=iring=kan officer=the/ he pt.foc. =accompany=act.foc.
oleh ra'yat sekalian by people all

Free translation

The following morning the king departed with all his ministers and officers, and accompanied by his people.

Note:

- Time Setting conn(ective) Cl(ause) conjoins two series of events;
- Arakian: initial punctuation for sentence cluster or paragraph level;
- maka: initial punctuation for sentence and clause level; in terms of role it is an event sequence sentence marker in a discourse;
- Core and Elabor(oration) contain the event of motion towards location;
- Core and Elaboration, in terms of cohesion, are referential in nature, while precore is textual;
- Precore in general has to do with preceding units of the text (prior text units), and Elaboration in general has to do with the units of the text that follow it (development or elaboration of the text).

Display 1.1.1. Tree Diagram

Arakian setelah datanglah pada keesokan harinya, ...
'The following morning, ...'
(for an explanation of all abbreviations see p.v)
Display 1.1.2. Tree Diagram

... baginda pun berangkatlah ...
'... the King departed ...'

Display 1.1.3. Tree Diagram

... dengan segala menteri hulubalangnya ...
'... with all his ministers and officers ...'
This thick description in preliminary stages of my analysis proved to be very useful for the purpose that has been stated above, i.e. to discover the strategies that were used in building up this text. However, the degree of details is so overwhelming that if I presented them here in my finished work it would be confusing rather than illuminating.

The main reason for me to leave out the thick description is that the focus in this work is on levels above the clause. In addition to this, I discuss and justify the clause-like embedded structures, the Yang Embedded Structures and the Unmarked Embedded ones, and those particles that are defined textually because they reveal some things of the nature of the levels above the clause: the conclusion markers arakian and demikian, the definite articles ini 'this' and itu 'that', the event sequence sentence marker maka, the evaluation marker syahdan, the marker of the change in the action or the event in an episode hatta, the topic marker pun and the comment marker -lah.

1.2. SUMMARY

The following is a summary of each consecutive chapter in this work. Chapter 2 presents a review of some of the literature within linguistics, anthropology and literary criticism that in one way or another are related to or have affected my work. Pike and Pike's four-cell tagmemic analysis as presented in Jones 1977 provides theoretical framework. Hopper 1976, Teeuw and Wyatt 1970, and Errington 1974 provide me with data and insights. Becker 1977 and his other essay 'Text building, epistemology, and aesthetics in Javanese shadow theatre' (to appear in Becker and Yengoyan, eds) provide me both theoretical framework, and insightful methodology. Chapter 3, interpretive analysis of the
text, i.e. the first story of part I of HP, which is the core of my work, consists of six parts: 1) the text and its translation; 2) Overall Structure; 3) Bahasa; 4) Naming and Etymologising; 5) Particles; and 6) Construction types, which in turn consists of 6.1) pun-lah constructions; 6.2) Frame-Content Constructions; 6.3) -lah constructions; 6.4) Other constructions; and 6.5) Embedded Structures.

The first part of Chapter 3 consists of the text in Malay accompanied by an interlinear and a free translation. The second part presents the text as a text unit that is part of a larger context, i.e. as the first story of part I of HP, and also as a text unit that in turn is composed of smaller ones. I claim in this part that the sequence of temporal adverbials is used by the narrators as a strategy to mark the outline of the text. Part 3, bahasa, deals with distancing, showing honour and deference, speaking up and speaking down as reflected in the speech act participants' vocabulary, manners, and gestures depending on who speaks to whom and on what occasion. Part 4 deals with naming and etymologizing as strategies to build texts on. Part 5 deals with particles that function as signals of certain text units and also of certain temporal aspects in the text. Part 6 has to do with construction types that occur in the text. The first type, the pun-lah construction, consists of three parts: a precore, a core (pun-lah part) and an elaboration, which is a further development of the core. The second type, Frame-Content construction type, consists of a preframe, a frame and a content part. The third type, the -lah construction type, are sentences that contain new information on the content or lexical level and on the meta-level, signalled by the comment marking particle -lah. In the subsection 'other constructions' I will describe transition sentences or constructions that occur between two pun-lah constructions or between a pun-lah construction and a pun variant of the pun-lah construction type. In the subsection 'embedded structures' I will discuss two kinds of embedded structures: the marked (yang) embedded structures and the unmarked embedded structures.

Chapter 4 presents a summary of things that have been discovered and discussed in my work. It also presents things that remain to be done, i.e. problems or hypotheses the truth of which needs to be verified by more evidence.
Chapter 2
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents a review of some of the literature within linguistics, anthropology and literary criticism that in some ways are related to or have affected my work. The effects of these works are of three kinds:

(1) The kind that provides theoretical framework: Pike and Pike's four-cell tag-memic analysis via Jones 1977.

(2) The kind that provides data and insights:
   (a) Hopper's (1976) discussion of the sequence of clauses marked with -lah viewed as the crucial foci of the narrative, i.e. it provides a synopsis of the dynamic line of the episode of the passage that he analyzed. His remarks of pun attached to topic which are not completely new to the narrative, but which have not been the most recent participant mentioned.
   (b) Teeuw and Wyatt's making available the Malay text of Hikayat Patani, their discussion of the meaning of the names of participants in the first two stories of Hikayat Patani.
   (c) Errington's (1974) generalized discussion of the notion of bahasa.

(3) The kind that provides both theoretical framework, and data and insights.
   (a) Becker's article 'Text-building, epistemology and aesthetics in Javanese Shadow Theatre' which provides the following kinds of relations:
      (i) Textual coherence
      (ii) Text within text: the Javanese art of invention
      (iii) Intentionality in a text: the uses of texture
      (iv) Reference
   (b) Another Becker article (1977), 'The figure a sentence makes: an interpretation of a Classical Malay sentence' which is a thorough study of a prototypical Malay pun-lah sentence.

2.2. TEEUW AND WYATT: HIKAYAT PATANI - THE STORY OF PATANI

What Teeuw and Wyatt do is, basically, contextualize the HP, which is a conceptually distant text, and make it available to modern readers, especially in the world outside Patani. As they put it in the preface, 'In any case [we]
hope that the book will help to give a better knowledge and understanding of the Malay world of Patani to both Eastern and Western readers.' (1970:viii). More specifically what they do is to 1) present a short history of Patani, including the probable date when it was founded and the dates of the reign of its rulers; 2) discuss different versions of HP and decide which is the most accurate one among them; 3) present its overall structure: discuss the nature of the authors of each part, the date when each part was written, and the style of language; 4) present Hikayat Patani (the Malay text); 5) give a translation of HP; 6) provide commentary for each story of all the parts of HP; 7) present a conclusion which discusses the reason why HP was written.

In discussing the first story of Part I of HP what they mainly do is 1) relate the story of the foundation of Patani to other stories of similar nature, i.e. all of them share the fact that the settlements were founded on the spot where a royal hound encounters a white mousedeer; 2) relate the story to other stories that are based on the popular belief that states that the name of the settlement is taken from Pak Tani; 3) relate the story to other stories in Malay literature and folklore about the foundation of Patani; 4) discuss the etymology of the inland town of Kota Maligai; and 5) discuss the meaning of the names of participants mentioned in the first two stories, in the persons of the King of Maligai, his son the first ruler of Patani, and the latter's three children.

2.3. HOPPER

In his article 'Focus and aspects in discourse grammar' (1976), Hopper isolates devices for indicating foregrounding and event sequencing in the mid-19th century narrative prose of the Malaccan writer Abdullah bin Abdul-Kadir Munshi. The passages that he chose are taken from Abdullah's autobiography, commonly known as the Hikayat Abdullah, and his Voyage, known as the Kesah Pelayaran Abdullah. Regarding these devices he reports the following:

In Malay narrative language, kinetically new events which are highly relevant to the story line are marked by suffixing the particle -lah to the verb. In such sentences, the verb generally appears in the initial position. This initial verb is without the prefix meng-, which, when attached to lexically specified verbs, denotes 'active voice'. If the verb is transitive and is in the key narrative function, it is invariably in some form of the passive. (1976:7,8)

After isolating all the events marked with the particle -lah and ignoring the others in one of these passages, he observes that the clauses marked with -lah:

provide a synopsis of the dynamic line of the episode, in the sense that without them the story would be unintelligible. They are successive events, each one dependent on the completion of the preceding one. (1976:9) ... the clauses not marked with -lah are incidental and supportive, or denote events which occur 'off-stage'; they are not skeletal, kinetic events, but are essentially subsidiary ones. (1976:8)

In other words, clauses marked with -lah are viewed as the crucial foci of the narrative and the ones not marked with -lah are not.
Regarding topicalization he observes the following:

This initial position of the verb, and the absence of the meng-prefix on the verb [as talked about above in footnote 3], are not found if the subject is 'topicalized', i.e. is placed ahead of the verb. Topicalization takes place under quite restricted discourse conditions, namely when the subject is not new in the narrative, has been mentioned fairly recently (almost always in the clause preceding the previous clause) and is not identical with the last named possible subject. (1976:8)

Regarding M.B. Lewis' grammar, he makes the following remarks:

I have felt it worthwhile to quote Lewis on the use of -lah and pun for two reasons. One is that, although standard grammars of Malay correctly describe the focusing function of -lah (misleadingly naming it an 'emphatic' function, however), they have consistently missed the rule-governed nature of its use in narrative, typically dismissing its appearance with qualifiers such as sometimes, frequently, etc. Moreover, the 'preterite' function of -lah mentioned by Lewis is seen as independent of its focusing function. It is only when a discourse analysis of -lah is approached that the essential unity of these two features can be seen. Similarly, the use of pun is also far from being an arbitrary choice of the writer. Pun is attached to topics which are not completely new to the narrative, but which have not been the most recent participant mentioned. -lah is a focusing particle, whose function is to indicate that the word of which it is a part, as well as any dependent clauses, are a central part of the narrative, and are foregrounded. These two functions - foregrounding and focusing - are not separable, but are aspects of one and the same principle. (1976:11)

Hopper also manages to relate the focusing function of the -lah particle to its extended function as a past tense marker or a completed aspect marker. Regarding this he says:

We have seen that the aoristic function of -lah requires a condition of strict sequentiality with the preceding verb + -lah clause. This sequential (non-overlapping) property of -lah involves necessarily a view of the action which it signifies as something completed; the next turn of events in the narrative cannot be initiated until the preceding event signalled by -lah has been completed. In narrative, therefore, the idea of anteriority is strongly attached to -lah, so much so that in some contexts it has a clear 'plerfect' sense, provided the principle of strict chronological sequentiality is observed. (1976:11-12)

According to him, this preterite function is discourse conditioned. Hence it is clear that this can hardly be a 'preterite' in the sense of the 'past tense' of English and German.
2.4. ERRINGTON

I will review here in general terms what Errington discusses in her dissertation, 'A study of genre: Meaning and form in the Malay Hikayat Hang Tuah' (1975:1-7). Basically what she does is explicate the text and by so doing reveal something of its coherence (form) and meaning. That is to say, that she explains the meaning of the text, parts of the text, especially key terms such as bahasa, tahu, raja by relating them to the context they occur in; in other words, she shows what premises the hikayat is based upon.

In explicating the text as a genre she points out that although hikayat come in the form of written texts, in their original context they were more analogous to performances than they are to 'literature' as it is known in the Western tradition. To elaborate on this let me quote what she says:

Hikayat were read aloud to an audience, not in private silence. In the performance, which involved no equipment, pictures, or puppets, the narrator's vocal skill and the quality of his voice became of paramount importance in rendering the hikayat's sound and meaning and it seems clear, too, that the sound of the beautifully modulated voice was thought to have an effect in its own right. Indeed, the sound, the meaning, and the effect on the listeners were probably considered to be part of the same inseparable whole. (1975:1)

Because of 'this emphasis on the unity of sound and meaning in the hikayat as well as its oral performance' she says that 'hikayat are probably more analogous to the Javanese wayang kulit performances than they are to the texts of the West, either of history or of literature.' Furthermore she states that 'as in wayang kulit, the plots of hikayat are diverse: no one hikayat can claim to be the one origin myth or paradigmatic statement about the Malays.'

Another characteristic which she points out, which she actually gets from Professor Bastin (Bastin 1964) is that figures in hikayat have no interiority. Professor Bastin has declared that an 'inside' view of Malay history is impossible, because Malay works have no 'personalities', by which he means that there is no character development and that readers are never given access to a figure's point of view. We are never given, for instance, an insight into an interior motive, a reflection, a diary - in short never told how the world appeared to a given character or to the author (for an authorial point of view is also lacking). Without point of view or motive, it is difficult for us to either discern or imagine what might be the reasons or impulses behind a figure's actions.

Another hindrance to a Western audience's understanding, she points out, is the lack of temporal framework. Periods of time are sometimes mentioned - 'the palace was built in forty days' - but they are never linked so as to form an unbroken temporal referent line to which events could be related.

(Note: these two last characteristics are seen from the point of view of Westerners, not from the point of view of the Malay people.)

The premises (1975:32-33) that the hikayat Hang Tuah is based on are:
(1) The sultan (called 'raja' in the hikayat) provided a principle which organized the story's events in a way which is analogous to the notion of 'time' in Western histories.
(2) The raja is the fixed reference through which the world's ordering makes sense.
(3) The raja's presence gives a shape to society's totality.

(4) The society is defined or given shape by bahasa, a term which in Modern Malay means 'culture', 'language', and 'good manners'. In Part One (of Hikayat Hang Tuah), bahasa means all those, but it is clear that it means not a culture or a language but culture, society and language themselves, which are all part of a single whole. Within Part One, there is no conception of social form outside bahasa; people, events, and places outside bahasa are imaged as simply anarchic.

(5) Social cohesion within society appears to depend on the raja's giving royal beneficence to his subjects, and their returning to him homage in the form of gifts or deference expressed through speeches and body-stance. This perfect relation of a raja bestowing beneficence and his followers offering homage is, in a profound sense, eventless.

(6) If the relationship, expressed in the forms of bahasa, is broken, events occur.

2.5. BECKER

2.5.1. 'The figure a sentence makes: an interpretation of a classical Malay sentence'

In this article, which is a study of the Classical Malay sentence:

\[
\text{Sa-telah demikian maka Sang Bimanyu pun berjalan-lah sambil} \\
\text{Bimanyu walk while} \\
\text{menchium bau bunga2an menghibarkan hati-nya itu, naik} \\
\text{sniff smell flowers entertain heart(liver) ascend} \\
\text{bukit turun bukit berapa gunong dan jurang dilalui} \\
\text{hill descend hill many mountain and valley pass over}
\]

taken from page 34 of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka edition (1964) of the Hikayat Pandawa Lima, edited by Khalid Hussain, Becker came out with the following interesting observations:

(1) There is a clear need in Classical Malay to distinguish between sentence structure and clause structure - and between sentence function and clause function. Some features of sentences as distinct from clauses in Classical Malay that he lists are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Topic-event structure</td>
<td>Subject-predicate structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Topic initial is unmarked</td>
<td>Predicate initial is unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Post-positional particles (pun, -lah) mark relations</td>
<td>Prefixes on predicates (meng-, di-) mark relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Referentially constrained topic</td>
<td>Role-focus constrained subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) In Classical Malay, case relations are not relevant at sentence level, which helps to explain some of the special features of pun-lah structures, particularly the observation that case-marked predicates do not in Classical Malay precede -lah. (This means only 'verbs' with ber- or ter- or no prefixes appear before -lah in Classical Malay, at least until quite late. The loss of this constraint appears central in the history of Malay.)
(3) There are three sections in this sentence:

I. DEICTIC CONNECTIVES
   Plot level relations
   textual coherence
   Sa-telah demikian maka

II. PUN-LAH CORE
   topic-event relations
   script indexing
   Sang Bimanyu pun berjalanlah

III. ELABORATION
   role-focus relations
   referential coherence
   sambil menchium ...

(4) The pun-lah structure has several variant forms as the result of other sections of the sentence, which precede and follow the central pun-lah structure, overlapping or merging with the pun-lah structure.

(5) In Longacre's (1972) terms, the sequence of pun-lah structures forms the 'backbone' or the 'skeleton' of the text. It indexes an event (-lah) and the participant (pun) who or which will be in a single case role - in the sentence under investigation, this role is actor or agent - in the clauses which follow the pun-lah core, clauses which fill in the details and particularize the event, in relation to this participant.

(6) Following the pun-lah structure are one or more clauses involving the topic (marked by pun) and within the scope of the event (marked by -lah).

(7) The progression of the clauses is: actor focus to no marked focus to non-actor focus (meng- to Ø to di-, morphologically).

(8) The readers experience topics moving in and out of roles and roles moving in and out of focus, the former at the sentence level, the latter at the clause level.

(9) The progression in the elaboration section from individual, actor-focused events to location-focused events (marked by the di-prefix and the -i suffix on the final predicate) appears to reflect what has been called variously the Cline of Person (Becker and Oka 1977), the Referentiality Hierarchy (Foley 1976), the Natural Topic Hierarchy (Hawkinson and Hyman 1974), or the Inherent Lexical Content Hierarchy (Silverstein 1976), all of which seem to be quite similar, a continuum from self to other, marked off in strikingly similar ways from language to language. In most general terms, this cline of hierarchy can be represented as:

   speaker > hearer > human proper > human common > animate > inanimate
   ( > location)

(10) The first section of the sentence contextualizes the pun-lah core in the hierarchy of the prior text.

(11) There are two kinds of coherence: referential coherence (relations to a single event or a series of events in a stereotypic script) and textual coherence (marked relations between sentences, with sentences defined as discourse units). In those terms, we could say that the first section marks the textual coherence of the core, the final section the referential coherence of the core. The REFERENTIAL coherence is provided by the event (or script) of a man moving through a landscape, with perspective shifting from man to landscape. The
TEXTUAL coherence is established by the first part of the figure, with the words sa-telah demikian maka ...

(12) The heaviness or density of connectives or deictics such as sa-telah demikian maka marks structural boundaries. At the level of sentences, the Classical Malay text uses just maka [or another single-word connective like shahadan or hatta] to mark separate units. At a boundary of a larger (i.e. larger in scope) unit, a cluster of sentences of some sort, heavier or denser connectives are used, two-word connectives (e.g. arakian maka, demikian maka, hatta sa-telah, arakian sa-telah, sa-telah demikian, and a few other combinations of these few connective words), and for larger units, three-word connectives (e.g. maka sa-telah sudah, hatta sa-telah sudah, sa-telah itu maka, and the form we are looking at here, sa-telah demikian maka).

(13) More coinciding deictics or connectives mean a higher-level plot boundary: new place, new time, new state, new major character, etc. To put it another way, this sentence is (or for the reader, will be) the context to background for a potentially large number of lower level sentences.

(14) The movement of the sentences is from generality to particularity, in several senses:

1) From non-role and case marking 'verbs' to role and case marking 'verbs' (e.g. from ber- prefixed verbs to meng-/di- prefixed 'verbs').

2) From least referential terms to most, in the sense that maka is less referential than menchium 'sniff'.

3) From metacomment (about telling) to comment (the telling). That is, from information about the text to information about the story.

4) From language to nature.

(15) The first two sections are constrained by prior text; the third section is more 'emotional' - more reflective of the imagination and the skill of the author, into whose 'subjectivity' we as readers enter in this third section.

(16) This Malay sentence is what might be called a PROTO-TYPICAL sentence, related not by derivation but by partial resemblances in several dimensions to a great many other Classical Malay sentences with which it shares some or nearly all its meanings.

(17) The boundary between sections II and III (core and elaboration) is no longer clear, and the functions of the two systems (referential-topic and role-focus) no longer distinguish clauses and sentences in modern urban Malay or Indonesian.

(18) Many of the deictic connectives which established textual coherence are no longer used, except in very formal situations where an archaic flavour is important.

Becker's work on the pun-lah sentence as reviewed above in some ways came out from the discussions that I had with him when I was working on pun-lah construction as one type of construction in section 3.6. of this work. The similarity and the difference between his work and mine can be seen when one reads the review above and compares it to section 3.6.1. In general, the difference is in the texts examined, i.e. in terms of time that they were written: the text in which Becker's prototype pun-lah sentence occurs was written 'approximately in the middle of the 15th century AD', while my text, according to Teeuw and Wyatt, was written between the years 1690 and 1720, i.e. the first draft in 1690 and the present form after 1720. Moreover, my work includes the variants of the pun-lah type of sentence, while Becker's only deals with one pun-lah sentence,
which he claims to be a prototype. The similarity, in general, is in the fact that in both works Becker and I claim that the pun-lah sentence type has three parts: a deictic connective precore part, a pun-lah core part and an elaboration part.

2.5.2. 'Text-building, epistemology, and aesthetics in Javanese shadow theatre'

This essay is a description of some of the constraints on text-building in Javanese shadow play, wayang kulit, which is performed in Javanese language. The goal is to discover how to build a text in Javanese, to explore what text-building revealed about Javanese epistemology, and to learn how to respond aesthetically to a very different artistic medium (Becker, to appear, p.2).

According to Becker,

the analysis of a text requires, minimally that the modern philologist describe several kinds of relations in order to recreate a conceptually distant context. A minimal set of these relations is:
1. The relation of words, phrases, sentences, and larger units of the text to each other (i.e. the coherence of the text)
2. The relation of this text to other texts: the extent that it is repetition or new (speaking the present or the past)
3. The relation of the author to both the text and the hearers/readers of the text – seen from the point of view of the author or from the point of view of the hearers/readers (i.e. the intent of the text-builder)
4. The relation of units in the text to non-literary events (i.e. reference). (p.8)

Based on this, Becker states: 'Context, then, includes coherence, degree of repetition/spontaneity, intent, and reference.' He goes on stating that sorting out the SOURCES of constraints on all these relations is a further task for the modern philologist: to what extent are the constraints on these relations human (i.e. universal to all texts)? Or are they operative only within a single language family or cultural tradition, or within a single language, or only in a specific genre, or only in the works of one author? Any work is constrained at all these levels'. (p.9)

Becker applies the relations that are discussed above to describe a Javanese shadow play. As a result, he claims that the following are the similar kinds of relations that the play has with its context:

(1) Textual coherence or plot coherence (plot as symbolic action): the relation of parts of a text to the whole (cf. pp.9,47).

(2) Text within text: the Javanese art of invention – the relation of the motifs or episodes of a text to their source in a cultural mythology (cf. pp.27,47).

(3) Intentionality in a text: the uses of texture – the relation of the text and its parts to the participants in the linguistic act (speaker – direct or indirect, hearer – direct or indirect, beneficiary – direct or indirect, etc.) (cf. pp.33, 47).
(4) Reference (either naming or metaphoric reference): the relation of the text and its parts to the non-text world (cf. p.47), i.e. the present-day non-wayang world (cf. p.40).

In describing the first kind of relation, Becker defines plot as follows:

The plot of a story or a play is a set of constraints on the selection and sequencing of dramatic episodes or motifs .... Plots, like tennis rules, do not allow one to predict - except in very general terms - what will happen in a play. Rather, plots tell us what cannot be done appropriately. They also, like scientific theories, tell us one other important thing: what the relevant variables are in the things one can do in the play. (p.10)

Note that Becker's kinds of relations discussed and listed above provide the basic methodology for my work. The first kind, that is the textual coherence, is reflected in the discussion of sections 3.2., 3.5. and 3.6. The second kind, i.e. text within text, can be seen in the discussion of sections 3.2. and 3.4. The third kind, i.e. intentionality in a text, can be seen in sections 3.2., 3.3. and 3.4. The fourth kind, i.e. reference, can be seen in sections 3.3. and 3.4.

2.6. Pike and Pike via Jones 1977

In doing my work, the following notions of Pike and Pike, which I use, integrate into, and modify according to the nature of my text, have in some ways influenced my theoretical orientation.

2.6.1. Part-whole hierarchical organization of reference

Commenting about this Jones (1977:108-109) states:

Part-whole hierarchy in tagmemics means organization into levels that embed within each other. Except for units of the lowest level, each unit of each level may be analyzed into parts, or IMMEDIATE CONSTITUENTS, which themselves are units of the same or different levels. This is a part-whole relation: the whole has parts, and each part in turn may be viewed as a whole which itself has parts, and so on until one reaches some fundamental units which may not be further decomposed.

She also states: 'Frequently the units of a level have as their immediate constituents units of the next lower level or layer. Sometimes ... there is level-skipping (dropping more than one level), or recursiveness.'

Regarding a framework for this hierarchy, she states: 'Pike and Pike have presented a tentative framework of the referential hierarchy, distinguishing four levels (from highest to lowest): performative interaction, story, event and identity.'

As an illustration of this framework she provides the following table with examples from her Allen Brown-Washington D.C. text (which is a text she made up) along with a discussion of each level in the framework:
The referential hierarchy with examples from the Allen Brown-Washington D.C. text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMATIVE INTERACTION:</th>
<th>Allen Brown REPORTING his Washington D.C. visit to Monte Wright, friend at work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY:</td>
<td>Allen's visit to Washington D.C. on vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT:</td>
<td>losing wallet in restaurant, visiting Washington Monument, getting stuck in Monument elevator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

along with the following discussion of each level:

The lowest level in the referential analysis would be IDENTITIES, with their emically-perceived properties: Allen Brown, Monte Wright, the restaurant, each of the governmental buildings, the elevator, the wallet, his hotel, etc. The next lowest level of the analysis – EVENT level – analyzes the actions and states the identities. For example, losing the wallet would be an event relationship between Allen and the wallet. Getting stuck in the elevator would involve the identities Allen and the elevator and the Washington Monument. Visiting the Washington Monument itself (of which getting stuck in the elevator was one part) would be a higher layer within the event level.

The STORY level would consist of the sequence of events, along with setting, background, and other pertinent information conveyed. That is, the story consists of everything told about Allen's visit to Washington, D.C. PERFORMATIVE INTERACTION level is represented by the whole of the discourse: Allen's report to Monte, and any responses by Monte. Here attitudes and beliefs belong, e.g. Allen's obvious enjoyment of the visit, his belief in the value of democracy and pride in his government, his good feelings toward Monte. Also included is the overall purpose for the discourse, which was REPORTING.

2.6.2. The referential hierarchy vs. the grammatical hierarchy

In this section, Jones (1977:110) uses her Allen Brown-Washington D.C. text to contrast the referential hierarchy with the grammatical hierarchy. Regarding this she states:

The Pike and Pike referential hierarchy is concerned with the relation of Allen (and Monte) to the real world situation depicted by the discourse. It involves pragmatic conditions of appropriateness as well as truth conditions. The grammatical hierarchy is concerned with the verbalization itself: the words, sentences, paragraphs, etc. involved, and the
relations of these grammatical constructions to one another. In sum, the referential hierarchy is matrix or network-like, whereas the grammatical hierarchy is more linear in nature.

The referential hierarchy has components of purpose, speaker attitude, belief, etc. that are not present in the grammatical hierarchy. On the other hand, there are elements in the grammatical hierarchy not present in the referential hierarchy, e.g. special cohesive elements such as third person singular inflection in English verbs.

The referential hierarchy is concerned with lexical collocational restrictions, e.g. round square is nonsensical in a normal universe of discourse. Grammatically, however, this sequence conforms to acceptable grammatical constructions for noun phrases: adjective before noun. This points out again the contrast of PARTICULARS in the referential hierarchy and GENERALITIES in the grammatical hierarchy.

2.6.3. Hierarchical organization of the grammar

Regarding this, Jones (1977:111) states: 'The levels in the Pike and Pike grammatical hierarchy are (from bottom of the hierarchy up): Morpheme, morpheme cluster, word, phrase, clause, sentence, paragraph, monolog, exchange, and conversation. These are grouped by pairs according to similar functions.' These functions, which she refers to in a footnote, are: 'lexical package (morpheme/morpheme cluster); term (word/phrase); proposition (clause/sentence); theme-development (paragraph/monolog); social interaction (exchange/conversation).'

To illustrate these levels, Jones provides the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCHANGE/CONVERSATION:</th>
<th>'Hi, Allen.' 'Oh, hi, Monte. Let me tell you about my visit to Washington D.C. ...'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARAGRAPH/MONOLOG:</td>
<td>Then I went to a French restaurant. I got a crepe and ... The food was fantastic!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUSE/SENTENCE:</td>
<td>Then, suddenly, the elevator stopped!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORD/PHRASE:</td>
<td>wallet, in the restaurant, few taxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORPHEME/MORPHEME CLUSTER:</td>
<td>the, to, -s, wallet, re-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and (4) COHESIVE aspects binding the unit into the larger system' (Jones 1977: 111-112). To illustrate these aspects, Jones (1977:112) provides the following figure which presents a generalized nature of a tagmeme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOT</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WHERE is the item on the including wave? (nucleus, margin)</td>
<td>WHAT is the form of the unit or construction?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>COHESION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What PURPOSE or FUNCTION does the item fill in relation to the system?</td>
<td>How does this item RELATE to others within the system; how does it govern them or is it governed by them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jones (p.113) presents the following table which gives a few sample tagmemes from several different hierarchical levels of Reference and Grammar for the Allen Brown-Washington D.C. Text. The referential tagmemes occur on the left; the grammatical tagmemes occur on the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents of REFERENCE Level</th>
<th>Constituents of GRAMMAR Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMATIVE INTERACTION:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus Talking with Monte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Real (vs. imagined)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORRY:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus Visiting Washington D.C. (vector)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacation Real</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVENT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreMargin Going up in elevator (complex)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation to goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituents of GRAMMAR Level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXCHANGE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus Monolog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONOLOG:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus Story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story-telling --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENTENCE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nucleus Transitive Clause Root</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement --</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAUSE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Verb Phrase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement Transitivity governs occurrence of Subj. and Dir.Obj. tagmemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.5. Comment

It should be noted that in my work I do not make any distinction between the referential and the grammatical hierarchies as Pike and Pike do. By this I am not implying that their making of this distinction is wrong. I just don't grasp it completely in order to apply this to my work. In other words in my work there is an overlap between these hierarchies. And the terms I use in a lot of ways are not similar to Pike and Pike's. This is mainly due to the fact that the nature of my data requires me to coin different terms. In spite of this the underlying principles introduced by Pike and Pike are operating in the description of my work. That is to say, notions such as part-whole, hierarchical organization, and four-cell tagmemes can be easily detected in my work.

2.7. CONCLUSION

Other works, which in one way or another have given richness to my work are Austin's and Searle's speech act theories as discussed in Austin 1962 (1970) and Searle 1969 (1974); Labov's, Waletzky's and Eisner's ideals about the functions of the narrative structure as discussed in Helm, ed., 1967, in Labov 1972 and in Eisner 1975; Grimes' discussion on kinds of discourse information in Grimes 1975; Halliday's and Hasan's explanations of the notions of anaphoric and cataphoric reference in Halliday and Hasan 1976; Klammer's ideas regarding Dialogue Paragraph in Klammer 1971; and Schank's explanation of the notion of Script in Schank et al. 1975.

The following scholars of Malay and Indonesian - besides Becker, Hopper, Errington, Teeuw and Wyatt whose works were reviewed above - have provided me with some basic ideas which I extend, expand and modify in accordance with the nature of my data and the purpose of this study: Winstedt and Lewis' discussion on deictic particles which they refer to as 'punctuation or transition words' respectively in Lewis 1947 and Winstedt 1913; Poerwadarminta's lexical meanings or definitions of most of the deictic particles in Poerwadarminta 1966.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. The remarks in square brackets are mine.
2. The numbering of the premises is mine.
5. I use Jones 1977 as a source to understand Pike and Pike's referential and grammatical hierarchies since she worked closely with them, and the way she presents their materials is very clear and helpful to me. Also, I don't have access to Pike and Pike's *Grammatical Analysis* published in 1976, in which these notions are presented.
3.1. THE TEXT AND ITS TRANSLATION

The following is the first story of Hikayat Patani (HP), the text which forms the primary source of insights that I am attempting to share with those who are interested in this study of a non-Western text tradition:

Text and interlinear translation

(0) Bismillah - rr ahm a ni -
In the Name of God - the Compassionate -
rrah Tm
the Merciful.

(1) Ini=lah suatu kisah yang
This=CM a story rel.pron.
di=cetera=kan oleh orang
pt.foc.=tell=act.foc. by person
tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat
old-old, origin king rel.pron. make
negeri Patani Darussalam itu
settlement Patani Abode of Peace that

(2) Ada=pun raja di Kota Maligai itu
Exist=TM king in town Maligai that
nama=nya Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana
name=the/he Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana

(3) Maka Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana pun beranak
conn. Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana TM beget child
se=orang laki-laki, maka di=nama=i
one=person boy-boy conn. pt.foc.=name=allt.

anakanda baginda itu Paya Tu Antara
child his majesty that Paya Tu Antara

Free translation

In the name of God
the Compassionate,
the Merciful.

This is a story
which has been told
by the old people:
the origin of the
king who founded the
settlement of Patani,
the Abode of Peace.

The king in Kota Maligai was called
Phaya Tu Kerub Mahajana.

He had one son,
whom he gave the name
of Phaya Tu Antara.
(4) Hatta berapa lama=nya maka Paya Tu Kerub
conn. how long=the conn. Paya Tu Kerub
Mahajana pun mati=lah
Mahajana TM die=CM

(5) Syahdan maka Paya Tu Antara pun
conn. conn. Paya Tu Antara TM
kerajaan=lah meng=ganti=kan
become king=CM ag.foc.=succeed=act.foc.
ayahanda baginda itu
father his majesty that

(6) Ia me.nama= i diri=nya Paya Tu
He ag.foc.=name=allt. self=he Paya Tu
Naqpa
Naqpa

(7) Selama Paya Tu Naqpa kerajaan itu
During Paya Tu Naqpa become king that
sentiasa ia pergi berburu
always he go hunt

(8) Pada suatu hari Paya Tu Naqpa pun duduk
On one day Paya Tu Naqpa TM sit
di=atas takhta kerajaan=nya di=adap
in=on throne royal=the/he pt.foc.=attend
oleh segala menteri pegawai
by all minister official
hulubalang dan ra'yat sekalian
officer and people all

(9) Arakian maka titah baginda: "Aku
conn. conn. speech his majesty: I
dengar khabar=nya perburuan sebelah
hear report=the hunting game side
tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon"
shore sea that very many report says

(10) Maka sembah segala menteri:
conn. obeisance all minister:
"Daulat Tuan=ku, sungguh=lah seperti
good fortune Lord=my true=CM like
titah Duli Yang Maha=mulia
speech dust of the feet the most=noble
itu, patik dengar pun demi=kian juga"
that slave hear TM like=that also

After some time
Phaya Tu Kerub
Mahajana died.

Then Phaya Tu Antara
became king,
succeeding
his father.

He called himself
Phaya Tu Nakpa.

During his reign
Phaya Tu Nakpa was
accustomed always
to go hunting.

One day Phaya Tu
Nakpa was seated
on his royal
throne while his
ministers, officials,
and all
his subjects were
sitting in attendance.

Then the king spoke:
"I have heard reports
that the game
near the sea-shore
is abundant indeed."

The ministers
replied respectfully:
"Hail my Lord, it
is true indeed as
Your Majesty has
spoken; we too have
heard likewise."
Maka titah Phaya Tu Nakpa: "Jikalau demikan kerah=kan=lah segala ra'yat kita. Esok hari kita hendak pergi berburu ke tepi laut itu." Phaya Tu Nakpa then spoke:
"In that case call up all our people. Tomorrow we shall go hunting along the sea-shore."

Maka sembah segala menteri obesiance all minister
hulubalang=nya: "Daulat Tuan=ku, officer=he good fortune Lord=my mana titah Duli Yang any speech dust of the feet the Maha=mulia patik junjung" most=noble slave carry on the head
The ministers and officers replied respectfully:
"Hail my Lord; we humbly accept whatever Your Majesty says."

Arakian setelah datang=lah pada conn. after this then come=CM to keesokan hari=nya, maka baginda pun tomorrow day=the conn. his majesty TM berangkat=lah dengan segala menteri depart=CM with all minister hulubalang=nya di=iring=kan officer=he the/he pt.foc.=accompany=act.foc. oléh ra'yat sekalian by people all
The following morning the king departed with all his ministers and officers, and accompanied by his people.

Setelah sampai pada tempat berburu After this then arrive to place hunt itu, maka sekalian ra'yat pun berhenti=lah that conn. all people TM stop=CM dan khémah pun di=diri=kan and tent TM pt.foc.=erect=act.foc.
orang=lah person=CM
When they arrived at the hunting-grounds the people made a stop and the tents were erected.

Maka baginda pun turun=lah dari conn. his majesty TM descend from=CM from atas gajah=nya semayam didalam on elephant=the/he sit in state in khémah di=adap oléh segala menteri tent pt.foc.=attend by all minister hulubalang ra'yat sekalian officer people all
Then the king descended from his elephant and sat in state in a tent while his ministers and officers and all his subjects were sitting in attendance.
When these men returned and appeared before the king they said respectfully:
"Hail my Lord, in the woods near the sea there are a great many tracks."

The king spoke:
"Good, let us go hunting early tomorrow morning."

Then the people went into the wood beating game from early morning until the sun began to decline; but not one animal was obtained.

The king was greatly astonished and gave orders to release his own hunting dogs. 3

Then the king ordered (some) men to go and look for the tracks of deer.
(22) Maka anjing itu pun di=lepas=kan
    conn. dog that TM pt.foc.=release=act.foc.
    orang=lah
    person=CM

So the dogs were released.

(23) Hatta ada sekira-kira dua[du] jam
    conn. exist about two hour
    lama=nya maka berbunyi=lah suara anjing
    long=the conn. sound=CM voice dog
    itu me=nyalak
    that ag.foc.=bark

Then, after about two hours, the sound of the dogs' barking was heard.

(24) Maka baginda pun segera
    conn. his majesty TM immediately
    men=dapat=kan suara anjing itu
    ag.foc.=find=act.foc. voice dog that

The king immediately went in the direction of the sound of the dogs.

(25) Setelah baginda datang kepada suatu
    After his majesty come to a
    sérokan tasik itu, maka baginda
    inlet sea that, conn. his majesty
    pun bertemu=lah dengan segala orang
    TM find=CM with all person
    yang me=nurut anjing itu
    rel.pron. ag.foc.=go with dog that

When the king arrived at an inlet of the sea he found the men who had gone with the dogs.

(26) Maka titah baginda: "Apa yang
    conn. speech his majesty: What rel.pron.
    di=salak oléh anjing itu?"
    pt.foc.=bark by dog that

The king spoke: "What were these dogs barking at?"

(27) Maka sembah mereka sekalian itu:
    conn. obeisance they all that
    "Daulat Tuan=ku, patik mohon=kan
    good fortune Lord-my slave beg=act.foc.
    ampun dan karunia. Ada se=ékor
    pardon and grace exist one=class
    pelanduk putih, besar=nya sepeti
    mousedeer white big=it/the as
    kambing, warna tubuh=nya gilang gemilang.
    goat colour body=it/the glittering
    Itu=lah yang di=hambat oléh
    That=CM rel.pron. pt.foc.=pursue by
    anjing ini. Maka pelanduk itu pun
    dog this Conn. mousedeer that TM
    lenyap=lah pada pantai ini."
    disappear=CM at beach this

They replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord, we beg your pardon and grace.

There was a white mousedeer the size of a goat, and its body had a luminous sheen.

That was what the dogs were pursuing; but the mousedeer has vanished on this beach here."
After this then his majesty had heard the men's report, he set out for that place.

After the king had heard the men's report, he set out for that place.

There he found a house where an old couple lived, catching prawns and setting snares.

The king then gave orders to ask these old people whence they had come and settled in this place and what their origin was.

The king's servants respectfully transmitted the king's words to the old people.

They respectfully replied:

"Hail my Lord, we are just servants of Your Majesty; for originally we lived in the town of Maligai. When your Royal Grandfather departed for Ayudhya in order to build a settlement there, we were summoned to come and accompany Him on His voyage.

"Daulat Tuan=ku, ada=pun patik ini good fortune Lord=my exist=TM slave this hamba juga pada kebawah Duli slave also at to under dust of the feet
Yang Maha=mulia, karena asal patik the most=noble because origin slave
ini duduk di Kota Maligai. Maka this reside in town Maligai conn.
pada masa Paduka Nenda berangkat at period foot grandfather depart
pergi berbuat negeri ke Ayutia, maka go make city to Ayutia, conn.
patik pun di=kerah orang pergi slave TM pt.foc.=summon person go
meng=iring=kan Duli ag.foc.=accompany=act.foc. dust of the feet
When he had arrived at this place we were stricken with an illness, so we were left behind here."

The king spoke: "What is your name?"

The old man respectfully replied: "My name is Enoik Tani."

When the king heard what the man told him, he returned to his tent.

That same night the king deliberated with his ministers and officers, as he wanted to build a settlement on the spot where the white mousedeer had been.

The following morning the ministers and officers ordered men to go upstream to the town of

Dan pada malam itu baginda pun
And on night that his majesty
berbicara dengan segala menteri
talk with all minister
hulubalang=nya hendak berbuat negeri
officer=he intend make settlement
pada tempat pelanduk putih itu
at place mousedeer white that

Setelah keésokan hari=nya
After this then tomorrow day=the
maka segala menteri hulubalang pun
conn. all minister officer
men=nyuruh orang mudik ke Kota
ag.foc.=order person go upstream to town
Malgai and to Lancang ag. foc. = summon, act. foc. to call up all the subjects, that they should come downstream and start building the settlement.

Dan ke Lancang me=ngerah=kan Maligai and to Lancang in order to call up all the subjects, that they should come downstream and start building the settlement.

sebag seeker" all people go downstream make

segala ra' yat hilir berbuat settlement that

all people go downstream make settlement that

negeri itu. settlement that

sett lement that

(38) Setelah sudah segala menteri After the ministers and officers had already all minister

hulubalang dititah=kan oleh oléh

office = order = act. foc. by

baginda masing=masing dengan his majesty each with

hulubalang dititah=kan oleh oléh

office = order = act. foc. by

baginda masing=masing dengan his majesty each with

hulubalang di=titah=kan oleh oléh

office = order = act. foc. by

baginda masing=masing dengan his majesty each with

berangkat kembali ke Kota Maligai depart return to town Maligai

(39) Hatta antara dua bulan lama=nya, maka conn. between two month long=the, conn.

sett lement that TM al ready=CM

negeri itu pun sudah=lah settlement that TM already=CM

(40) Maka baginda pun pindah hilir conn. his majesty TM move go downstream

duduk pada negeri yang reside at settlement rel. pron.

di=perbuat itu, dan negeri itu pt. foc. = make that and settlement that

pun di=nama=kan=nya Patani TM pt. foc. = name = act. foc. = he Patani

Darussalam Abode of Peace

(41) Arakian pangkalan yang di=tempat conn. landing stage rel. pron. in=place

pelanduk putih lenyap itu [dan mousedeer white disappear that and

pangkalan=nya itu] pada Pintu Gajah landing stage = the that at Gate Elephant

ke=hulu Jambatan Kedi, [itu=lah. to=inland Pier Kedi that=CM

Kedi Pier.

(42) Dan] pangkalan itu=lah tempat Encik And landing stage that=CM place Encik

Hence the landing-stage on the spot where the white mouse-deer had disappeared, i.e. at the Elephant Gate, inland from the Kedi Pier.

And that landing stage was the place
3.2. OVERALL STRUCTURE

3.2.1. From the speech act perspective

The overall structure of the story, i.e. the first chapter of Part I of Hikayat Patani, from the speech act perspective can be seen in the following display:

Display 3.2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrator(s)</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA(_1)</td>
<td>I. Supernatural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA(_2)</td>
<td>II. Natural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(S(peech)A(ct), \text{ refers to the Arabic invocational prayer } Bismillahi-rahmani-rahat at the beginning of the story (which is presented as Chapter 1 of Part I of Hikayat Patani). From a limited perspective, i.e. from the chapter level, it looks as if it were part of Chapter 1. However, upon closer examination, i.e. from a broader or an overall perspective, it is clear that the prayer belongs to a level higher than the chapter level, i.e. the book level or the Hikayat level. This can be seen as presented in Display 3.2.2. below:
Display 3.2.2.

From the display we see that the invocational prayer forms the pre-marginal part of HP, with the HP Proper as the nucleus and the concluding paragraph as the post-margin. The following lists, which present the parts of HP Proper with their topics and chapters, serve, along with Display 3.2.2. above, to give my readers a clearer perspective of where the story proper of the first chapter, as presented in Display 3.2.1. above, fits in the overall structure of HP.

(a) 1. Part I: The history of Patani during the rule of the Inland Dynasty
2. Part II: The story of Patani during the rule of Kalantan Dynasty
3. Part III: A summary of Bendaharas (i.e. Prime Ministers) of Patani
4. Part IV: The story of the elephant doctor Cau Hang and progeny
5. Part V: The story of the death of Datuk Sai and the struggle between the pretenders to the position of bendahara during the reign of the Kalantan Dynasty
6. Part VI: The Undang-Undang Patani (i.e. the court customs of the royal orchestra of Patani)

(b) 1. Part I has 22 chapters: chapters 1-22
2. Part II has 2 chapters: chapters 23-24
3. Part III has 1 chapter: chapter 25
4. Part IV has 2 chapters: 26-27
5. Part V has 1 chapter: chapter 28
6. Part VI has 1 chapter: chapter 29

In relation to the nuclear HP proper, the concluding paragraph is what Labov and Waletzky call Coda, i.e. a functional device for returning the verbal perspective to the present moment, since the actual sequence of events described
in the narrative does not, as a rule, extend up to the present. In other words, it is "the signal which ends a narrative and bridges the gap between the narrative and the present moment." The present moment in the case of HP is the time when the copying of the text was completed, i.e. October 16, 1839. From the point of view of the production of the text, the coda can also function as a colophon, since it provides the date as to when the production or the copying of HP was completed. Furthermore it provides information as to who the owner was, i.e. who the copying of the story was done for. These can be seen in the following quotation:


which translates as:

Here ends the text. The copying of the book of the laws of Patani was completed in the town of Singapore on the ninth day of the month Sya’ban of the year 1255, i.e. on the sixteenth of October of the year AD 1839. This is the end. The owner of the manuscript is Mr North.

The Arabic invocational Prayer, as made clear in Display 3.2.1. above, is a supernatural speech act which functions as an opening or preparation for a ritual or a venerable activity. I call it supernatural because the addressee of this speech act is God, a non-human and invisible being. Translated into English this prayer means 'In the Name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.' The sacred activity or the ritual for which the prayer is said is the act of retelling HP. It is sacred because it is traditionally passed down by the old narrators who were the original or master performers of the act of telling the story. It is not the product of the personal artistic inspiration of the present quoting or reporting narrator, i.e. the narrator who is doing the retelling of HP according to how it has been told by the old narrators, the narrators that are being quoted from or reported about.

The reason for the saying of the prayer is to assure help, blessing, inspiration and support from God for the narrator's act of retelling the story, because the latter is an act of invoking sacred or traditional elements which may bring into play great and potentially dangerous powers. The prayer is therefore considered as a channel to receive the needed strength from God that is capable of controlling these powers. It is generally believed and accepted that the name of a ruler or a supreme being such as God has authority and power. According to J.D. Douglas, et al., underlying the name of a person are three propositions: 1) the name is the person, 2) the name is the person revealed, and 3) the name is the person actively present. By invoking God's name the present quoting narrator is calling upon the person of God who, in response, reveals His person or nature of authority, power and might that the narrator particularly needs in combating the potentially dangerous powers referred to above. However, realizing that he is a mortal man who does not have the prerogative to call upon the name of a powerful and mighty God and that, even as with the dangerous powers, he could also be destroyed by the power of God, the narrator needs to call upon the other names or attributes of God, i.e. the Compassionate and the Merciful, that could save him. This act presupposes that the narrator, whether conscious or not, is aware of God's active presence.
Why is the invocational prayer in Arabic instead of in Malay? To answer this question, let me quote A.L. Becker, writing about Javanese shadow theatre, who states:

Archaic language is not merely embellishment or mystification, else it would have been lost long ago. Rather it is essential language addressed to the essential audience....

As to essential audience he says the following: 'The essential audience of a wayang is normally unseen: spirits, demons and creatures, gods, and ancestors.' Hence, Arabic might be used here for the same reason, i.e. as the essential language to the essential audience, Allah (God).

SA₂, in Display 3.2.1. above, refers to the announcing and the concluding of the story as manifested respectively by the introductory sentence (sentence 1), Inilah suatu kisah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu. 'This is a story which has been told by the old people: the origin of the King who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace' and by the concluding sentence (sentence 45), 'That was the story.'

SA₃ refers to the assertion of the point of the story, i.e. the reason why the story is told, which is found towards the end of the story and manifested as: Syahdan kebanyakkan kata orang nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang meraw itulah. Bahwa sesungguhnya nama negeri itu mengikut sembah orang mengatakan pelanduk lenyap itu. 'Most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn fisherman. In actual fact the name of the settlement derived from the words which the people used when reporting the disappearance of the mousedeer.'

SA₄ stands for the actual telling of the story by the old people as the quoted narrators and also by the present narrator as the quoting narrator. It should be noted that the quoting narrator used the introductory and the concluding sentences as a quotative strategy to put the reported story in quotation.

The reported story in essence is a text, a specific hunting story, that is built on the meaning of the name of the main participant in the story and within the text are embedded two incidents, the climax of the hunting and the result of the hunting, which in turn are used by the narrators as illustrative supports or background information for their point of the story, i.e. SA₃ referred to above.

From the point of view of the four-cell tagmemic analysis, chapter I of HP can be seen in the tree-diagrams of Display 3.2.3. Note that the introductory sentence can be analyzed in two ways, i.e. B.1 which is analyzed based on the perspective of Frame-Content Construction and B.2 which is analyzed from the point of view of -lah Construction. (For details, see the section on construction types.) Note also that the content specific NP or the content reported NP (depending on what perspective one chooses) asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu is the abstract of the story, i.e. the brief summary given at the beginning of the account.

The content reported story, which is the middle node in Display 3.2.3.A, consists of three major parts:

(1) Orientation, which introduces the father of the main participant in the foreground, the main participant in the background, i.e. the name that the father gave him, and the place where they live.

(2) Introduction of the main participant in the foreground, specifically in terms of his name, i.e. on the basis of its meaning, as a strategy to start off the story, which is comprised of
(a) a generic statement about one of his characteristics, i.e. his habit of hunting;
(b) a specific account of a hunt, as an instantiation of the generic statement in point 2a, which consists of:
1. the preparation of the hunting:
   a. dialogue in the court
   b. movement away from the court
2. the actual hunting
3. the result of the hunting which consists of:
   a. the encounter with the prawn fisherman
   b. the decision to build the settlement on the spot where the mousedeer disappeared
   c. completion of the building of the settlement
(3) Point of the story: etymologizing about the name of the new settlement that the main participant built as a strategy
(a) to conclude the story of the hunt, and
(b) to expand on the point of the story which is embedded in the scenes or the episodes of the encounter of the main participant with the old couple and the act of the main participant's dogs pursuing the mousedeer (for details see section 3.4.).

Returning to the NP asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'the origin of the King who founded the settlement of Patani', the abstract of the story, I could state that asal 'the origin' is developed in the Orientation part of the reported story and raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu is developed in the second and the third part of the story, i.e. the Introduction of the Main Participant and the Point of the Story.

3.2.2. From the perspective of temporal adverbials

Having seen the overall structure from the speech act perspective, let us now look at it from the perspective of temporal adverbials. In most grammar textbooks, temporal adverbials are analyzed and accounted for in the context of sentence, clause or phrase level, without taking into consideration discourse or textual structure. In this section I would like to focus on the function of temporal adverbials in the context of discourse structure.

In our story all the temporal adverbials together are used as a strategy to mark the outline of the story which is expressed in all the main clauses that follow these adverbials. In the following I will present them side by side as illustrations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clauses</th>
<th>Temporal clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) old king (king's father) died</td>
<td>BERAPA LAMANYA '(After) a while'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) he (new king) used to hunt</td>
<td>SELAMA PTN kerajaan itu 'during the time when PTN was on the throne'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) PTN (new king) sat on his throne, attended by ministers, officials, officers and subjects</td>
<td>PADA SUATU HARI 'on a certain day'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) King departed (to hunt)</td>
<td>SETELAH datanglah pada keesokan harinya 'after coming to the next day'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) subjects stopped and tents erected</td>
<td>SETELAH sampai pada tempat berburu itu 'after arriving at the hunting place'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) report to the king: much game</td>
<td>SETELAH orang itu datang mengadap baginda 'after the people came and appeared before the king'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) set up traps and nets</td>
<td>SETELAH keesokan harinya 'after the next day'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) the dogs' voices were heard</td>
<td>ADA sekira-kira dua jam lamanya 'for about two hours'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(25) king found the people that were following the dogs
SETELAH baginda datang kepada suatu serokan tasik itu 'after the king came to an inlet of the sea'

(28) king went to the place [i.e. where the mousedeer disappeared]
SETELAH baginda menengar sembah orang itu 'after the king had heard the people's report'

(35) king returned to the tent
SETELAH SUDAH baginda menengar sembah orang tua itu 'after the king heard what the old man said'

(36) king discussed with ministers and officers the intention to build a town at the spot where the mousedeer disappeared
DAN PADA malam itu 'and on that night (or in the evening of that day)'

(37) ministers and officers ordered (some) people to get all the subjects downstream to build the town
SETELAH keésokan harinya 'after the next day'

(38) king returned to Kota Maligai
SETELAH sudah segala menteri hulubalang dititahkan oleh baginda masing-masing dengan ketumbukannya 'after all the ministers and officers had received instructions from the king, each with his own men'

(39) the town was finished
ANTARA dua bulan lamanya 'after [lit. 'between'] two months'

It should be noted that the connective particle setelah 'after this then', 'having gone over, thus, then ...' signals a change of scene and the beginning of a new activity. The latter occurs always in the main clauses as can be seen above. Notice that the scene and the new activity involved are usually expressed in a cluster of sentences. They can however be expressed in a single sentence, e.g. sentence (13) which is followed by sentence (14) with another setelah particle. In this sentence, the narrators obviously did not think of elaborating the scene probably due to the fact that it is not important or relevant to do so.

3.3. BAHASA

This section deals with distancing, showing honour and deference, speaking up and speaking down as reflected in the speech act participants' vocabulary, manners, conduct and gestures depending on who speaks to whom and on what occasion. All of these manifestations are encapsulated in the Malay term bahasa. To confirm the meaning of this notion let me quote Shelly Errington who, writing of the Hikayat Hang Tuah, states:

The world's order depends on the raja in the profound sense that his presence gives the world a shape, makes it intelligible. This abstraction, translated into social terms, means simply that the raja ought to be the center of patterned or formulaic behavior, and of course the court is precisely that. In the court we see at its most concentrated those aspects of
social form which we term 'hierarchy': etiquette, formulaic speech and orderly location of people; and, appropriately, they are in the Malay context all aspects of one another. The term which means all of them is bahasa. Bahasa is usually translated 'language', but also as 'appropriate behavior'. An early translator from Europeans to the Malay court was sent back because he did not 'know bahasa'. He spoke the language perfectly well; the problem was that he did not use the right etiquette and terms of deference and, in short, did not behave appropriately .... It is interesting that Hang Tuah's parents went to Bentan so that Hang Tuah would 'know bahasa'; there were no religious scholars where they were, apparently making 'knowing bahasa' impossible. In short, religion, culture, manners, norms and speech are equated in the term bahasa.

In another source²¹ Errington gives a similar explanation about bahasa and extends it into contexts where events occur, i.e. events occur if and whenever relationship expressed in bahasa is broken:

The raja is the fixed reference through which the world's ordering makes sense. The raja's presence gives a shape to society's totality. This society is defined or given shape by bahasa, a term which in modern Malay means 'culture', 'language', and 'good manners'. In Part One, bahasa means all those, but it is clear that it means not a culture or a language, but culture, society and language themselves, which are all part of a single whole. Within Part One, there is no conception of social form outside bahasa; people, events, and places outside bahasa are imaged as simply anarchic. Social cohesion within society appears to depend on the raja's giving royal beneficence to his subjects, and their returning to him homage in the form of gifts or deference expressed through speeches and body-stance. This perfect relation of a raja bestowing beneficence and his followers offering homage is, in a profound sense, eventless. The very first paragraph in the hikayat pictures such a relationship between a raja of heaven and his court. If the relationship, expressed in the forms of bahasa, is broken, events occur.

As a native speaker of Bahasa Indonesia (Bahasa Melayu) I can confirm from experience Errington's explanation above, especially regarding bahasa as 'appropriate behavior' or 'good manners' by giving some examples that I have used in speaking Malay or Indonesian.

(1) Orang itu tak tahu bahasa
    man that not know manners
    'The man doesn't know any manners.'

(2) Orang itu melanggar bahasa
    man that commits a breach of good manners
    'The man commits a breach of good manners.'

(3) Baik sekali budibahasanya
    good very manners he
    'He/she has very good manners.'

Note that another word for bahasa, in the sense of good manners, is budibahasa (cf. example 3 above), which is derived from the Sanskrit words budi 'sense, intelligence, kindness, character' and bahasa 'manners'.
In the following I will present examples from my text (the first story of HP) that has features or aspects of bahasa and discuss them.

(4) Arakian maka titah baginda: "Aku conn. speech his majesty: I
dengar khabar=nya perburuan sebelah hear report=the hunting game side
tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon" shore sea that very many report says

Then the king spoke:
"I have heard reports that the game near the sea-shore is abundant indeed."

(5) Maka sembah segala menteri:
"Daulat Tuan=ku, sungguh=lah seperti good fortune Lord=my true=CM like
titah Duli Yang Maha=mulia speech dust of the feet the most=noble
itu, patik dengar pun demi=ian juga that slave hear TM like=that also

The ministers replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord, it is true indeed as Your Majesty has spoken; we too have heard likewise."

Examples (4) and (5) are components of a single dialogue paragraph, i.e. example (5) is the response to example (4) as the assertion by the King. Now, the following are vocabularies that reflect bahasa in these two examples in the sense of showing deference, speaking up and speaking down: titah, baginda, aku, sembah, Daulat Tuanku, Duli Yang Mahamulia, patik. Now, I will discuss the meaning of each of these words:

titah means 'speech of a ruler' in this context; it may mean 'royal command'.

baginda means 'His or Her Majesty' or 'King'; it is a title for rulers; it is a Sanskrit word which literally means 'the fortunate'.

aku is the first person pronoun which is used by a speaker when addressing his addressee in an intimate circle.

sembah means 'obeisance (with folded hands raised to forehead for rulers, to nose or chin for lesser rajas), respectful address, statement (to any superior)'; in this context, i.e. in relation with segala menteri 'all ministers', it means 'the speech of all the ministers (running)'; in relation to example (4) sembah segala menteri is better translated as 'all the ministers replied respectfully', which implies that the ministers, who are of lower status are speaking up to the King, who is of a higher status.

The word daulat in Daulat Tuanku is an Arabic word which literally means 'good fortune'. Used with Tuanku 'My Lord', the whole expression means 'May Your Highness prosper!' This expression is a distancing device used by a speaker of a lower status when addressing a king or ruler; it is a speech act of blessing the ruler. That is to say that in responding to the speech of the ruler, the speaker of the lower status has to use a distancing expression, a form of metalanguage, to separate the content level of his speech from the content level of the speech of the ruler.

Duli Yang Mahamulia literally means 'the dust (of the feet) of the most noble'. This expression is also a distancing device that is used by a speaker of lower status to address a ruler. In this instance the speaker of the lower status is using this expression as a means of humbling himself before the
ruler. That is to say, he puts himself literally at the level of the dust of the feet of the most noble. The deictic marker anchorage here is in the addressee, the King, and not in the speaker.

Patik 'first person pronoun', which literally means 'slave', is also an expression of lower status humbling himself before a ruler or a king.

Consider now the following:

(6) Maka titah Phaya Tu Naqpa: "Jikalau conn. speech Phaya Tu Naqpa: if demi=kian kerah=kan=lah segala ra' yat like=that summon=act.foc.=CM all people kita. Esok hari kita hendak pergi I tomorrow day I intend go berburu ke tepi laut itu." hunt to shore sea that

Phaya Tu Nakpa then spoke: "In that case call up all Our people. Tomorrow We shall go hunting along the sea-shore."

(7) Maka sembah segala menteri conn. obeisance all minister hulubalang=nya: "Daulat Tuan=ku officer=he good fortune Lord=my mana titah Duli Yang any speech dust of the feet the Maha=mulia patik junjun" most=noble slave carry on the head

The ministers and officers replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord; we humbly accept whatever Your Majesty says."

The only term which I will discuss from examples (6) and (7) is junjun, which literally means 'to carry on the head'. Example (6) is given since it helps the readers to understand example (7), i.e. example (7) is a response to the command expressed in example (6). Now, junjun is a term that expresses the attitude or the act of the speakers, all the ministers and officers, humbling themselves before the addressee, the King, who is of higher status than they are. So what they 'carry on their heads' is whatever the King says. By saying this they are speaking up to the king, while also humbling themselves before the king as was stated before.

Consider now the following:

(8) Maka titah baginda: "Apa yang conn. speech his majesty: What rel.pron. di=salak oleh anjing itu?" pt.foc.=bark by dog that

The king spoke: "What were these dogs barking at?"

(9) Maka sembah mereka sekalian itu: conn. obeisance they all that "Daulat Tuan=ku, patik mohon=kan good fortune Lord=my slave beg=act.foc. ampun dan karunia. Ada se=ekor pardon and grace exist one=class pelanduk putih, besar=nya seperti mousedeer white big=it/the as

They replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord, we beg your pardon and grace."

There was a white mousedeer the size of a goat, and its body had a luminous sheen.
kambing, warna tubuh=nya gilang gemilang.
goat colour body=it/the glittering

Ibu=lah yang di=hambat oleh
That=CM rel.pron. pt.foc.=pursue by
anjing ini. Maka pelanduk itu pun
dog this conn. mousedeer that TM
lenyap=lah pada pantai ini."
disappear=CM at beach this

That was what the dogs were pursuing; but the mousedeer has vanished on this beach here."

What I want to discuss here from examples (8) and (9) is the clause patik mohonkan ampun dan karunia that is the reason given since it helps my readers to understand example (9). Example (8) is given since it helps the question posed in example (8). However, in example (9) the answer to the question given in example (8) actually starts at the second sentence in the Content Part of the Frame-Content Construction as found in example (9). Why is this? What is the function of the first sentence: Daulat Tuanku, patik mohonkan ampun dan karunia? The meaning of Daulat Tuanku has been made clear above. Why is there patik mohonkan ampun dan karunia? To answer this we have to understand the fact that the king and his subjects prior to this point in the story have been hunting all day with no avail. So the king ordered his men to release his hunting dogs. After two hours the sound of the dogs' barking was heard, which meant that they were after some deer. However the deer, the white mousedeer they were pursuing, suddenly disappeared. Now, part of being good and loyal subjects of a ruler is trying always to please the ruler (this is part of proper behaviour). In this case the king's men fail to do this (even though it is not their fault), and so the appropriate way to express their failure and disability is by saying patik mohonkan ampun dan karunia, which is an act of humbling yourself through the speech act of asking pardon and grace. And this asking of pardon and grace is part of appropriate behaviour (bahasa) that one should have in cases like this.

Consider the following:

(10) Maka titah baginda suruh bertanya conn. speech his majesty order ask kepada orang tua itu, dari mana to person old that from where datang=nya maka ia duduk kemari ini come=he conn. he reside hither this dan orang mana asal=nya and person where origin=he

The king then gave orders to ask these old people whence they had come and settled in this place and what their origin was.

(11) Maka hamba raja itu pun men=junjung=kan conn. servant king that TM ag.foc.=carry on the head=act.foc. titah baginda kepada orang tua itu speech his majesty to person old that

The king's servants respectfully transmitted the king's words to the old people.

(12) Maka sembah orang tua itu; conn. obeisance person old that:

"Daulat Tuan=ku, ada=pun patik ini good fortune Lord=my exist=TM slave this hamba juga pada kebawah Duli slave also at to under dust of the feet

They respectfully replied: "Hail my Lord, we are just servants of Your Majesty; for originally
Yang Maha-mulia, karena asal adalah yang paling mulia karena asal adalah.
Ini duduk di Kota Malagai. Maka ini duduk di Kota Malagai. Maka
we lived in the town of Malagai. When our Royal Grandfather
pas pada masa Paduka Nenda berangkat at period foot grandfather depart
departed for Ayutthaya in order to build a settlement there, we
pergi berbuat negeri ke Ayutthaya, maka go make city to Ayutthaya, conn.
go make city to Ayutthaya, conn.
patik pun di=kerah orang pergi slave TM pt.foc.=summon person go
meng=iring=kan =Duli 
ag.foc.=accompany=act.foc. dust of the feet
Paduka Nenda berangkat itu. foot grandfather depart that
Setelah Paduka Nenda After this then foot grandfather
When he had arrived at this place we
sampai kepada tempat ini, maka patik pun arrive to place this conn. slave TM
were summoned to come and accompany Him on His voyage.
kedatangan penyakit, maka patik pun stricken with illness conn. slave TM
when he had arrived at this place we
di=tinggal=kan orang=lah
pt.foc.=leave behind=act.foc. person=CM
pada tempat ini" at place this
at this place we were stricken with an illness, so we were left behind here:"

(13) Maka titah baginda: "Apa nama conn. speech his majesty: What name
engkau?"
you

(14) Maka sembah orang tua itu: "Nama conn. obeisance person old that: name
patik Encik Tani" slave Encik Tani
The old man respectfully replied: "My name is Encik Tani:"
The king spoke: "What is your name?"

Notice the complexity of the frame part of the indirect frame-content construction in example (10) above. All the speech acts, titah, suruh, bertanya, are expressed explicitly. Why is it that the narrator chose to speak about it in this elaborate way, i.e. the King spoke in the form of ordering someone to ask these old people, instead of just speaking about it plainly in the form of maka baginda bertanya kepada orang tua itu 'the King asked these old people'.
The reason why the narrator had to or rather chose to do this is a matter of bahasa, a proper way of speaking about the King and also because that is the way it should be. The King, constrained by bahasa, has to use a mediator when speaking to someone he never met before. The narrator's name would be at stake, i.e. he would be considered melanggar bahasa 'committing a breach of good manners', if he did not do this or if he did not describe it. Notice that this matter of bahasa involves two kinds of distancing: physical distancing and linguistic distancing. The former requires the presence of a mediator, hamba
raja 'King's servant' in example (11) to be ordered and mainly to carry out the speech act of asking the question to the old people. The latter requires three speech acts, titah, suruh, bertanya, expressed explicitly, and not just one, bertanya as discussed above.

In example (11) the predicate menjunjunghan literally means 'to carry on one's head' (cf. discussion of junjungh in example (7) above). The reason why this word is chosen and not any other, e.g. menyampaikan 'to convey' or 'to transmit', is again a matter of bahasa. Notice that bahasa here involves two aspects: physical distancing and the act of showing respect. The former is manifested in the fact that the servant carries on his head (menjunjunghan) the speech (or the words) of the King towards (kepada) the old people. The latter is signalled by the fact that the servant carries on his head (menjunjunghan) the speech of the King. The physical distancing may be motivated by the fact that normally when a king speaks to a stranger, especially when the status of relationship between them has not been established, the former usually makes use of a mediator. Once the status of their relationship is established, as can be seen in example (12), the mediator isn't used anymore. This fact, i.e. the King speaking directly to the old man without any mediator, can be seen in the exchange as portrayed in examples (13) and (14).

In example (12), the clause adapun patik ini hamba juga pada kebawah Duli Yang Mahamulia 'we are also servants of Your Majesty', which literally translates as 'Your slaves here are also servants underneath the dust of the feet of the Most Noble', is a speech act of humbling oneself before a ruler or a King. It is a distancing device used by the speaker, the old man, to put himself literally at a level which is underneath the dust of the feet of the most noble. By means of this, the speaker, in other words, is making clear his status in relation to the King. This is one aspect of this distancing device. The second aspect of this device involves the separation of the content level of example (10), i.e. the question dari mana datangnya maka ia duduk kemari ini dan orang mana asalnya 'where they had come from and settled in this place and what their origin was', from its answer, i.e. the content level of example (12), which starts with karena asal patik ini ... and ends with ... pada tempat ini. The separation of these two content levels is done by means of the information in example (11) and in example (12), Daulat Tuanku, adapun patik ini hamba juga pada kebawah Duli Yang Mahamulia.

Paduka Nénda and Duli Paduka Nénda as found in the second and third sentences of the content part of example (12) are again proper ways for the old man to refer to the King's Royal Grandfather. Note that bahasa does not allow the old man to refer to the King's Royal Grandfather by terms other than Paduka Nénda. Notice that the form Paduka Nénda occurs in subordinate adverbial clauses, whereas the form Duli Paduka Nénda occurs in the main clause. This might indicate that Paduka Nénda is probably the second mention form of the nominal form Duli Paduka Nénda. The truth of this inference has to be verified by more data.

Notice that in the exchange between the King and the old man in examples (13) and (14), two kinds of distancing devices are absent, i.e. the non-verbal physical one and the verbal relational one. The former is manifested in the absence of the mediating servant (cf. examples (10) and (11) for his presence). The latter is manifested in the absence of the relational formulaic address term Daulat Tuanku, which is used in the context of examples (4) and (5), and in the context of examples (6) and (7) to separate the content level of the King's speech from the content level of the speech of his subjects. The reason for the absence of the term Daulat Tuanku is probably due to the fact that example (14) is still part of the same speech act interaction, i.e. the asking of questions
that still involves the same speaker and addressee, that starts out in example (10) and extends to example (14). In other words, when the interaction involves a new speech act other than the one prior to it in a previous dialogue paragraph, the term Daulat Tuanku usually appears as a signal of this change in speech act. Note that this term only occurs in context where a king is speaking down to his subject and exclusively in the addressee part of the dialogue, and not in the speaker part of the dialogue. To back up the validity of this inference (or hypothesis) compare the dialogue paragraphs which are illustrated by examples (4) and (5), and examples (6) and (7), and which occur in the text one after the other. Notice that the term Daulat Tuanku occurs both in example (5) and in example (7). Notice also that the speech act in the context of examples (4) and (5) is an assertion (or a statement), whereas in the context of examples (6) and (7) it is not an assertion but a command. Hence, a change of speech act involves the following: a change of participants with the same speech act or a change of speech act with the same participants.

Despite the absence of these two distancing devices, there are two others that are involved in the context of examples (13) and (14). The first type is reflected in the pronouns engkau and patik. Engkau is a second person pronoun which is used by elders and superiors in addressing juniors and inferiors. Hence, there is a distancing here that the King is making between him and his addressee, the old man. The latter's proper response to this, constrained by bahasa, is the use of patik 'slave' as a way of acknowledging his status and accepting the distancing set up by the King.

The second type of distancing is the one used by the narrators and is reflected in the words titah 'speech (of)' for the King and sembah 'speech (of)' for the old man. This distancing is implied in the meanings of these words which have been discussed above.

So far I have been talking about three types of speech act participants: 1) the narrator, who talks about the others, i.e. the characters in the story, 2) speaker of high status (character in the story): speaks down to addressee of lower status, 3) speaker of low status (character in the story): speaks up to the addressee of high status.

The terms in the examples above that are used by the narrator to refer to the fact that the speaker of low status is performing the speech act towards the addressee of high status are sembah and to the fact that the speaker of high status (in this case the king) is performing the speech act towards the addressee of low status is titah. In other words, titah and sembah are in complementary distribution. They have basically the same meaning, i.e. 'the speech of' but are used by the narrator in different contexts. In this way the narrator is acting appropriately, i.e. berbahasa, in the sense of applying proper terms to proper speech act participants. The terms that are used by the King to refer to himself in addressing his addressee are aku and kita. Aku as discussed above is the first person which is used by a speaker when addressing his addressee in an intimate circle. Kita, on the other hand, is used by a high status speaker when speaking down to a low status addressee. Note that aku is used by the King when he is making an assertion or a statement to his ministers, officials, officers and all the people about the abundance of the hunting game near the seashore (see example (4) and the sentence prior to example (4) in the text). Kita is used by the King when he is giving an order to his ministers and officials to summon all his subjects (see example (6)). In other words, in example (4), the form aku is used because the context or the speech act made by the King is informal and intimate. However, in example (6) the form kita is
used because the context or the speech act made by the King then requires a formality and not an intimacy.

The terms that are used by the speaker of low status to speak up to the King, the addressee of high status, are patik, Daulat Tuanku, Duli Yang Mahamulia, (patik) junjung, (patik) mohonkan ampun dan karunia.

In summary, display 3.3.1. presents what has been discussed above.

In conclusion, all these terms should be used right and properly by the speaker, whether narrator or speech act participant, in any hikayat of a Malay kingdom. If they are not, then the speaker will be described as someone who melanggar bahasa 'commits a breach of etiquette', or tak tahu bahasa 'does not know manners'. However if they are used right and properly the speaker will be praised as someone who is baik sekali budibahasanya, i.e. who 'has very good manners'.

**Display 3.3.1.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>DIRECT SPEECH</th>
<th>INDIRECT SPEECH/DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Person</td>
<td>Second Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. King</td>
<td>aku</td>
<td>Tuanku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(used by 2, 3 &amp; 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ministers</td>
<td>patik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. people who follow the dogs</td>
<td>patik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. the old man</td>
<td>patik</td>
<td>engkau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(used by 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Royal Grandfather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The King never uses speech act verbs (or performative verbs); other participants always do except the old man, Encik Tani.

† This is the instance (see discussion of examples (13) and (14)) where the old man does not use a speech act verb. This has to do with the problem of the scope of Daulat, i.e. one daulat per speech act. More precisely, it has to do with the fact that the exchange in which examples (13) and (14) take place still occur within the same speech act.
3.4. NAMING AND ETYMOLOGIZING

The text under analysis, the first story of HP, is essentially a story that is built on the meaning of the name of the main participant, Paya Tu Naqpa. Paya, according to Teeuw and Wyatt (1970:221) is an honorific title which is common in Thai, Burmese and Môn. Tu according to them (1970:221) 'has one meaning common to both Malay and Thai, as a demonstrative pronoun meaning "that, those".' However, they comment further that 'its application and interpretation are uncertain' in the text. Naqpa, again according to Teeuw and Wyatt (1970:221) 'might be Thai nak-pa "man of the forest" - a name appropriate to one who was accustomed to always go hunting'.

Now, the story starts off by introducing the father of the main participant, the place where he lives and the name that the father gave to the son, Paya Tu Antara (sentences (2-3)). The story goes on to the event of the son succeeding the father after the latter died and provides information about the new name, Paya Tu Naqpa, that the son gave himself (sentences (4-6)). After this point, i.e. beginning with sentence (7), Selama Paya Tu Naqpa kerajaan itu sentiasa ia pergi berburu 'During his reign Paya Tu Naqpa was accustomed to always go hunting', the story goes on developing a context where the name is made meaningful, i.e. an account of a specific instance of the habitual generic act of hunting as expressed in sentence (7). In summary form the specific account could be presented as follows:

'The King, Paya Tu Naqpa, heard about a hunting ground by the seashore where there was plenty of game. His subjects confirmed this news and so he decided to go hunting at this place. During the climax of the hunt, his dogs came across a mousedeer which they pursued to the beach and disappeared at a spot on the beach.

On his way to the spot, the King met an older couple who were prawn-fishermen. He asked them how they got there and asked the name of the husband.

Returning to his tent, that night after discussion with his ministers and officers, he decided to build a town/country at the spot where the mousedeer appeared/disappeared. The town was completed in two months and was given the name Patani Darussalam.'

Towards the end of the story, the narrators present the point of the story, i.e. the reason why the story was told, in the following form:

Syahdan kebanyakakan kata orang nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang merawa itulah. Bahwa sesungguhnya nama negeri itu mengikut sembah orang mengatakan pelanduk lenyap itu. 'Most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fishermen. In actual fact the name of the settlement derived from the words which the people used when reporting the disappearance of the mousedeer.'

Notice that the point of the story, i.e. the explication of how the name of the settlement was arrived at, is a form of etymologizing. It consists of two sentences. The first one states the popular public opinion. The second states the opinion of the narrators, the 'true' etymology.

The first etymology is embedded in the specific hunting account in sentence (34), Maka sembah orang tua itu: 'Nama patik Encik Tani' 'The old man respectfully replied: "My name is Encik Tani"', which is a reply to the King's question in sentence (33), Maka titah baginda: 'Apa nama engkau?' 'The King spoke: "What is
your name?". In reality the dialogue as expressed by sentences (33) and (34) is part of a text unit, an episode or a scene (extended from sentence (28) to sentence (35)), that is developed by the narrators as a further extension to back up the explication that contains the popular belief.

The second or the 'true' etymology is backed up in the hunting account by sentence (27), especially by the phrase pantai ini 'this beach' which is part of the last sentence in the content part of sentence (27), Maka sembah mereka sekalian itu: 'Daulat Tuanku, patik mohonkan ampun dan karunia. Ada seekor pelanduk putih, besarnya seperti kambing, warna tubuhnya gilang gemilang. Itulah yang dihambat oleh anjing ini. Maka pelanduk itu pun lenyaplah pada pantai ini.' 'They replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord, we beg your pardon and grace. There was a white mousedeer, the size of a goat, and its body had a luminous sheen. That was what the dogs were pursuing, but the mousedeer has vanished on this beach here."' Sentence (27) is a reply to the King's question in sentence (26), Maka titah baginda: 'Apa yang disalak oleh anjing itu?' 'The King spoke: "What were these dogs barking at?"' This dialogue, expressed in sentences (26) and (27), is part of an episode or a scene which is developed by the narrators as a further extension to back up the explication that is expressed in the sentence that contains the opinion of the narrators.

Notice that the first name, Nakpa, or rather the meaning of it is used as a strategy to build up the hunting story which is a specific instance of the main participant's generic habitual act of hunting that he was accustomed to do during his reign. Within this hunting story are embedded two scenes or episodes, the encounter of the King with the old couple and the act of the King's dogs pursuing the mousedeer, which illustrate, instantiate or rather expand on the point of the hunting story, i.e. the explication of how the name of the settlement is arrived at. Hence, the second name, i.e. the name of the settlement, is also used as a strategy to build up the two embedded scenes or episodes within the bigger text of the hunt.

In other words, in terms of its expansion, the point of the story is embedded within the story about the meaning of the name of the main participant. In terms of role relation the latter, i.e. the specific hunting story, assumes the role of instrument to achieve the former, i.e. the point of the story, as the goal or the intention of the narrators that they try to communicate to their audience. Following is a diagram to make this point clear:

Display 3.4.1.

1. Popular belief vs.
2. Narrator's opinion

1 = the King went on a hunt
2 = the dogs pursued the mousedeer
3 = the King met the old couple

Narrator

Point of the story

Addressee

TEXT

1

2

3
Notice that in the first case, i.e. the meaning of the name of the participant, name is used as a base or topic from which the text is developed, while in the second, the name of the settlement, name is used as a concluding point. In other words, names in this text are used by the narrators to give a sense of completeness to the text. This act of giving a sense of completeness to the text by means of names at the beginning and at the end of the text is another text-building strategy that should be distinguished from the strategy of using names or their meanings to build up a text as discussed above.

Etymologizing about names is not highly valued in Western culture because people in this culture 'tend to feel that names are the most arbitrary words of all, given to people and places before they really "are".' However, in Judeo-Christian tradition this strategy of text-building is very pervasive, e.g. 'The new name given to Jacob after his night of wrestling at Penuel: "Your name", said his supernatural antagonist, "shall no more be called Jacob, but Israel, for you have striven [šārītā, from šārâ 'strive'] with God and with men, and have prevailed"; (Genesis 32:28, RSV); the name Jesus, meaning 'Yahweh or God saves', based on which lots of sermons have been written and preached; an American Christian family I know of gave their first son the name Jesse, meaning 'God exists', the story behind it being as follows: At the time the mother gave birth to this son, the doctor said that the baby would not live because of the difficult delivery. The parents, who were about to be Christians then, did not yield to the doctor's statement, but were convinced that if God exists their son would survive. He did survive and so they named him Jesse. Hence, I would say that in the Christian and Jewish part of the Western culture names are not arbitrary and etymologizing about names is still valued, if not highly valued.

3.5. PARTICLES
3.5.1. Maka

Richard Winstedt, in his Malay English Dictionary (1967), states that maka in literary language means 'then' or 'next' with an additional comment that it is 'an untranslatable word that fulfills the function of a full stop or comma in Malayo-Arabic script; obsolescent in Romanized Malay'.

The first meaning given by Poerwadarminta in his Kamus Umum Bahasa Indonesia 'General Dictionary of Bahasa Indonesia' (1966) is Kata untuk memulai kalimat, berarti: dan, lalu, sudah itu lalu 'a word to start or to introduce a sentence, with the meaning: and, then, after that then'.

Lewis, in his Teach Yourself Malay (1947:255) gives the following information:

Maka is the commonest of the punctuation words. When you are translating a passage, you will find it helpful to think of it as an introductory word marking the opening of a clause, whether main or subordinate. But its real function is rather to join one clause to the next. 'This happened, then, that happened.' It can sometimes be translated by 'and' or 'then', but it is usually better to omit it in translation.

Becker, in his article 'The figure a sentence makes' subtitled 'An interpretation of a classical Malay sentence' (1977:13) provides the following etymological explanation: 'Maka can be analyzed into ma- + (k + a), in which ma- = stative prefix, -k- = deictic formative, and -a = third person there/then.'
the same article (p.14), he also states that: 'At the level of sentences, the Classical Malay text uses just maka (or another single-word connective like shahadan or hatta ...) to mark separate units.'

Winstedt, again in his Malay Grammar, in the section of 'punctuation words' (1913:161-163), provides the following information: 'maka is written after the words sa-bermula "story introducing word", bermula "the story begins", sa-kali p尔斯有a (Skt.) "once upon a time", alkesah (Ar.) "the story is", hata "next", sahadan (= sah Skt. + dan), kalakian, arakian "moreover".' Besides this, he also states that maka 'marks the temporal causal or other antithetical connection between clauses and parts of sentence' and 'connects principal sentences in rapid staccato narrative, marking each separate event of the whole', e.g. 'maka dengan sa-saat itu juga, maka Bētara Kala mēnjadilah katak; maka ia pun hēndak lari; maka dilihat diri-nya tēlah mēnjadikatak, maka lalu tēlompatlompat, maka sērta bērbynī gēruk-gēruk "At that very instant Bertara Kala became a frog; he wanted to run, noticed his changed form, straightway made leap after leap, at the same time croaking"' and that it conjoins subordinate clauses.

Notice that all the definitions of maka given above have three things in common. That is, maka is an initial punctuation that starts off a sentence or a clause and since it always occurs at the beginning of sentences or clause it is therefore a marker of these text units. It is also a connective because it occurs between clauses and sentences and connects them.

These three aspects of maka hold true in our text. However, there is one more aspect of its meaning that we would like to add to what has been given above. That is, in terms of the context of the text as a discourse, maka always occurs preceding an event and a sequence sentence (or clause). It never occurs preceding a discourse initiating sentence. In other words, maka could be viewed as an event sequence sentence (or clause) marker in a discourse.26 It should be noted that Lewis implied this in the following sentence as quoted above: 'This happened, then, that happened.' However, this does not necessarily mean that maka is a temporal sequence marker, although it can be temporal.

In summary we could state that maka is a sentence level property in a discourse. In terms of its function slot it is an initial punctuation; in terms of its function or semantic role it is an event sequence sentence marker in a discourse; in terms of its filler class it is a connective. In a four-cell tagmeme, it will appear as follows:

```
initial punctuation       connective
ESM                     ESM
maka                     maka
```

3.5.2. Arakian

Winstedt again in his Malay English Dictionary states that arakian means 'again' or 'moreover'. In relation with kian, which means 'as many (much, far) as' or 'there', he provides arakian with the meaning of 'next' or literally 'direction there' which probably derives from arah 'direction' and kian 'there'. In his Malay Grammar as quoted above, he considers this particle as belonging to the class of words that he calls 'punctuation words' (1913:161), i.e. 'words which serve to introduce the commencement of story, of paragraph, and of sentence, and to mark the balance of clauses.' He comments further that 'these words are not found in Malay conversation, and may be omitted in translating
Malay composition into a foreign language.' He goes on elaborating that 'a fresh topic or paragraph will be opened by hata "next", sahadan (= saha Skt. + dan), kalakian, arakian "moreover" — ... all followed by maka' without making any clear distinction between arakian and sahadan, which is spelled syahdan in my text, and also between arakian and kalakian.

Lewis, in his *Teach Yourself Malay* which is based on Winstedt's *Malay Grammar* labels these punctuation words, i.e. hatta (or hata), shahadan, arakian and kalakian 'transition words'. His comments on these words, with a little modification, are basically the same as Winstedt's given above: 'These words are used to introduce a new topic, or a new aspect of a topic already introduced.' (1947:230). Again Lewis, like Winstedt, does not specify the difference between arakian, syahdan and kalakian. The meaning he gives to these words is just the same as Winstedt's, that is, 'moreover'.

Poerwadarminta 1966 provides arakian with the meaning of sesudah itu lalu 'after that then' or 'having that before then'.

From all the contexts of arakian in my text, I observe that this particle is a conclusion marker of a sentence, paragraph or an episode within the story. That is to say that it does not function in the same way as demikian in demikian-lah hikayatnya 'Thus was the story', which is a story conclusion marker and hence occurs at the end of the story. In other words, arakian and demikian are both conclusion markers which are in complementary distribution.

To illustrate this point, take for instance sentence (9) and relate it to sentences (7) and (8); or take sentence (13) and relate it to sentences (9-12), especially sentence (11); or take sentence (41) and relate it to sentences (39-40).

For more evidence following portions from story 2 of HP are presented (p.72, paragraph 4):

*Setelah sudah Syaikh Sa'id berjanji dengan raja itu, maka Syaikh Sa'id pun duduklah mengobat raja itu. Ada tujuh hari lamanya, maka raja pun dapatlah keluar diadap oleh menteri hulubalang sekalian. Arakian maka Syaikh Sa'id pun bermohonlah kepada baginda, lalu kembali kerumahnya.*

('After Sheikh Sa'id had made this agreement with the King he sat down to treat him. It took seven days before the King was able to go out and give audience to the ministers and officers. Then (or 'after that then') Sheikh Sa'id respectfully took his leave of the King and returned to his home."

(p.72, paragraph 5, and p.73, paragraph 1, partially:)

*Hatta ada dua tahun selangnya, maka raja pun sakti pula, seperti dahulu itu juga penyakitnya. Maka Syaikh Sa'id pun disuruh panggil pula oleh raja. Telah Syaikh Sa'id datang, maka titah baginda: 'Tuan obatlah penyakit hamba ini. Jikalau sembuh penyakit hamba sekali ini, bahwa barang kata tuanhamba itu tiadalalah hamba lalu lagi.' Maka kata Syaikh Sa'id:*

'After two years had elapsed the King fell ill again, suffering from the same disease as before. Again the King sent for Sheikh Sa'id. After the sheikh had arrived the King spoke. "Please treat this illness of mine. If I recover this time, then indeed I shall not ignore again whatever you say." The sheikh said:
'Sungguh-sungguh janji Tuanku dengan patik maka patik mau mengobati Duli Tuanku. Jikalau tiada sungguh seperti titah Duli Tuanku ini, tiadalah patik mau mengobat dia.'

Setelah didengar raja sembah Syaikh Sa'id itu demikian, maka raja pun berteguh-teguhan janjilah dengan Syaikh Sa'id. Arakian maka Syaikh Sa'id pun duduklah mengobat raja itu.

(p. 75: sentences 4-6:)

"If your agreement with me is truthful, then I will cure Your Majesty. But if your words are not sincere, then I will not treat you." When the King heard the words of Sheikh Sa'id he solemnly confirmed his agreement with him. Then (or 'after that then') Sheikh Sa'id sat down to treat the King.

"After the sheikh had given the name to the King, the King spoke: 'You should also give my three children names at once so that in all respects I become a good Muslim.' Sheikh Sa'id said respectfully: 'May Your Majesty's might and prosperity increase, so that till the end of time Your Majesty's children and grand-children may be forever secure and safe on the royal throne in the land of Patani, Abode of Peace.' Then (or 'after that then') Sheikh Sa'id gave the eldest son of the King the name of Sultan Mudhaffar Syah, and the middle one, the daughter, he gave the name of Sitti 'A'isyah, and the youngest son he gave the name of Sultan Mansur Syah.'

Arakian, according to Winstedt (quoted above), in two of our illustrations could be a punctuation word which introduces the beginning of a paragraph, i.e. in sentence (9) it introduces the Complex Dialogue Paragraph that is composed of sentences (9-12), and in sentence (13) it introduces the paragraph that is made up of sentences (13-16). However, this generalization does not hold well for the examples given above that are taken from story 2.

Lewis, as quoted above, classifies this particle as one of the transition words that 'are used to introduce a new topic, or a new aspect of a topic already introduced.' This generalization holds true in all the examples above. However I argue that there is a difference between arakian, syahdan, hatta and kalakian.²⁷ And this difference was not discussed either by Lewis or Winstedt. It will be clear what it is by the time we are through with discussing each of these particles.

3.5.3. Hatta (or hata)

According to Winstedt in his Malay English Dictionary, hat(t)a is originally a Sanskrit word which means 'next' and is used to introduce a new paragraph.
The original Sanskrit form for hatta is ṛṭha or ṛṭhā. In his *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* (1899), Sir Monier Monier-Williams provides the following information: 'an auspicious and inceptive particle (not easily expressed in English), now, then, moreover, rather, certainly, but, else, what?, howelse?, etc.'

From all the contexts of hatta in my text, I observe that this particle marks the beginning of a text unit that contains a change in the action or the event. It usually has to do with the change in participant orientation or in the scene. The change in participant orientation may involve the change of the background major participant with the foregrounded major participant. It may also involve the introduction of new significant participant, while the major participant is still the same, with a change in the scene.

The text unit in which this change takes place is probably close to what others label as 'episode'. The following quotations describe what an episode is, and is, in terms of properties, somewhat close to the text unit in which hatta occurs:

Episode settings always involve a change of participant orientation and scene from the previous incident in the story .... While the opening incident of an episode takes its temporal setting from the speech of the participant thematized in the episode setting, settings for subsequent incidents are defined by their motion away from or their return to the previous setting ... (Grimes 1975:109-110)

... an episode may consist of a series of paragraphs in which the same characters take part, so that a new episode begins when a significant change of participants takes place. (Grimes 1975:110)

To know the specific context of hatta in my text, the following are comments about them:

Sentence (4) contains the information about the death of the old king, the father of the focussed major participant, Paya Tu Naqpa. This sentence forms the beginning of the episode where the King's son started his reign in the kingdom. There is a change of participant orientation at this point. That is to say that both the hatta sentence and the one after it provide the information about this change.

Sentence (17) contains the information regarding the report of the scout to the King that there are plenty of deer to hunt. And this information marks the beginning of the actual hunt. It involves some change of scene here, i.e. movement from the camping place to the forest.

Sentence (23) contains the information about the dogs' barking being heard after two hours. It marks the beginning of the account of the discovery of the spot where the mousedeer disappeared and of the encounter of the prawn fisherman and his wife. There is a change of scene involved and an addition of significant participants to the story at this point.

Sentence (39) contains the information about the completion of the building of the town. It marks the beginning of the kingdom in the new town. In other words, there is a change of scene or location involved here.
3.5.4. Ini - itu

Ini is a deictic particle which means 'this' or 'these'. In terms of deictic anchor it usually modifies the speaker or other entities that are close to the speaker. This proximity can be temporal or physical.

The following example contains ini as temporal cataphoric deictic particle:

(1) Ini=lah suatu kisah yang di=cetera=kan oleh orang tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu

This is a story which has been told by the old people: the origin of the king who founded Patani, the Abode of Peace.

The fact that ini is cataphoric in this particular sentence is due to the position of kisah, i.e. it follows ini. In other words, the cataphoric feature or 'nature' of ini is not something inherent but it is something external. Since kisah 'story' is an abstract noun, ini, in terms of proximity, is therefore temporal rather than physical. That is to say that the actual telling of the story happens right after this sentence is uttered. In light of all these facts, our sentence above would be interpreted as having the following meaning: 'This is a story which I, the speaker, am about to tell. It has been told by the old people and is about the origin of the king who built the settlement of Patani.'

Now, suppose we reverse the order of ini and kisah and as a result have the following: Kissah ini=lah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'This (then) was the story told by the old people about the King who built the settlement of Patani.'

Ini in this context is not cataphoric but anaphoric. Hence, as has been stated above, it is the position of the noun kisah in relation to ini that determines whether the latter is cataphoric or anaphoric. In other words, this sentence is a speech act of concluding the story as opposed to the former which is a speech act of introducing or announcing the telling of the story. Another difference that one could observe between these two sentences is that the former sentence is an exocentric construction, whereas the latter is an endocentric one.

The following is an example where the use of ini is more physical than temporal due to the fact that the noun it modifies is a concrete one.

(2) Maka pelanduk itu pun lenyap=lah pada pantai ini.

The mousedeer disappeared on this beach.

Now, ini here refers to the fact that the beach the speaker is referring to is close to him physically. That is to say he was standing on the beach in Patani when he was uttering this sentence. Notice that ini in this particular context is neither cataphoric nor anaphoric. It refers to an entity that is non-textual. That is, something that is part of nature, the non-textual world, and not part of the text.

Itu, like ini, is a deictic particle which means 'that' or 'those'. It also carries a sense of definiteness. In terms of deictic anchor it is usually

...
hearer centred and also other centred, i.e. the person or thing talked about by
the speaker and hearer.

In our text there are two kinds of itu: the presupposed or the script\textsuperscript{29} one
and the non-presupposed one which is usually anaphoric. To illustrate the first
type following are some examples:

(3) Ada=pun raja di Kota Maligai itu

            Exis\textsuperscript{T}TM king in town Maligai that
nama=nya Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana
name=the/he Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana

(4) Arakian maka titah baginda: "Aku

       conn. conn. speech his majesty: I
dengar khabar=nya perburuan sebelah
hear report=the hunting game side
tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon"
shore sea that very many report says

(5) Maka baginda pun me=nitah=kan

       conn. his majesty TM ag.foc.=order=act.foc.
orang pergi me=lihat bekas rusa itu
person go ag.foc.=see track deer that

(6) Maka baginda pun amat hairan=lah

       conn. his majesty TM very astonished=CM
serta me=nitah=kan me=nyuruh
and ag.foc.=say=act.foc. ag.foc.=order
me=lepas=kan anjing perburuan
ag.foc.=release=act.foc. dog hunting

None of the itu's in these sentences nor the one that occurs in sentence (1) are
anaphoric. That is to say that the nouns they modify haven't been mentioned
before in the text. They are presupposed by the narrators. In other words, itu
in sentence (1) implies that the narrators assume that their audience knows
about Patani the Abode of Peace; it is not an indefinite or a new information
to the latter. The same implication holds true for Kota Maligai in sentence
(3). In addition to this, itu in this context gives a sense of a unit to the
first nominal phrase Adapun raja di Kota Maligai.

All the noun phrases modified by itu in sentences (4-6) are part of the
hunting script. That is to say that the seashore in sentence (4), although it
has not been mentioned before in the text, is known to both the King as speaker
and to his ministers, officials, officers and all his subjects as addressee.
So what the King is really saying is: 'I have heard reports that the game near
the seashore is abundant indeed. I assume you all know what seashore I am
talking about. That is why I could launch into talking about it as something
definite.'\textsuperscript{30}

In sentence (5) the narrators assume that their addressee knows that when
they talk about a king going out on a hunt the only object of his game is deer.
And so mentioning tracks of deer at this point in the text without explicitly
mentioning them before makes sense to both parties and also to us as outside interpreters of the system. In sentence (6), the narrators assume that the hunting dogs are stereotypic part of the hunting script. And so they mention them here for the first time as an old definite information.

The anaphoric non-presupposed itu is different from the script one in that the former always modifies nouns that have been mentioned previously in the text whether it be the same noun or the paraphrase of it, e.g. hutan itu 'the forest' in sentence (20) in the text refers back to hutan sebelah tepi laut ini 'the forest on the side of this seashore' in the content part of sentence (17); anjing itu 'the dogs' in sentence (26) which is anaphoric of the string of anjing itu in sentences (25), (24), (23), (22) and also of anjing perburuan baginda sendiri itu 'the king's own hunting dogs' in sentence (21), which is an instance of the script itu as has been mentioned above.

In terms of time, ini usually has to do with immediate time before or after a speech act is performed. See discussion of sentence (1) above for this. On the other hand, itu usually has to do with distant time whether in the past or in the future. For example, itu in (1) may also be interpreted as the modifier of the phrase raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam. In this case itu refers to the fact that the king's indefinite action of building the town of Patani, the Abode of Peace was taking place in the past. Itu does not refer so much to raja as to his action. If it did, then raja would be interpreted as being definite. This interpretation is not quite right because at this point in the story raja is indefinite to the addressee despite the fact that he is definite to the old reported narrators, i.e. they know which raja they have in mind when telling the story. Itu in sentence (3) above may also be interpreted as the modifier of the whole phrase Adapun raja di Kota Maligai. With this interpretation it is possible to interpret the existence of the raja (ada 'exist, be') as being in the past. Again here itu refers more to the EXISTENCE of the king rather than to the king himself. The reason for this is quite the same as the one given above where itu modifies the action of the king rather than the king.

The following is an example of the use of itu in the distant future. This example is taken from a prophecy from the book of Zechariah (12:4a) in the Indonesian (Malay) Bible (published by Pertjetakan Lembaga Alkitab Indonesia [the Indonesian Bible Society], Tjiluar-Bogor):

(7) Maka pada hari itu djuga, demikianlah Firman Tuhan, akan kupala segala kuda dengan kekedjutan dan segala orang jang mengendarainya dengan gila; on that day, thus says the Lord, I will strike every horse with panic and its rider with madness. ...

3.5.5. Syahdan

In Winstedt's Malay English Dictionary, syahdan is spelled shahadan and the meaning that is given there is 'moreover' or 'furthermore'. In his Malay Grammar (1913:161) he classifies this particle as a fresh topic or paragraph opener along with other particles of similar nature such as hatta, kalakian and arakian.
According to him sahadan is derived from the Sanskrit saha 'together with, along with, with, in common, in company, jointly, conjointly, in concert' and Malay dan 'and'. On the same page he makes a note that 'Sahadan is sometimes used in old literature for the copula and.' The examples that he gave to illustrate this are: Maharaja Rawana kararlaha dengan adilnya sahadan dengan murahan 'Maharaja Ravana was established with justice and graciousness'; tērlalu luas humanya sahadan tērlalu jadi padi-nya 'the field was very large and the crop bountiful.'

In the text under analysis syahdan apparently is used as an evaluation marker. The term EVALUATION here is adapted from Labov and Waletzky (1967:37). It is the part of the text which reveals the attitude of the narrators toward the text by emphasizing the relative importance of some narrative units as compared to others. Syahdan, which is used twice in the text, occurs with and modifies text units which are considered important by the narrators. The first one is: Syahdan maka Paya Tu Antara pun kerajaanlah menggantikan ayahanda baginda itu. Ia menamai dirinya Paya Tu Naqpa. 'Then Paya Tu Antara became king, succeeding his father. He called himself Paya Tu Nakpa.' The second one is: Syahdan kebanyak kata orang nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang merawa itulah. Bahwa sesungguhnya nama negeri itu mengikut sembah orang mengatakan pelanduk lenyap itu. 'Most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fisherman. In actual fact the name of the settlement derived from the words which the people used when reporting the disappearance of the mousedeer.' Note that the first text unit, especially Naqpa, the last part of the name in the second sentence, is used as a base or topic or a theme from which the rest of the text is developed (cf. the meaning of Naqpa as a text-building strategy discussed in section 3.4., Naming and Etymologizing); it is also used as a device to start off the hunting story. The second text unit is used to express the point of the story; it is also used as a device to conclude the story.

3.5.6. Demikian

In discussing arakian above (section 3.5.2.), I stated that this particle is a conclusion marker of a sentence, paragraph, or an episode within the story and that demikian is a conclusion marker at a story or a discourse level and occurs at the end of it.

In this subsection I will point out two more aspects regarding the meaning of demikian. According to Poerwadarminta (1966) demi in classical Malay literature means sebagai 'like'. Kian, according to both Winstedt (1957) and Poerwadarminta (1966), means sana, situ 'there'. The following is the concluding sentence of the text in which demikian occurs:

(1) Demikianlah hikayatnya like there CM story the That is the way the story goes.

Note that demikian 'like there' or 'like that' is anaphoric of the reported story which is introduced by the introductory sentence Inilah suatu kisah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'This is a story which has been told by the old people: the origin of the King who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace.' In the context of the telling of the story ini in the introductory sentence is the opposite of demikian in the concluding sentence, i.e. ini is cataphoric and demikian is anaphoric, ini is introducing and demikian is concluding the story.
Now the following is a context in the text where Demikian occurs in a dialogue paragraph level:

(2) Arakian maka titah baginda: "Aku
dengar khabar=nya perburuan sebelah
tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon"

Then the king spoke:
"I have heard reports that the game near
the sea-shore is
abundant indeed."

(3) Maka sembah segala menteri:
"Daulat Tuan=ku, sungguh=lah seperti
titah Duli Yang Maha=mulia
speech dust of the feet that most=noble
itu, patik dengar pun demi=kian juga"

The ministers replied respectfully: "Hail
my Lord; it is true indeed as Your
Majesty has spoken;
we too have heard likewise."

Notice that demikian in (3) is anaphoric of the information perburuan sebelah tepi laut itu terlalu banyak 'the game near the sea-shore is abundant indeed' in (2). It is also conclusive in the sense of giving a sense of closure or completeness to this paragraph.

Consider the following context, which follows (2) and (3) in the text:

(4) Maka titah Phaya Tu Naqpa: "Jikalau
demi=kian kerah=kan=lah segala ra'yat
kita. Esok hari kita hendak pergi
I tomorrow day I intend go
to hunt to shore sea that

Phaya Tu Naqpa then
spoke: "In that case call up all
Our people. Tomorrow We shall go hunting
along the sea-shore."

Demikian in (4) is anaphoric of the content level information sungguhlah seperti titah Duli Yang Mahamulia itu, patik dengar pun demikian juga 'it is true indeed as Your Majesty has spoken, we too have heard likewise' in (3). And since demikian in (3) is anaphoric of the information perburuan sebelah tepi laut itu terlalu banyak in (2), the scope of demikian in (4) has a range that includes both these content levels of (2) and (3). In other words, the content part of the Frame Content construction in (4) means 'If you think that what I have heard is true, i.e. the fact that the game near the seashore is abundant, and that you have heard about this yourselves, call up all my people.' Demikian in this context is conclusive. However, because of the presence of the contingency connective particle jikalau 'if' in this context, the sense of closure inherent in demikian is delayed to the end of the sentence in example (4). In other words, there is a sense of prolonged suspense that is not present in (1) and (3) above where demikian occurs.

To know more of demikian, its meaning and its nature, let us compare it with arakian (discussed in section 3.5.2. above):
Based on this it is inferred that demikian, in comparison to arakian, is more a content word than a function word. Arakian on the other hand is a function word more than a content word. In other words, from the point of view of coherence, demikian has more of a referential nature, i.e. it is anaphoric, while arakian has more of a textual nature, i.e. it is more connective in nature than demikian.

3.5.7. Summary

The following is a summary chart of the particles discussed in this section:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICLE</th>
<th>FEATURES/COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hatta</td>
<td>- marks a change in the action or the event in an episode. The change usually has to do with the change in participant orientation or in the scene of location. The change in participant orientation may involve the change of backgrounded major participant with the foregrounded major participant; it may also involve the introduction of a significant participant while the major participant is still the same, with a change in the scene. - usually occurs at the beginning of the episode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maka</td>
<td>- operates on the clause and sentence levels; in terms of its function slot it is an initial punctuation; in terms of its function role it is an event sequence sentence (or clause) marker in a text; in terms of its filler class it is a connective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syahdan</td>
<td>- functions as an evaluation marker and occurs always at the beginning of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ini</td>
<td>- modifies speaker or other entities that are close to the speaker. - proximity is temporal if the noun it modifies is abstract. - proximity is physical if the noun it modifies is concrete. - is cataphoric and exocentric if it is followed by a noun. - is anaphoric and endocentric if it is preceded by a noun. - is neither anaphoric or cataphoric if it refers to an entity that is non-textual, i.e. an entity that is part of nature (ostensive reference). - signals immediate time before or after a speech act is performed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Itu
- types: 1. presupposed or script itu
2. non-presupposed or anaphoric itu
- signals distant time whether in the past or in the future.

Arakian
- conclusion marker of a sentence, paragraph or an episode of a
descriptive indirect speech within the story.
- always occurs at the beginning of the concluding unit. i.e. in
the preframe part of a Frame Content construction.
- not modified by comment marker -lah.

Demikian
- conclusion marker of a Dialogue Paragraph or a Complex Dialogue
Paragraph level, and also of a story as a discourse unit.

3.6. CONSTRUCTION TYPES

My text is made up of five types of construction:
1 - Pun-lah constructions
2 - Frame-Content or Reporting-Reported constructions
3 - -Lah constructions
4 - Other constructions
5 - Embedded structures

3.6.1. Pun-lah constructions

This construction type has two variants: pun-lah constructions and the pun
constructions.

3.6.1.1. Pun-lah constructions

This construction is a type of sentence that is very common in my text and
in other Classical Malay texts I have read. The name pun-lah derives from the
fact that at the core of this construction there is a pun constituent and a -lah
constituent. The pun constituent is the topic of the construction and the -lah
constituent is the event of the construction, i.e. the event that is performed
by the topic or that is affecting the topic. In terms of the information con­
veyed specifically through the content of the text or the story the pun consti­
tuent is old or given information and the -lah constituent is new information.
This dichotomy is not tight or absolute, since in the -lah constituent there are
sometimes forms or elements that pertain to given information. The following
construction is an illustration of this fact:

(1) ... maka jaring dan jerat pun di=tahan ... nets and snares
conn. net and trap TM pt.foc.=set were set by the
orang=lah
person=CM people

The word that pertains to old information in this construction is orang 'people'.
It was mentioned before in the texts in the form of orang and ra'yat sekalian
'all the people'. It should be noted however that the newness of information
or event is expressed by ditahan ‘(were) set’ and orang taken together as a unit.

Besides the pun-lah structure, which is the core, there are two other parts of structures which together with the former constitute the construction. The one that precedes the core is called the PRECORE and the one that follows the ELABORATION. The core is obligatory, whereas the first and the last parts are generally structurally optional. Following is an example from my text to illustrate the three parts of the construction with an interlinear translation:

(2) Syahdan maka Paya Tu Antara pun
   conn. conn. Paya Tu AntaraTM
   kerajaan=lah meng=ganti=kan
   become king=CM ag.foc.=succeed=act.foc.
   ayahanda baginda itu
   father his majesty that

Syahdan maka is the precore part, Paya Tu Antara pun kerajaanlah is the core, and menggantikan ayahanda baginda itu is the elaboration.

The role of the precore is to contextualize the core in the hierarchy of the text. That is, it tells the reader that the sentence occurs at a certain hierarchical level in the text. This is done not so much through the definition of the meaning of the particles syahdan and maka individually, not through etymological explanation of these particles, but mainly through the density in both sound and meaning of these terms. This viewpoint is inherent in certain Southeast Asian cultural patterns and was brought to my attention by A.L. Becker, who, in his article 'The figure a sentence makes', states:

The main question, it seems to me, is about the sheer heaviness of these terms, a density in both sound and meaning which is very reminiscent of the basic principle of heaviness and lightness in Southeast Asian music and calendars: the coincidence of gongs at structural boundaries (the more gongs sounding together, the higher-level the boundary), or - in calendric terms - the coincidence between marked (highly valued) days in simultaneously occurring 'weeks' of different lengths. The Malay text at the level of sentences uses just maka (or another single word connective like shahadan or hatta from Persian and Hindi); sentence clusters (or whatever the next hierarchical unit should be called) use 'heavier' or 'denser' connectives, two words (e.g. arakian maka, demikian maka, hatta sa-telah, arakian sa-telah, sa-telah demikian, and various other combinations of a few connective words) or three words (e.g. maka sa-telah sudah, hatta sa-telah sudah, sa-telah itu maka, ... sa-telah demikian maka). Aside from the rich meanings and significant variant orders of these terms, it is the 'heaviness' itself which marks the figure we are studying - the Classical Malay sentence - as a major boundary in the hierarchical structure of the text, somewhat like a photograph in English or Burmese. More deictics or connectives mean a higher-level plot boundary: new place, new time, new state, new major character, etc. (1977:11)
So syahdan maka, besides being part of the sentence in which they occur, marks the fact that the sentence is the beginning of a hierarchical unit above the sentence level, whatever it should be called.

In my text the hierarchical unit above the sentence level, besides being expressed by two or three connective words, is also expressed by combinations of connective phrases or connective clauses which starts with one or two connective words and is followed by another connective word, e.g.:

(3.1) HATTA berapa lamanya MAKA
       some time
       conn. phrase conn.

(3.2) ARAKIAN SETELAH datanglah pada keésokan harinya, MAKA
       arrive at the next day
       conn. conn. clause conn.

(3.3) SETELAH sampai pada tempat berburu itu, MAKA
       arrive at the hunting ground
       conn. clause conn.

(3.4) MAKA SETELAH keésokan harinya MAKA
       the next day
       conn. conn. phrase conn.

(3.5) SETELAH baginda datang kepada suatu serokan tasik itu, MAKA
       he (the king) arrived at an inlet of the sea
       conn. clause conn.

Since the precore as stated above is the core contextualizer in the text, the core or the pun-lah structure, Paya Tu Antarapun kerajaanlah, in relation to the former could be called the object of the precore or the contextualized. Now the pun-lah structure as stated above consists of a pun constituent and a -lah constituent which in this particular example are instantiated by Paya Tu Antara pun and kerajaanlah. The former is the topic and the latter is the comment. The topic consists of the head proper noun Paya Tu Antara and the modifying enclitic particle pun; in terms of role the particle is the topic marker and the proper noun is the marked topic or the object of the topic marker. The comment consists of the head 'verb' kerajaan 'became king' and the modifying enclitic particle -lah; in terms of the role the former is the marked comment or the object of the comment marker and the latter is the comment marker.

The 'verb' kerajaan is made up of the state marking affix ke- an and the word root raja 'king'.

The topic Paya Tu Antarapun in relation to the comment kerajaanlah has the role of Dative or Patient. This is expressed semantically as well as grammatically through the affix ke- an. In relation with the topic, the comment kerajaanlah has the role of event.

Following are other pun-lah structures from our text:

(4.1) Paya Tu Kerub pun matilah
       Paya Tu Kerub died

(4.2) baginda pun berangkatlah
       he (the king) departed
(4.3) sekalian ra'yat pun berhentilah
all the people stopped

(4.4) khémah pun didirikan oranglah
tents were erected by the people

(4.5) baginda pun turunlah
he (the king) descended from

(4.6) Jaring dan jerat pun ditahan oranglah
nets and snares were set by the people

(4.7) segala ra'yat pun masuklah
all the people went into (entered)

(4.8) baginda pun amat hairanlah
he (the king) was greatly astonished

(4.9) anjing itu pun dilepaskan oranglah
the dogs were released by the people

(4.10) baginda pun bertemulah
he (the king) came across

(4.11) pelanduk itu pun lenyaplah
the mousedeer disappeared

(4.12) patik pun ditinggalkan oranglah
we (slaves) were left behind by the people

(4.13) baginda pun kembali lah
he (the king) returned

(4.14) negeri itu pun sudahlah
the settlement was ready (completed)

Note that there are no meN-Verbs (agent focus verbs) in the -lah constituent of the pun-lah structures listed above. Only 'verbs' with ber-, ke--an, di- or di--kan, or no affixes appear before -lah. Note also that with di- or di--kan 'verbs' -lah always occurs after the agent and not before it, i.e. not attached to the verb. We will see later on that meN-Verbs tend to occur in the elaboration part of the construction. This has something to do with the fact that the core in terms of role is more generic and indefinite and the elaboration is more specific and definite.

I stated above that -lah constituent is the new information part of the message conveyed in the pun-lah sentence given above. To test this let us look at the following sentences:

(5) Ada=pun raja di Kota Maligai itu nama=nya As for the king in
exist=TM king in town Maligai that name=the/he Kota Maligai his name
Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana
Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana was Paya Tu Kerub
Mahajana.

(6) *Adalah raja di Kota Maligai itu namanya Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana.
There was a king in Kota Maligai. His name was Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana.

I stated above that the elaboration is the specification of the generic pun-lah core. In my example, sentence (2) above, the elaboration menggantikan ayahanda baginda itu is the specification of the generic event kerajaan lah that happens to the topic Paya Tu Antara as the result of the motivating event matilah 'die' that happens to Paya Tu Antara's father and is expressed in the preceding pun-lah construction as:

After some time

Then the king
descended from his elephant and sat in state in a tent
while his ministers and officers and all his subjects
The king was greatly astonished and gave orders to release his own hunting dogs.

The king came across all the men who had gone with the dogs.

The mousedeer disappeared on this beach here.

We were left behind by the people of this place.

The king returned to his tent.

The following list, with the numbers referring to each pun-lah construction given above, consists of information stating clearly the number of constituents each elaboration has and what filler classes their constituents belong to:
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- (9) consists of the prepositional phrase (PP) dengan segala menteri hulubalangnya and the clause (Cl.) diiringkan oleh ra'yat sekalian

- (10) consists of the PP dari atas gajahnya and two Cls. semayam didalam khémah and diadap oleh segala menteri hulugang ra'yat sekalian

- (11) consists of the PP kedalam hutan itu and two Cls. mengalau-alau segala perburuan itu dari pagi-pagi hingga datang ngelincir matahari and sekor perburuan tiada diperoleh

- (12) is made up of only one compound Cl. serta menitahkan menyuruh melepaskan anjing perburuan baginda sendiri itu

- (13) is made up of one PP dengan segala orang yang menurut anjing itu

- (14) is made up of one PP pada pantai ini

- (15) is made up of one PP pada tempat ini

- (16) is made up of one PP pada khémahnya

From this we can see that the elaboration structure can be a phrase (PP), or a clause, or a combination of both. Note that referentially, i.e. the semantic domain in which the core and the elaboration occur and share their features, the PP is more closely related to the event than to the topic, while the clause is more closely related to the topic than to the event. That is to say that the clause is the place where things related to the topic get specified or commented about, and as a result the topic gets foregrounded here in the verbs as agent or patient depending on the perspective the narrator(s) chose; on the other hand the PP is the place where things related to the event get specified in terms of direction (e.g. the elaboration of (16)), location (e.g. the elaboration of (14)), and other participants the topic participant relates to (e.g. the elaboration of (13)).

As illustration for the specification of the topic consider construction (2) above. Its elaboration clause menggantikan ayahanda baginda itu, especially the predicate menggantikan, is an action that gets focussed by means of the prefix meN- (mentioned above). In this sense the topic Paya Tu Antara gets specified or commented about in the elaboration clause in terms of his action. This fact also applies to the elaboration compound clause of construction (12), where through the same prefix meN- the topic baginda pun gets specified or commented about again in terms of his action. Notice that in both these cases the agent role of the topic participants are brought to the foreground grammatically by means of the prefix meN-, while in the pun-lah structure both topics have the role of Dative or Patient (however one would label these). (In construction (2) the role of the topic participant Paya Tu Antara pun is expressed semantically and grammatically in the event kerajaanlah and in construction (12) the role of the topic participant baginda pun is expressed lexically in the affix-less event hairanlah.)

There are also elaborations where topics get specified or commented about with affix-less or unmarked predicates, e.g. semayam 'to sit in state' in the first clause of the elaboration of construction (10). In cases like these the
roles of the topic participant are expressed referentially (or semantically), i.e. not by means of grammatical devices such as meN- or di-, but by the lexical meaning of the root word itself.

Hence, one would generalize that through the elaboration clause other roles of topic participants are foregrounded, whether both referentially and grammatically or referentially alone.

We have seen above that there is clear distinction between the pun-lah structure and the elaboration structure. At this point I want to focus especially on the elaboration structure that is expressed in the form of a clause, i.e. I will discuss the features that make it different from the pun-lah structure and the reasons why I need to focus on their differences:
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A. PUN-LAH STRUCTURE

- a. precedes clause elaboration structure
- b. more independent, i.e. can stand alone without elaboration and precore structures
- c. topic initial, i.e. there is an explicit syntactic topic
- d. more generic
- e. marked by pun-lah particles
- f. distinction between old and new information more clearly cut
- g. has no meN- 'verbs', i.e. generally has affix-less, di- or di--kan and ber- 'verbs'

B. CLAUSE ELABORATION STRUCTURE

- follows pun-lah structure
- more dependent, i.e. it is part of the pun-lah structure and cannot stand alone without it
- 'verb' initial (or predicate initial), i.e. has no explicit syntactic subject
- more specific
- not marked by pun-lah
- distinction between old and new information not very clearly cut
- has meN- 'verbs' (definite intended acts)

To illustrate the features in both columns above see examples (2), (10), (11) and (12), and the information that goes with these examples in Display 3.6.1. above. Note that feature (c) in column B does not apply to the second clause of example (11): seékor perburuan tiada diperoléh. The reason for this will be expounded in the section that discusses constructions without pun-lah that share both features of pun-lah structure and Clause Elaboration Structure.

I stated above that the pun-lah construction (note: pun-lah structure is the core of the pun-lah construction) is a type of sentence. It is the type whose topic and event are marked respectively by the particles pun and -lah. These constituents are marked because they are important information of the story. That is to say, the Old Malay narrators consider them significant and so mark them to make the structure they occur in distinctive from other kinds whose topic and event are not marked. In this light, to borrow Longacre's term, the sequence of these pun-lah structures form the 'backbone' or the 'skeleton' of the text. Commenting about this, A.L. Becker says:
It indexes an event (—lah) and the participant (pun) who or which will be a single case role — in the sentence under investigation, this role is actor or agent — in the clauses which follow the pun—lah core, clauses which fill in the details and particularize the event in relation to this participant. (1977:9)

What Becker calls 'a sentence' is that which is referred to here as the pun—lah construction. In a sense the pun—lah structure is a sentence or better yet a marked sentence as opposed to the unmarked type (i.e. the type whose topic and event are not marked by pun—lah particles) which will be discussed later on (section 3.6.4.).

Based on this I could say that the features presented in columns A and B in Display 3.6.2. above reveal the difference between a marked sentence and a clause in our classical Malay text. I stated above, between examples (1) and (2), that the elaboration part of the pun—lah construction is structurally optional. The following sentence, which is the fourth sentence in our text, exemplifies this fact, i.e. after its pun—lah structure, the story goes on with another pun—lah construction without particularizing or specifying the pun—lah structure in an elaboration structure:

(17) Hatta berapa lama=nya maka Paya Tu Kerub conn. how long=the conn. Paya Tu Kerub Phaya Tu Kerub Mahajana pun mat=i=lah Mahajana TM die=CM After some time

The pun—lah sentence that follows this sentence, as can be seen in the text, is the one given in example (2) above:

(18) Syahdan maka Paya Tu Antara pun conn. conn. Paya Tu Antara TM kerajaan=lah meng=ganti=kan become king=CM ag.foc.=succeed=act.foc. ayahanda baginda itu father his majesty that

Then Phaya Tu Antara became king, succeeding his father.

3.6.1.2. Pun construction

Pun construction is a variant of the pun—lah construction in that its event constituent is not marked by —lah. It is not marked because it is not considered important by the narrators, i.e. relatively speaking, it is not as important as when it is marked by —lah. In other words in this variant the topic is the only constituent that gets foregrounded.

There are two subvariants within the pun construction. The first subvariant basically has the same structure as the pun—lah type, i.e. it has the precore, the core and the elaboration structures. The following examples, dissected into three parts with interlinear translation, show this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECORE</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>ELABORATION</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(19) maka conn.</td>
<td>Paya Tu Kerub Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana pun Mahajana TM baranak seorang beget a laki-laki son</td>
<td>maka di=nama= i conn.pt.foc.=name=allt. anakanda baginda itu child king the Paya Tu Antara Paya Tu Antara</td>
<td>Paya Tu Kerub Mahajana had one son, to whom he gave the name of Paya Tu Antara.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Pada suatu on one hari day</td>
<td>Paya Tu Naqpa Paya Tu Naqpa pun duduk TM sit</td>
<td>diatas takhta kerajaan on up throne royal nya diadap oleh his attended by segala menteri all minister pegawai hulu balang dan official officer and ra'yat sekalial people all</td>
<td>One day Paya Tu Naqpa was seated on his royal throne, while his ministers, officials, officers and all his subjects were sitting in attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Setelah After baginda pun king TM berangkat depart</td>
<td>berjalan kepada walk to tempat itu place that</td>
<td>After the King heard the man’s report, he set out for that place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) maka conn.</td>
<td>baginda pun king TM bertemu find</td>
<td>dengan sebuah rumah with a house orang tua laki-bini man old husband- wife duduk merawa reside catch prawn dan menjerat and set snares.</td>
<td>The King found a house where an old couple lived, catching prawn and setting snares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Maka pada masa conn. at time Paduka Nénda foot Grandfather</td>
<td>patik pun slave TM dikerah summon</td>
<td>pergi mengiringkan go accompany Duli Paduka Nénda dust foot Grandfather</td>
<td>When your Royal Grandfather departed for Ayudhya in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRECORE</td>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>ELABORATION</td>
<td>GLOSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berangkat pergi</td>
<td>orang</td>
<td>berangkat itu depart that</td>
<td>to build a settlement there, we were summoned to go and accompany Him on this voyage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depart go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berbuat negeri make settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ke Ayutia maka to Ayutia conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Setelah Paduka after foot</td>
<td>patik pun</td>
<td>kembali ke return to</td>
<td>When your Royal Grandfather arrived at this place we were stricken with an illness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenda sampai grand- arrive</td>
<td>slave TM</td>
<td>Kota Maligai town Maligai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father kepada tempat to place</td>
<td>kedatangan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ini, maka this conn.</td>
<td>stricken with illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Setelah sudah after already</td>
<td>baginda pun</td>
<td>duduk pada negeri reside in settlement yang diperbuat itu that built that</td>
<td>After the ministers and officers had received instructions from the King, each with his own men, the King returned to the town of Maligai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>segala menteri all minister</td>
<td>king TM</td>
<td>Patani Darussalam Patani Abord of Peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hulubalang officer</td>
<td>berangkat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dititahkan oleh command by</td>
<td>depart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baginda the king</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masing masing each</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dengan ketumbukannya, maka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with men his conn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26a) maka conn.</td>
<td>baginda pun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26b) dan and</td>
<td>king TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pindah hilir move down-stream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negeri settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>itu pun the TM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinamakannya name he</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The King moved downstream (and) resided in the (newly) built settlement and he named the settlement Patani, Abode of Peace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice that in this subvariant the di-, ber- and affix-less 'verbs' tend to occur in the elaboration part of the pun construction along with the meN-verbs. As illustrations for di-verbs see examples (19) and (20); for ber-verbs see example (21), for affix-less 'verbs' see examples (23), (25) and (26a). This situation is the reverse of the one in the pun-lah construction, i.e. in the pun-lah sentences these 'verbs' tend to occur in the core structure and not in the elaboration structure. Example (26a and b) taken together is an illustration of a compound pun construction.

To illustrate the second subvariant of the pun construction, following are four examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECORE</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>ELABORATION</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(27) maka conn.</td>
<td>baginda pun king TM</td>
<td>menitahkan orang command people pergi melihat bekas go see track rusa itu deer that</td>
<td>Then the King ordered (some) men to go and look for the tracks of the deer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28) maka conn.</td>
<td>baginda pun king TM</td>
<td>segera mendapatkan immediately obtain suara anjing itu sound dog that</td>
<td>The King immediately went in the direction of the sound of the dogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) maka conn.</td>
<td>hamba raja slave king itu pun that TM</td>
<td>menjunjungkan titah carry on the head speech baginda kepada orang king to person tua itu old that</td>
<td>The king's servant respectfully transmitted the king's words to the old people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) setelah after keésokan next harinya day maka conn.</td>
<td>segala all menteri minister hulubalang officer pun TM</td>
<td>menyuruh orang mudik order men go upstream ke Kota Maligai dan ke to town Maligai and to Lancang mengerahkan Lancang call up segala ra'yat hilir all subject come downstream berbuat negeri itu build settlement that</td>
<td>The following morning the ministers and officers ordered men to go upstream to the town of Maligai and to Lancang in order to call up the subjects, that they should come downstream to build a settlement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that in this subvariant there are no di-, di--kan, ber, and affix-less 'verbs' in the core structure. Probably this is due to the fact that all of these examples are sentences specifying those generic ones that precede them in the text. For example:

- Sentence (27) is preceded by the generic pun-lah construction Maka baginda pun turunlah dari atas gajahnya semayam didalam khémah diadap oleh segala menteri hulubalang ra'yat sekalian (for translation see example (10)).
- Sentence (28) is preceded by the following two sentences:

Maka anjing itu pun di=lepas=kan
conn. dog that TM pt.foc.=release=act.foc. So the dogs were
orang=lah
person=CM
released by the

and:
Hatta ada sekira-kira dua[du] jam
conn. exist about two hour
lama=nya maka berbunyi suara anjing
long=the conn. sound voice dog
itu me=nyalak
that ag.foc.=bark
Then, after about two hours, the
sound of the dogs' barking was heard.

- Sentence (29) is preceded by the sentence that is given in example (42).

- Sentence (30) is preceded by:

Dan pada malam itu baginda pun
And on night that his majesty TM
berbicara dengan segala menteri
talk with all minister
hulubalang=nya hendak berbuat negeri
officer=he intend make settlement
pada tempat pelanduk putih itu
at place mousedeer white that
That same night the king deliberated
with his ministers and officers, as
he wanted to build a settlement on the
spot where the white mousedeer had been.

The distinctive features of the first type of construction or sentence can be summarized as follows:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</th>
<th>CORE</th>
<th>ELABORATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| pun-lah           | - has both pun and -lah
|                   | - generally has
|                   | and affix-less 'verbs'
|                   | - generally has meN-verbs
|                   | - generally has di-, di--kan, and ber-verbs
| pun (variant of  |
| pun-lah)         | - has pun constituent and
|                   | a-lah-less predicate
|                   | constituent
| - Type 1          | - has pun constituent only
|                   | and no-lah-less predicate
|                   | constituent
|                   | - elaboration comes right
|                   | after the pun constituent
| - Type 2          | - generally has a mixture
|                   | of di-, di--i, ber-, affix-less and
|                   | meN-verbs
|                   | - generally has meN-verbs |
3.6.2. Frame-content constructions

This construction or sentence is different from the pun-lah construction discussed previously. The difference is manifested in the fact that the nature of this construction is endocentric or attributive, i.e. it has a relation analogous to a Head-Modifier relation, while the nature of the pun-lah construction is exocentric or predicative, that is, it has a relation analogous to a Subject-Predicate relation. In terms of the inherent system of Classical Malay we have viewed the exocentric type of construction as having a Topic-Event relation, or better yet a pun-lah relation. For lack of a better term, i.e. one that is Malay by nature, we will view the endocentric construction as having a relation of FRAME and CONTENT. Becker calls this relation a 'Metacomment-Comment Relation' (1977:16). In terms of role relation, as opposed to the slot relation expressed by the terms FRAME and CONTENT, we will view this construction as having a relation of REPORTING-REPORTED.

As illustrations, the following are some examples taken from our text:

(31) Maka titah Paya Tu Naqpa: "Jikalau demi=kian kerah=kan=lah segala ra'yat kita. Esok hari kita hendak pergi I tomorrow day I intend go berburu ke tepi laut itu." Phaya Tu Nakpa then call up all Our people. Tomorrow We shall go hunting along the sea-shore."

(32) Maka titah baginda: "Baik=lah esok pagi-pagi kita berburu." The king spoke: "Good, let Us go hunting early tomorrow morning."

(33) Itu=lah yang di=hambat oléh anjing ini. The king spoke: That was what the dogs were pursuing;

dog this

(34) Syahdan kebanyakan kata orang nama negeri itu meng=ikut nama orang yang me=rawa itu=lah person rel.pron. pt.foc.=follow name that prawn-fisherman person rel.pron. ag.foc.=catch prawn that=CM

Furthermore (and note this) most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fisherman.

(35) Ini=lah suatu kisah yang di=cetera=kan oléh orang tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu old-old, origin king rel.pron. make settlement Patani Abode of Peace that

This is a story which has been told by the old people: the origin of the king who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace.
That was the story.

And that landing stage was the place where Encik Tani used to go up and down catching prawns and setting snares.

The structure of examples (31) and (32) in terms of slot and role is made up of a preframe connective maka (identical to precore in pun-lah construction), a reporting frame titah Paya Tu Naqpa, titah baginda and a reported content Jikalau demikian kerahkanlah segala ra'yat kita and Baiklah ésok pagi-pagi kita berburu.

Examples (33-37) are reduced forms of the complete structure Preframe-Frame-Content as expressed in examples (31) and (32). That is to say that in examples (33-37), the part of the structure that is lexically manifested is the content one; the preframe and the frame parts are lexically not manifested because they are not relevant or interesting to the narrator.

In terms of the overall hierarchy of the story, there are two kinds of levels involved in examples (34-37). The first level is the story level, i.e. the level where the narrator is telling the story to his audience in the form of a monologue. This level, in terms of the substance of speech — its reference to who is doing the telling of the story — involves two kinds of narrator(s). The first one is what I call the reporting narrator, and the second one is what I term the reported narrators. The reporting narrator is involved in examples (35) and (36) (the former is the introductory sentence of the story and the latter is its concluding sentence). The reported narrators, on the other hand, are involved in examples (34) and (37). That is to say that if I were asked to lexically fill the frame parts in examples (35) and (36), we would fill them with a phrase such as cetera saya ('story I') meaning roughly 'Thus my story', and if I were asked to do the same for examples (34) and (37), I would fill them with a phrase such as cetera orang tua tua 'Thus the story of the old people'. In other words, sentences (35) and (36) are what some people would call the editorial comments, while sentences (34) and (37) are part of what is reported or quoted; or in terms of level, the former would be called the level above the story and the latter the level within the story.

The second level, as opposed to the story level or the monologue level, is the dialogue paragraph level, i.e. the level within the story where one finds verbal interaction between the participants of the story, e.g.:

(38) Maka titah baginda: "Apa yang di=salak oléh anjing itu?"

conn. speech his majesty: what rel.pron. bark by dog that

The king spoke: "What were these dogs barking at?"

(39) Maka sembah mereka sekalian itu: "Daulat Tuan=ku, patik mohon=kan good fortune Lord=my slave beg=act.foc. ampun dan karunia. Ada se=ékor pardon and grace exist one=class

conn. obeisance they all that Hail my Lord, we beg your respect fully: "Hail pardon and grace. There was a
Both sentences (38) and (39) constitute the dialogue paragraph referred to above. These two sentences are made up of the same basic structure that sentences (31) and (32) are built around. Sentences (31) and (32) are actually part of other dialogue paragraphs in the text. So is sentence (33). Actually, sentence (33) is part of the dialogue paragraph expressed by sentences (38) and (39) above. It is part of the content part of the Preframe-Frame-Content structure which consists of four sentences and is the third sentence of this part.

It should be made clear that there are two kinds of endocentric relations in the Preframe-Frame-Content structure. The first one, on a higher level (whatever name one would give this level), is the Frame-Content relation which, in terms of speech act, has a role relation of Reporting-Reported as mentioned above. In terms of the inherent nature of the parts themselves the frame and the content parts may be viewed as having a role relation of Generic-Specific. That is to say that the speech of the speaker may manifest specifically in the form of a command, an assertion, a request, a question (see example (38)), or in the form of a word, a clause, a sentence (see examples (31), (32), (38)), a sentence cluster (example (39)), a paragraph or a whole discourse.

The second kind of relation, on the phrase level, occurs within the frame part of the construction, e.g. titah baginda 'the speech of the King' in example (32). Now, in terms of slot relation, titah is the head and baginda is the modifier; in terms of role relation titah is the possessed and baginda is the possessor (or the possessing constituent).

In discussing the story level above, I stated that sentences (35) and (36) are respectively the introductory and the concluding sentences of the story. I stated also that some people call them editorial comments. Now in a certain sense these two sentences put some kind of quotation marks around the story. Hence the structure that the whole story is made up of could be conceived as consisting of Frame (introductory sentence), Content (story proper), and Frame (concluding sentence). In other words the structure of the story as a whole is a non-context free variant of the Frame-Content structure. That is to say that whenever the form of a discourse or a text is a monologue the structure that one would get is generally Frame-Content-Frame, whereas whenever the form of it is a dialogue the structure that one would get is generally Frame-Content.

In terms of how the message was communicated, there are two kinds of Frame-Content constructions: the direct and the indirect types. The direct type is illustrated clearly in examples (31) and (32). Example (33) is also an illustration of the direct type and can clearly be seen in example (39). Examples (34) through (37) are also other illustrations of the direct type. However, they seem not to make sense, because they are listed here out of context. That is to say that sentences (34) and (37) will only make sense when they are seen as
part of the direct speech of the reported narrators in their act of telling the story and sentences (35) and (36) will too, when they are seen as part of the direct speech of the reporting narrator in his act of retelling the story as told by the reported narrators.

The indirect type is illustrated within example (34): syahdan is the pre-frame, kebanyakan kata orang is the frame and nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang merawat itulah is the content. Following are four other examples (40-43) from the text as illustration; interspersed with discussion of each example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFRAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(40) Aku dengar khabar=nya report=the I hear hunting game sebelah tepi laut side shore sea itu terlalu banyak that very many konon say</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have heard reports that the game near the seashore is abundant indeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that sentence (40), when seen in a bigger context, is a direct reported content part of the Preframe-Frame-Content construction maka titah baginda: Aku dengar khabarnya perburuan sebelah tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon. In other words sentence (40) is an example of an indirect speech embedded within a direct one. Note, furthermore, that it is the only example on the sentence level that has the structure Frame-Content-Frame. This structure gives sentence (40) a certain sense of closure just as the one that the concluding sentence (example (36)) gives to the story as a unit of discourse. Their difference is that the former operates on the sentence level, and the latter on the discourse level.

In terms of function slot, aku is the subject, dengar is the predicate, and khabarnya perburuan sebelah tepi laut itu terlalu banyak konon is the direct object. Note that khabarnya basically has the same meaning as konon. Hence there is a redundancy here. This redundancy is a grammatical as well as a semantic device to foreground the content message perburuan sebelah tepi laut itu terlalu banyak. The foregrounding has a correlation with the form dengar, i.e. because of it the 'verb' dengar doesn't take the agent focus marker meN-. In other words, the agent is defocussed for the sake of foregrounding the patient or the content message. Hence, the foregrounding is motivated by two factors: the absence of meN- in dengar and the occurrence of Frame twice (khabarnya and konon).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFRAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41) ... serta and menitahkan ag.foc.=speak= act.foc. melepaskan ag.foc.=release=act.foc. anjing perburuan dog hunting baginda sendiri itu king self that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and gave orders to release his own dogs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example (41) is actually the elaboration structure of the pun-lah construction as illustrated in example (12). Notice that there are three different clauses in this construction. The first one has the predicate menitahkan 'speak', the second one has the predicate menyuruh 'order' or 'command' and the third has the predicate melepaskan 'release' and the direct object anjing perburuan baginda sendiri itu 'his (the king's) own hunting dogs'. Notice the progression of generic to specific expressed in these predicates: menitahkan is a generic speech act performed by the topic participant baginda 'the king', menyuruh is a specific speech act, i.e. the illocutionary force of the generic speech act, and melepaskan anjing perburuan baginda sendiri itu is the specification on the content of the command menyuruh. Notice also that the agent of the frame predicates menitahkan and menyuruh is baginda, whereas the agent of the content predicate melepaskan is orang 'people', which is made explicit in the sentence following this one where menitahkan, menyuruh and melepaskan occur. The sentence referred to is as follows:

Maka anjing itu pun di=lepas=kan
conn. dog that TM pt.foc.=release=act.foc.  So the dogs
orang=lah
person=CM

were released by
the people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFRAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(42) maka</td>
<td>titah baginda speech king</td>
<td>dari mana datang from where come</td>
<td>The King then gave orders to ask these old people where they had come from and settled in this place, and what their origin was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conn.</td>
<td>suruh bertanya order ask</td>
<td>nia maka ia duduk he conn. he reside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kepada orang to person</td>
<td>kemari ini dan hither this and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tua itu old that</td>
<td>orang mana asalnya person where origin the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Frame part of example (42) has three speech acts: the generic speech act titah baginda 'the speech of the King', the specific speech act suruh 'command' which is the specification or the illocutionary force of the former, and the specific speech act bertanya 'ask'. Note that the agent of the first two speech acts, titah and suruh is baginda 'the king' and the agent of the last speech act is hamba raja 'King's servant' which is explicitly stated in the sentence following (42) in the text:

Maka hamba raja itu pun men=junjung=kan
conn. servant king that TM ag.foc.=carry on the head=act.foc.  The king's servants
respectfully transmitted the king's
words to the old
people.

In other words, hamba raja is the patient object of the command suruh and is the agent of the question speech act implied in the predicate bertanya. This implies that there are two kinds of content: the content of the command of the King and the content of the question of the King's servant.

From these two examples, (42) and (42), we infer that the difference between a direct Frame-Content structure and an indirect one is not only a matter
of the presence or the absence of quotation marks, but it involves more than this. The indirect Frame-Content structure tends to be more elaborate than the direct one. That is to say that the indirect type usually expresses all the speech acts explicitly in terms of the range of their generality to the range of the specificity, e.g. menitahkan is generic, menyuruh is specific, melepaskan is more specific; and titah is generic, suruh is specific and bertanya is more specific. And it usually involves more than one speech act participant, e.g. baginda 'the king' and orang 'people' in example (41), and baginda, hamba raja 'king's servant' and orang tua 'old people' in example (42). The direct Frame-Content structure, on the other hand, has the generic speech act explicitly stated in the Frame part, e.g. titah baginda in (38), and sembah mereka sekalian itu in (39), and the specific speech act implied in the content part, e.g. the content part of example (38) is a question although there is no such word as bertanya 'ask' in it, and the content of example (31) is a command without having an explicit word such as suruh 'command' or 'order'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFRAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43) bahwa sesungguhnya truly</td>
<td>kata kami sekalian (presupposed)</td>
<td>nama negeri itu name settlement that mengikut sembah orang follow worship people mengatakan pelanduk say mousedear lenyap itu disappear that</td>
<td>In actual fact the name of the settlement derived from the words which the people used when reporting the disappearance of the mousedeer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Frame part of example (43) is presupposed. If it is stated explicitly, it would refer to the speech of the reported old narrators and would probably take a form such as kata kami sekalian 'our speech'. Note that this sentence forms the antithesis of the statement made in (44):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFRAME</th>
<th>FRAME</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(44) syahdan conn.</td>
<td>kebanyakan most kata orang speech person</td>
<td>nama negeri itu name settlement that mengikut nama orang follow name person yang merawa rel.pron. catch prawn itu lah that CM</td>
<td>Most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fisherman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

which, in the text, comes before example (43).

To sum up the types of Frame-Content construction that are discussed above, consider display 3.6.4.
Display 3.6.4. Frame-content constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: IN TERMS OF SPEECH MADE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
<td>- has the generic speech act explicitly stated in the Frame part and the specific speech act implied in the Content part</td>
<td>(31), (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- has clear distinction between Frame and Content parts, signalled by the colon and quotation marks in writing and by a juncture in speech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- has no speech act verb chain moving from generality to specificity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indirect</td>
<td>- has neither quotation marks nor colon</td>
<td>(41), (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- no distinctive juncture between Frame and Content parts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- usually expresses all speech acts explicitly, moving from generality to specificity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- usually involves more than one speech act participant, i.e. more than one agent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: IN TERMS OF LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Dialogue</td>
<td>- is open-ended, i.e. has the structure of Frame-Content (FC)</td>
<td>(31), (38), (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Monologue (Story)</td>
<td>- has a sense of completeness, i.e. has the structure of Frame-Content-Frame (FCF)</td>
<td>Introductory sentence (35) + Story proper + Concluding sentence (36), taken as a unit; and example (40).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.3. -Lah constructions

In this construction the information that has not been introduced before in the text gets specified. That is to say that in it one finds new information which is marked by the comment marker -lah. Sentences (31-37) are presented again as examples of -lah construction and not of Frame-Content construction, together with (45) and (46) below:

(31) Maka titah Paya Tu Naqpa: "Jikalau conn. speech Paya Tu Naqpa: if demi=kian kerah=kan=lah segala ra'yat like=that summon=act.foc.=CM all people kita. Esok hari kita hendak pergi I tomorrow day I intend go berburu ke tepi laut itu." hunt to shore sea that Paya Tu Nakpa then spoke: "In that case call up all Our people. Tomorrow We shall go hunting along the sea-shore."
Maka titah baginda: "Baiklah esok pagi-pagi kita berburu." The king spoke: "Good, let us go hunting early tomorrow morning."

Itu lah yang dihambat oleh anjing ini. That was what the dogs were pursuing;

Syahdan kebanyakakan kata orang nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang me=rawa itu=lah person rel.pron. ag.foc.=catch prawn that=CM

Ini=lah suatu kisah yang di=cetera=kan orang pt.foc.=tell=act.foc. by person tua=tua, asal raja yang berbuat orang yang me=rawa itu=lah person rel.pron. ag.foc.=catch prawn that=CM

Demi=kiian=lah hikayat=nya like=that=CM story=the

Dan] pangkalan itu=lah tempat Encik Tani naik turun me=rawa Tani go up down ag.foc.=catch prawns

Maka sembah segala menteri: "Daulat Tuan=ku, sungguhlah seperti titah Duli Yang Maha=mulia

Hatta ada sekira-kira dua[du] jam lama=nya maka berbunyi suara anjing itu me=nyalak that ag.foc.=bark 

Furthermore (and note this) most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fisherman.

This is a story which has been old by the old people: the origin of the king who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace.

That was the story.

And that landing stage was the place where Enaik Tani used to go up and down catching prawns and setting snares.

The ministers replied respectfully: "Hail my Lord, it is true indeed as Your Majesty has spoken;

Then, after about two hours, the sound of the dogs' barking was heard.
The newness of the information in all these examples generally operates on two levels: the content level and the metalevel. By content level I mean the level where the utterance or the sentence means exactly what it says or expresses. By the metalevel I mean the level where the utterance may mean something other than what it says, i.e. the illocutionary force of the speech act. In example (31) the information that is new is the command as the illocutionary force as well as the content of the command expressed in kerahkanlah segala ra'yat kita. In example (32), the act of agreeing as well as the content of this act as expressed in baiklah ésok pagi-pagi kita berburu is the new information. In example (33) since itu is anaphoric it means that the information it refers back to, i.e. Ada seêkor pelanduk putih, besarnya seperti kambing warna tubuhnya gigang gemilang 'There was a white mousedeer, the size of a goat, and the colour of its body was glittering', is new (see examples (38), (39)). Example (33) itself, as a speech act of concluding, is also new information. In example (34), the act of quoting other people as expressed by the content nama negeri itu mengikut nama orang yang merawa itulah is the new information. The content itself might be new to the audience. In example (35), since ini is cataphoric, it means that the information it refers to, i.e. suatu kisah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu its instantiation in the story proper, by implication, are what are new. Besides this, the speech act of announcing or introducing as expressed mainly by ini is also new information. In example (36) demikian is anaphoric of the story proper as the new information. In addition to this, the speech act of concluding as expressed by this example is also new information. In example (37) the modifier itu of pangkalan itu is anaphoric of Arakian pangkalan yang ditempat pelanduk putih lenyap itu 'As for the landing stage on the spot where the white mousedeer had disappeared' as the new information. The speech act of concluding as expressed in this example is also new information. In example (45) the information that is new is the speech act of confirming as well as the content of the confirmation as expressed in sungguhlah seperti titah Duli Yang Mahamulia. In example (46) the information that is new is berbunyilah suara anjing itu menyalak. Note that on the metalevel this information is part of the story proper, i.e. the act of telling the story, as the new information.

Note that examples (31-37), as stated before in section 3.6.2., have the structure of Preframe-Frame-Content in reduced as well as in complete forms. Example (45) is a complete form of the same structure. Example (46), however, looks like a pun-lah construction. That is to say that it has a precore: Hatta ada se kira-kira dua jam lamanya, a core berbunyilah and an elaboration suara anjing itu menyalak. Note however that the core doesn't have any pun constituent. This is probably due to the fact that it is not relevant here. What is relevant in this sentence is suara anjing itu 'the voice of the dogs' which gets specified in berbunyilah 'sound' as the new information, and not anjing itu 'the dogs' which is the pun constituent in the sentence Maka anjing itu pun dilepaskan oranglah 'the dogs were released by the people', which is the sentence that precedes example (46) in the text.

Note that all the examples above that have anaphoric and cataphoric definite articles have a core part and an elaboration part. The core parts don't have any pun constituent. They only have -lah constituents, e.g. itulah in example (33), inilah in example (35), demikianlah in example (36), pangkalan itulah in example (37). This is due to the fact that ini 'this' is textually pointing-forward-to in its nature, while itu 'that' and demikian 'like that' or 'thus' are textually pointing-backwards-to. In other words, the topics that are being commented upon by these examples either precede or follow them. Now these topics may take the form of nouns or noun phrases, e.g. suatu kisah yang
diceterakan oleh orang tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu in example (35). They may take the form of sentences, e.g. Ada seekor pelanduk putih, besarnya seperti kambing, warna tubuhnya gilang gemilang 'There was a mousedeer, the size of a goat, and the colour of its body was glittering' which precedes example (33) in the text. They may take the form of paragraphs or whole discourses, e.g. the story proper which precedes example (36) in the text. They usually do not have any pun marker. This is probably due to the fact that they are new topics and not old ones. The newness of these topics can be seen in words like seekor 'a', an indefinite article plus classifier for animate non-human nouns, in the sentence prior to example (33) in the text, and suatu 'a', an indefinite article for inanimate nouns, in example (35). Hence, we infer that there are two kinds of topic: new and old. The former is not marked with pun and is viewed as new information, the latter is marked with pun and is viewed as old information. To prove this point, note that preceding example (33) in the text is the new topic sentence Ada seekor pelanduk putih, besarnya seperti kambing, warna tubuhnya gilang gemilang and following it is the pun-lah sentence Maka pelanduk itu pun lenyaplah pada pantai ini (see examples (38) and (39)).

In summary, we may infer that -lah constructions, especially the ones that have anaphoric deictic particle itu, demikian and cataphoric deictic particle ini, are sentences that foreground both topics and comments as new information and this is done by means of two sentences or two text units that may belong to different hierarchical levels as has been illustrated above. Pun-lah constructions, in the light of this, may be viewed as sentences that foreground old topics and old information only in terms of their comments which are the constituents that carry new information.

Furthermore, -lah constructions are sentences that contain new information on the content level and on the metalevel signalled by the comment marking particle -lah.

3.6.4. Other constructions

In this section I will discuss sentences that we have not described yet in the three construction types discussed above.

(47) Ia me=nama=i diri=nya Paya Tu Naqpa He ag.foc.=name=allt. self=he Phaya Tu Naqpa He called himself Paya Tu Nakpa.

(48) Selama Paya Tu Naqpa kerajaan itu During Paya Tu Naqpa become king that Phaya Tu Nakpa was accustomed always to go hunting.

sentiasa ia pergi berburu always he go hunt

Note that there are no pun and -lah enclitics in these sentences. If we examine carefully the bigger context where they occur in the HP text, however, we see that both sentences occur one after the other according to the order they are presented here after the following pun-lah construction. (Note: examples (47) and (48) occur after example (49) in the text.)

(49) Syahdan maka Paya Tu Antara pun kerajaan=lah mengganti=kan become king=CM ag.foc.=succeed=act.foc. Then Phaya Tu Antara become king, succeeding his father.
It seems to us that both these sentences are part of the elaboration part of example (49), i.e. menggantikan ayahanda baginda itu. In other words, the elaboration part of example (49) includes the sentences that are presented in examples (47) and (48). One proof why this is so is the fact that there are no pun and -lah constituents in these sentences and the fact that the predicate in (47) is a meN-verb which is a feature of the elaboration part of a pun-lah construction (see display 3.6.3.). Note that example (48) differs from example (47) in the fact that it has a connective clause Selama Paya Tu Naqpa kerajaan itu and it has an affixless and a ber-verb which is characteristic of either an elaboration or a pun-lah structure. Note also that both examples have explicit free syntactic subject ia 'he' which is characteristic of the core structure in a pun-lah construction (see display 3.6.2.). In other words, there is a merging or an overlap here between an elaboration part of a pun-lah construction and some of the features that occur in a precore and a core part of a pun-lah construction. This might be due to the fact that both these examples are transition sentences between a pun-lah construction and a pun variant of the pun-lah construction type. It might also be due to the fact that example (48) is a further elaboration or specification of the name Paya Tu Naqpa 'man of the forest' in example (47). However, in relation to the rest of the story, except the concluding sentence Demikianlah hikayatnya 'That was the story', it forms a generic sentence. That is to say that the rest of the story is a specific account of the habitual act of the King as given in the generic sentence (48).

Just like examples (47) and (48), example (50) below is also a transition construction which shares both the features of a pun-lah structure and the features of an elaboration structure. That is to say, it has an explicit free syntactic subject, seékor perburuan 'one animal', and a di-verb diperoléh 'obtained', which are features of a pun-lah structure, and that it does not have any pun and -lah constituents which is characteristic of an elaboration structure.

(50) seékor perburuan tiada diperoléh not one animal was obtained.

Example (50) is a transition between the following two pun-lah constructions.

Maka segala ra'yat pun masuklah kedalam hutan itu mengalau-alau segala perburuan itu dari pagi-pagi hingga datang ngelincir matahari 'All the people went into the wood beating the game from early morning until the sun began to decline'

and

Maka baginda pun amat hairanlah serta menitahkan menyuruh melepaskan anjing perburuan baginda sendiri itu. 'The king was greatly astonished and gave orders to release his own hunting dogs.'

In summary, other constructions are transition sentences (or constructions) that occur between two pun-lah constructions or between a pun-lah construction and a pun variant of the pun-lah construction type. That is to say they have meN-verbs, which is a feature of the elaboration part; they have affix-less and ber-verbs, which are features of the core; they have explicit free syntactic subjects, which is characteristic of the core; they have a connective clause, which is characteristic of the precore; however they do not have any pun and any -lah constituent.
3.6.5. Embedded structures

In this section we will discuss two kinds of embedded structures: 1) the marked embedded structure, and 2) the unmarked embedded structure. The first type may be called the yang-embedded structure, because it is marked by the relative pronoun yang.\(^1\)

3.6.5.1. Yang-embedded structure

Following are all the sentences that contain the yang-embedded structures in our text:

(51) Maka titah baginda: "Apa yang
    conn. speech his majesty: What rel.pron.
    di=salak oléh anjing itu?"
    pt.foc.=bark by dog that

(52) Itu=lah yang di=hambat oléh
    That=CM rel.pron. pt.foc.=pursue by
    anjing ini.
    dog this

(53) Maka baginda pun pindah hilir
    conn. his majesty TM move go downstream
    duduk pada negeri yang
    reside at settlement rel.pron.
    di=perbuat itu,
    pt.foc.=make that

(54) Ini=lah suatu kisah yang
    This=CM a story rel.pron.
    di=cetera=kan oléh orang
    pt.foc.=tell=act.foc. by person
    tua-tua, asal raja yang berbuat
    old-old, origin king rel.pron. make
    negeri Patani Darussalam itu
    settlement Patani Abode of Peace that

(55) Setelah baginda datang kepada suatu
    After his majesty come to a
    serokan tasik itu, maka baginda
    inlet sea that conn. his majesty
    pun bertemu=lah dengan segala orang
    TM find=CM with all person
    yang me=nurut anjing itu
    rel.pron. ag.foc.=go with dog that

The king spoke:
"What were these dogs barking at?"

That was what the dogs were pursuing;

The king moved downstream and resided in the newly made settlement;

This is a story which has been told by the old people: the origin of the king who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace.

When the king arrived at an inlet of the sea he found the men who had gone with the dogs.
Furthermore (and note this) most people say that the settlement was named after the prawn-fisherman.

Let us examine the first four yang embedded structures, i.e.

(51a) Apa yang disalak oleh anjing itu?
(52a) Itu lah yang dihambat oleh anjing ini
(53a) ... negeri yang diperbuat itu
(54a) ... suatu kisah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua-tua

For the sake of clarity and to see their minute differences, we will present them in four different tree diagrams (displays 3.6.5.-3.6.8.). It should be noted that in the tree structures displayed the relative pronoun yang is anaphoric of the patient which may or may not be explicitly present preceding the nominal clause.

In examples (54b-57a) we will see that the relative pronoun yang is also anaphoric of constituents that are agent and locative, i.e. those that do not take patient focus verbal prefix di-:

(54b) ... raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu
(55a) ... segala orang yang menurut anjing itu
(56a) ... orang yang merawa itu
(57a) ... pangkalan yang ditempat pelanduk putih lenyap itu
Display 3.6.5. Tree diagram

(51a) Apa yang disalak oleh anjing itu?

```
Content     Reported Sp.S

Reported

TM          N(Q.Part.) M Nom.Cl.

defined     defining

apa

Σ           Rel.Pron.

Pred.       V

V

3rd pers.   TM'

pt.

pa

3rd pers. pron.

ia

-TM

-3rd

foc.

Rt.

def.

Act

Salak

O

Prep.       A NP

D              Ag.

Ag.

oléh

H N M Def. Art.

defined defining

anjing itu
```
Display 3.6.6. Tree diagram

(52a) Itulah yang dihambat oleh anjing ini

```
C      S
   Concl.
   TH -lah const.(NP)
      defined Pt.
            Pro.Pt. Anaphoric CM
              itu -lah
                  3rd pers. pron. TM' -ng
                      lan -ng
                          di-
                              hambat
                                  D Prep. A N
                                      Ag.m. Ag. 
                                          oleh
                                              H N M Def.Art.
                                                  defined defining
```

defined Pt.
defining
Display 3.6.7. Tree diagram

(53a) ... negeri yang diperbuat itu.

```
   A       NP
   |       |
Loc.     M     Def.Art.
   H     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
negeri
   TH     N      M
   |     |      |
NP     NP     Nom.Cl.
defining defining itu
defined Pt.
Display 3.6.8. Tree diagram
(54a) suatu kisah yang diceterakan oleh orang tua-tua
Display 3.6.9. Tree diagram

(54b) ... raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu

```
M | NP
---|---
Possessing

TH  | NP
---|---
defined | Ag.
raja

Σ
Rel.Pron.
Ag. | anaphoric of TH

3rd.pers. | pron.
ia

Pred.
vb.pref.
ber-

V
indef.
art.

O  | NP
---|---
Pt.

H  | NP | M | Def.Art.
defining | itu

H  | N
defined

M | Prop.N
defined
negeri

Patani Darussalam
```
Display 3.6.10. Tree diagram

(55a) ... segala orang yang menurut anjing itu
Display 3.6.11. Tree diagram

(56a) orang yang merawa itu

```
H | NP
  |    | Def.Art.
  |  defined | defining | anaphoric
TH | N | M | Nom.Cl.
  | defined | Ag. | orang
  | Σ | Rel.Pron. | Pred. | V
    | Ag. | anaphoric | def.Act. | of TH
    | 3rd.pers. pron. | 3rd.pers. pron. | ag.foc. | Rt.
      | ia | -ng | | meN - rawa
```
Display 3.6.12. Tree diagram

(57a) ... pangkalan yang ditempat pelanduk putih lenyap itu

```
NP
  TH N defined loc. pangkalan
  M NP defining
    H Rel.Pron. defined anaphoric of TH
      3rd.pers. pron. ia
      TM' -ng
    M PP defining
      D Prep.
        Loc.TM -ng
        di-
      A NP Location
        H NP defining
          itu
        M Def.Art.
          H NP defined tempat
            M Cl.
              Σ NP defining
                Σ NP defined
                  H N defined
                    M Adj. lenyap
                      H N defined
                        M Adj. putih
```
The basic pattern that each of these yang embedded structures have in common may be described in formulas as follows:

**Yang Embedded Str.** = TH + M

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{TH} & \uparrow \{\text{NP} \} \\
\text{Defined} & \{\text{Pt.} \} + \{\text{Ag.} \} \\
\text{M} & \{\text{Nom. Cl.} \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Nom.Cl.** = Σ + Pred. + Adjn. + PP

\[
\begin{align*}
\Sigma & \uparrow \{\text{Rel. Pron.} \} \\
\text{Pred.} & \{\text{defoc.def.Act} \} + \{\text{indef.Act} \} + \{\text{def.Act} \} \\
\text{Adjn.} & \{\text{Ag.} \} \\
\text{PP} & \{\text{PP} \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

**NP** = H + M + PP

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{H} & \uparrow \{\text{Rel. Pron.} \} + \{\text{M} \} + \{\text{PP} \} \\
\text{defined} & \text{anaphoric} + \text{defining} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The way to read these formulas is: Yang Embedded Structure is made up of a topicalized Head (TH) and a modifier (M). The TH has the role of the defined, which may be further specified as having the role of patient, or agent or location depending on its relation to the predicate in the Modifier, and in terms of class it may be either a NP or a -lah constituent which is actually a proform of a NP modified by the particle -lah. The modifier has the role of the defining and in terms of class it may be either a Nominalized Clause (Nom.Cl.) or a NP. The Nominalized Clause is made up of a Subject (Σ) and a Predicate (Pred.) and an Adjunct (Adjn.). The Σ, in terms of role, is a patient (pt.) and in terms of class, is a Relative Pronoun (Rel.Pron.). The Predicate, in terms of role, can be a defocussed definite Act di-Verb (defoc.def.Act), or an indefinite Act ber-Verb (indef.Act), or a definite Act meN-Verb. The Adjunct, in terms of role, is an Agent and in terms of class, is a Prepositional Phrase (PP). The NP is made up of a Head (H) and a modifier. The Head, in terms of role, is a defined, and, in terms of class, is a Relative Pronoun yang (Rel.Pron.). In terms of cohesion the Relative Pronoun yang is anaphoric of the TH. The part of yang that is anaphoric is ya or ia which is actually the third person pronoun. The morpheme -ng is the Topic Marker (TM'). The modifier has the role of defining and the class of prepositional phrase.

From the perspective of the defining modifier, which can be either a Nominalized Clause or a NP, the Yang Embedded Structure may be described as an endocentric construction (i.e. it has a relation analogous to the Head-Modifier relation) that consists of either an embedded exocentric structure (i.e. it has a relation analogous to a Subject-Predicate relation) or an embedded endocentric structure.
3.6.5.2. Unmarked embedded structure

Following are the sentences in my text that contain the unmarked embedded structures:

(58) Maka baginda pun bertemu dengan conn. *his majesty* TM find with
    se=buah rumah orang tua laki-bini one=class house person old husband-wife
duduk me=rawa dan men=jerat reside ag.foc.=catch prawn and ag.foc.=set snare
    There he found a house where an old couple lived, catching prawns and setting
    snares.

(59) Hatta ada se kira-kira dua[ju] jam conn. *exist about* two hour
    lama=nya maka berbunyi suara anjing long=the conn. *sound* voice dog
itu me=nyalak that ag.foc.=bark
    Then, after about two hours, the sound of the dogs' barking was heard.

(60) Bahwa sesunguh=nya nama negeri itu conn. *truly*=the name settlement that
    meng=ikut sembah orang ag.foc.=follow obeisance person
    me=nagara=kan pelanduk lenyap itu ag.foc.=say=act.foc. mousedeer disappear that
    In actual fact, the name of the settlement derived from the words which the people
    used when reporting the disappearance of the mousedeer.

(61) Dan] pangkalan itu=lah tempat Encik conn. *and*=CM place Encik
    Tani naik turun me=rawa Tani go up down ag.foc.=catch prawns
    And that landing stage was the place where Encik Tani used to go up and down catching
    prawns and setting snares.

To examine these unmarked structures, let us look at the following sentence fragments:

(58a) ... sebuah rumah orang tua laki-bini duduk merawala dan menjerat
(59a) ... maka berbunyi suara anjing itu menyalak.
(60a) ... sembah orang mengatakan pelanduk lenyap itu.
(61a) ... tempat Encik Tani naik turun merawala dan menjerat itu

Let me now present these sentence fragments in the form of tree diagrams for us to see how the unmarked embedded structures fit within these fragments (displays 3.6.13.-3.6.16.).

The Unmarked Embedded Structure (UEStr.) as displayed in (58a) (3.6.13.) can be described in formulas as:

\[
\text{UEStr.} = \frac{H \quad \text{NP} + \quad M \quad \text{Nom.Cl.}}{\text{possessed} \quad \text{possessing}}
\]

\[
\text{Nom.Cl.} = \frac{\Sigma \quad \text{NP} + \quad \text{Pred.} \quad \text{VP}}{\text{Ag.} \quad \text{State} \quad \text{and Act}}
\]
Display 3.6.13. Tree diagram

(58a) ... sebuah rumah orang tua laki-bini duduk merawa dan menjerat

A | NP
---|---
H NP | M Nom.Cl.

possessed | possessing
---|---
M Indef.Art. | H N

defining | defined
---|---
M possessed | H NP

prefix | inanimate
classifier | defined
buah | gen.
---|---
H N | M Coord.NP

defined | defining
---|---
H N | M Coord.NP

acted | gen.state
---|---
V Coord. VP | Coord. VP

spec.Act. | V
---|---
Ag.foc. | Rt.
meN- | rawa
---|---
def. Act | def. Act
---|---
Ag.foc. | Rt.
meN- | jerat
Display 3.6.14. Tree diagram

(59a) ... maka berbunyilah suara anjing itu menyalak

Note that in (59a) anjing itu 'the dog(s)' in relation to suara 'sound' (literally 'voice') is a defining modifier, while in relation to menyalak it is an agent subject.
The Unmarked Embedded Structure which is part of the Elaboration Structure of (59a) (Display 3.6.14.) can be formulated as:

\[
\text{Elab. Str.} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{H} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{defined} \\
\text{defining} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{NP}_1 = \begin{array}{c}
\text{H} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{Def. Art.} \\
\text{defined} \\
\text{defining} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{UEStr.} = \begin{array}{c}
\Sigma \\
\text{NP}_1 \\
\text{Pred.} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Ag.} \\
\text{Def. Act} \\
\end{array}
\]

The Unmarked Embedded Structures as displayed in (60a) (Display 3.6.15.) and (61a) (Display 3.6.16.) can be formulated as follows:

\[
\text{UEStr.} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{H} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{Nom. Cl.} \\
\text{defined} \\
\{ \text{possessed/Gen.SA} \} \\
\{ \text{defining} \} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{Nom. Cl.} = \begin{array}{c}
\text{H} \\
\text{Cl.} \\
\text{M} \\
\text{Def. Art.} \\
\text{defined} \\
\text{defining} \\
\text{anaphoric} \\
\text{past m.} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{Cl.} = \begin{array}{c}
\Sigma \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Pred.} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{Ag.} \\
\text{gen. Act} \\
\text{def. Act/Spec.SA} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Pt.} \\
\end{array}
\]

In conclusion, the Unmarked Embedded Structure is distinguished from the Yang Embedded Structure (discussed above) by the fact that it does not have any relative pronoun yang. From the perspective of its modifier, which has either the role of defining or possessing, the Unmarked Embedded Structure can be either a Nominalized Clause or a NP which is actually a merging between a NP and a Clause; that is to say the NP, in relation to the defined head Noun that precedes it, is a defining modifier, whereas in relation to the predicate that comes after it, is an agent subject.
Display 3.6.15. Tree diagram
(60a) ... sembah orang mengatakan pelanduk lenyap itu"6

```
O  NP
   Pt.
   H  N  M  Nom.Cl.
   possessing
   H  Cl.
    defined
    M  Def.Art.
     defining anaphoric past m.
     itu
     E  N
      Ag.
       orang
       Pred. V
        def.Act spec.SA
        Ag.foc. Rt. act.foc.
        meN- kata -kan
        H  N  M  Adj.
         defined defining
          pelanduk lenyap
```
Display 3.6.16. Tree diagram

(61a) ... tempat Encik Tani naikturun merawa dan menjerat itu

```
Elab.  NP
        Spec.
          H  N  M  Nom.Cl.
            defined  defining
            tempat
          H  Cl.  M  Def.Art.
            defined  defined
            past m. anaphoric
            itu
  Σ  NP
    Ag.  Pred.  VP
      M  Address Term  H  Prop.N
        defining  defined
        Encik  Tani
      H  V  M  Coord.V
        gen. direction naikturun
          H  V  M  Spec. Act
            Coord. Conn.  def. Act
              dan
                meN-rawa  meN-jerat
```
3.6.6. Summary

In conclusion the following is a summary table with comments of each construction type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>COMMENTS/FEATURES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. pun-lah constructions</td>
<td>- has three parts: Precore, Core, and Elaboration. - Precore and Elaboration are structurally optional; Core is obligatory - has two variants: pun-lah variant and pun variant, which is subdivided into two subvariants: the subvariant which has the pun constituent and a -lah-less predicate constituent; and the subvariant that has only the pun constituent without any -lah-less predicate and hence make the elaboration come right after the pun constituent</td>
<td>1. Syahdan maka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Maka</td>
<td>baginda pun pindah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Maka</td>
<td>baginda pun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Frame-Content constructions</td>
<td>A. In terms of speech mode, can be subdivided into Direct and Indirect subtypes 1. The Direct subtype: - has the generic speech act explicitly stated in the frame part and the specific speech act implied in the content part. - has a clear distinction between Frame and Content parts: frame is endocentric in its structure, i.e. it has a head-modifier relation and content is exocentric in its structure, i.e. it has a subject-predicate relation.</td>
<td>1. Maka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPES  |  COMMENTS/FEATURES  |  EXAMPLES
---|---|---
- has no speech act verb chain moving from generality to specificity
2. The Indirect subtype:
- frame has an overlap of endocentric and exocentric relations
- usually expresses all speech acts explicitly moving from generality to specificity
- usually involves more than one level of speech act participants, i.e. more than one agent.

B. In terms of level, can be subdivided into:
1. Dialogue: is open-ended, i.e. has the structure of Frame-Content (FC)
2. Monologue (Story): has a sense of completeness, i.e. has the structure of Frame-Content-Frame (FCF)

III. -lah construction
- contains new information on the content level and on the meta-level signalled by the comment marking particle lah
- the ones that have deictic particles ini 'this', itu 'that' and demikian 'like that' usually foreground both topics and comments as new information and this is done by means of two sentences or two text units that may belong to different hierarchical levels.

EXAMPLES
- Preframe  |  Frame
Maka |  titah baginda suruh bertanya kepada orang tua itu dari mana datangnya. 'The King then gave orders to ask these old people where they had come from and settled in this place, and what their origin was.'

- Introductory Sentence + Story Proper + Concluding Sentence
Maka titah Paya Tu Naqpa:
'Jikalau demikian kerah-kanlah segala ra'yat kita.' 'Paya Tu Naqpa then spoke: "In that case call up all our people."

1. Maka titah baginda: 'Baiklah esok pagi-pagi kita berburu'. 'The King spoke: "Good, let us go hunting early tomorrow morning."

2. Itulah yang dihabat oléh anjing ini. 'That was what these dogs were pursuing.' (The new topic referred to by this lah construction is in the form of the sentence: Ada seekor pelanduk putih besarnya seperti kambing, warna tubuhnya silang gemilang. 'There was a mousetedear, the size of a goat, and the color of its body was glittering.')
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPES</th>
<th>COMMENTS/FEATURES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. Other constructions</td>
<td>These are transition sentences (constructions) between two pun-lah constructions or between a pun-lah construction and a pun variant of the pun-lah construction type. That is to say they have meN-Verbs (elab.), they have affix-less and ber-Verbs (core), they have explicit free syntactic subjects (core), they have a connective clause (precore), but they do not have pun and-lah constituents.</td>
<td>1. Ia menamai dirinya Paya Tu Naqpa. 'He called himself Paya Tu Naqpa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Selama Paya Tu Naqpa kerajaan itu senantiasa ia pergi berburu. 'During the time he was king, Paya Tu Naqpa was used always to go hunting.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V. Embedded structures | - are subdivided into the Yang Embedded Structure and the Unmarked Embedded Structure.  
- the Yang Embedded Structure from the perspective of its defining modifier can be either a Nominalized Clause or a NP. The Nominalized Clause has an exocentric structure, i.e. it has a subject-predicate relation. The NP has an endocentric structure, i.e. it has an attributive or Head-Modifier relation  
- the Unmarked Embedded Structure is distinguished from the Yang Embedded Structure by the fact that it does not any relative pronoun yang. From the perspective of its modifier, which has either the role of defining or possessing, the unmarked embedded structure can be either... | 3. raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'the King who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace'  
4. pangkalan yang ditempat pelanduk putih lenyap itu 'the landing stage on the spot where the white mousedeer disappeared' |
a Nominalized Clause or a NP which is actually a merging between a NP and a Clause; that is to say the NP, in relation to the defined head Noun that precedes it, is a defining modifier, whereas in relation to the predicate that comes after it, it is an agent subject.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. The translation here is for the most part based on that of Teeuw and Wyatt. Where my interpretation of specific lexical items differs from theirs I will use my own translation. Furthermore, the equal sign (=) is to separate morphemes within a word.

2. I do not use the word 'about' here because I believe that this sentence is basically a Frame Content construction (for details see 3.6.2.), which I feel is not clearly reflected by the English 'tell about' construction. That is, Inilah suatu kisah yang dicetak oleh orang tua-tua 'This is the story which has been told by the old people' is the frame part, and asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'the origin of the King who founded the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace' is the content part. It should be noted also that the frame part is a lah-construction (for details see 3.6.3.).

3. Teeuw and Wyatt use the two English words 'hound' and 'dog' to translate anjing. I see no reason for using two terms, therefore I will simply use 'dog'.

4. I am using 'the' here instead of 'a' because of the presence of the definite article itu in its Malay counterpart.

5. Arakian is translated here as 'hence' and not as 'as for' because I believe that this particle is a conclusion marker (for details see 3.5.2.) and not a topic marker.

6. I am using 'that' here instead of 'this' because of the presence of itu in its Malay counterpart.

7. Syahdan is translated here as 'furthermore' since it is a coordinate conjunction that is used for important information in the text; in this case it is used for the point of the story (for details see 3.5.5.).

8. Demikianlah hikayatnya is translated as 'That is the way the story goes' due to the fact that demikian 'like that' is anaphoric of the story which was retold by the narrator prior to it.

17. See Becker (to appear).
20. Errington 1974:12-13; Hang Tuah is the name of the main character (hero) in the Hikayat Hang Tuah, which is the text that Errington studies.
21. Errington 1975:32-33. Note that the term 'Part One' refers to part one of Hikayat Hang Tuah, the text that Errington analyzes.
22. cf. Windstedt 1957 (1967) for the meanings of titah, baginda, daulat tuanku, Duli Yang Mahamulia; the explanation about distancing, speaking up and speaking down, and the act of humbling is my own.
23. Notice that the reason why the narrators think that their argument, i.e. the second one, is true rather than the first one (the popular belief) is due to the fact that the mousedeer in most Malay animal fables is the main character who always outwits all the other animals, especially the strong ones such as tigers, crocodiles, apes, etc. In other words, in Malay culture the mousedeer stands for intelligence. Sometimes it also stands for gracefulness, elegance, and beauty. He is a trickster character, somewhat like Br'er Rabbit in American folklore.
26. Richard Rhodes and I discovered this as we wrote down all the sentences and clauses that are preceded by maka.
27. We won't take kalakian 'at that time' or 'next' (derived from kala 'time' or 'period' and kian 'that' or 'there') into consideration, since it does not appear in our text.
28. "Suatu kissah iniilah is ungrammatical, because suatu is indefinite and iniilah is definite; one cannot have the definite and the indefinite articles simultaneously modify the noun kissah.
29. SCRIPT is a term used by Roger Schank and his colleagues on the Yale Artificial Intelligence Project (a project to construct a computer that will 'understand' a story). They define SCRIPT as 'a performed sequence of actions that constitutes the natural order of a piece of knowledge' (Schank et al. 1975:3). 'Scripts', according to them, 'serve to fill in the gaps in a causal chain when they can't be inferred just by themselves' (1975:3). They also state that 'scripts are intended to handle the range of events that are the most mundane' (p.4). For their purposes, they state that 'a script is a predetermined, stereotyped sequence of actions
that define a well-known situation .... Scripts allow for new references to objects within them just as if these objects had been previously mentioned; objects within a script may take "the" without an explicit introduction because the script itself has already implicitly introduced them' (1975:3).

In modern Indonesian this presupposed use of itu is substituted by the use of -nya, e.g. if I say 'Siapa namanyaa?''What's your name?'' to my addressee what I mean is not 'What is YOUR name?' but rather 'I presuppose that you have a name. What is it?'

30. Another interpretation for this is that itu could be a modifier whose scope is beyond laut, that is, it modifies the whole phrase perburuan sebelah tepi laut. In this case itu is used as an anaphoric non-presupposed deictic particle and not as a script one. This is due to the fact that sentence (7) in our text, especially sentiasa ia pergi berburu 'he used to go hunting' already implies that there is always a location for hunting when one talks about it.


32. To know what frame-content construction is, see 3.5.2.

33. Demikian here is part of an understood dialogue between Narrator(s) and Addressee.

34. These terms - CORE, PRECORE and ELABORATION - were developed together with A.L. Becker as I was working on this construction.

35. -lah constituent is called COMMENT, because the term 'comment' is more inclusive than the terms 'event' and 'new information' and also because I want to use 'comment' as a slot label and 'event' as a role label. There are also comments that have 'non-events' roles, e.g. sungguh 'indeed' in sungguhlah as intensifier, ini 'this' in inilah as an introductory marker, etc.

36. Lewis 1947:233 discusses a different use of adalah, i.e. the fact that adalah, in introducing a statement, stresses the existence of the state of affairs made known by that statement. For example, 1) Maka ada-lah daripada kēbanyakan ra'yat bērjalan itu sēgala hutan bēlantara pun habis-lah mēnjadi padang. 'It came about that because of the great multitude of the marching army the spreading jungle was utterly destroyed and became a treeless plain.' 2) Ada-lah bēsi ini kami bawa dari nēgēri China sapērti lēngan bēsar-nya, sēkarang habis haus. 'This iron that we are carrying from China, the truth is that it was originally of an arm's thickness, and now it has rusted away almost to nothing.'


38. This list is in some ways similar to and in other ways different from Becker's (1977:8). Some of the features on my list are different from the ones on his because the nature of his text is different from mine and also because his features are obtained on the basis of studying one particular type of sentence. That is to say, my list of features is a result of studying more than one type of sentence; it is a further elaboration of what he started out in his list.

39. In the case of example (40) the FCR construction is stated in the form of a sentence and then the development of the content is given after that, in the form of a discourse, whereas in the case of 'Introductory S + Story
Proper + Concluding S', the FCF construction is stated in the form of a non-openended discourse, where the content is the discourse itself. In other words, in the former the content is the theme, whereas in the latter the content is the development of the theme, which is expressed in the frame, i.e. the introductory sentence, as Asal raja yang berbuat negeri Patani Darussalam itu 'The origin of the King who built the settlement of Patani, the Abode of Peace'. Note that this is an example of structural similarity at different levels.

40. There is a third which has already been discussed in section 3.6.2. on Frame-Content Construction, i.e. the content part of it. I did not however state explicitly that it is an embedded structure.

41. Yang consists of a third person singular ia + the topic marker-ng (cf. ang in Tagalog).

42. To know what the abbreviations stand for consult the list of abbreviations on p.v.

43. Note that these formulas, including the ones of (58a), (59a), (60a) and (61a), are not intended to give a complete breakdown to word and relevant morpheme levels, but they are intended to give my readers a general idea of what the difference is between the Yang Embedded Structure and the Unmarked Embedded Structures, and of how complex the Unmarked Embedded Structures are, i.e. they are so complex that I can't represent them in one generalized formulaic pattern, but I have to represent them in three different formulaic patterns. For interested readers who want to see the complete breakdown formulas of these structures, please follow each individual tree diagram (Displays 3.6.5.-3.6.16.) down from where I stop in the formulas.

44. This topic marker (TM') is on the phrase level. It is distinguished from pun as the topic marker (TM) on the sentence level.

45. NP₁ in relation to Elaboration Structure (Elab.Str.) is the defining modifier of the defined Head Noun, whereas in relation to UEStr., NP₁ is the agent subject of the Pred.Def.Act Verb.

46. itu in this context, besides being anaphoric and marking past tense, has also a function of giving a sense of closure to the sentence.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSION

This chapter consists of two parts: a list of things that have been discovered and discussed in this book and things that remain to be done, i.e. problems or hypotheses the truth of which needs to be proven.

4.1. FINDINGS

4.1.1. In analyzing the overall structure of the text I found out about the following:

(1) There are two kinds of narrators, the old people as the reported narrators, and the present narrator as the reporting narrator.

(2) From this it is inferred that, in terms of the time of the telling of the story, there are two types of addressee, the past addressee and the present addressee. These two types of addressee are what I refer to as natural addressees. The counterpart of this addressee is the supernatural addressee whose name and protection is invoked by means of the Arabic invocational prayer at the beginning of the story.

(3) The telling of the story on a higher level involves the following speech acts: the invocation, manifested by the Arabic invocational prayer, the announcing and the concluding of the story manifested by the introductory and the concluding sentences, the assertion of the point of the story, and the actual telling (or retelling) of the story.

(4) The announcing and the concluding of the story is a quotative strategy used by the present narrator to signal the fact that the telling (or the retelling) of the story is an act of quoting the old narrators. In other words, the introductory and the concluding sentences function as quotation marks around the first story of part I of HP.

(5) The point of the story, i.e. the etymologizing about the name of the new settlement that the main participant in the story built, is a strategy
   (a) to conclude the story of the hunt - which is an embedded text in the story - and
   (b) to expand on the point of the story which is embedded in the scenes or the episodes of the encounter of the main participant with the old couple and the act of the main participants' dogs pursuing the mousedeer.

(6) The sequence of temporal adverbials is a strategy to mark the outline of the text.
4.1.2. In exploring bahasa I discovered the following:

(1) Distancing, showing honor and deference, as an expression of bahasa has two aspects: physical non-verbal and verbal relational.

(2) Based on only one context in the text, i.e. the fact that the form Duli Paduka Nenda occurs in one main clause, while the form Paduka Nénda occurs in two subordinate adverbial clauses (both of which mean 'Royal Grandfather'), I hypothesize that Paduka Nénda is the reduced form (or the second mention form) of the nominal form Duli Paduka Nénda. Note that the truth of this inference needs to be verified by more data.

(3) The King, who is the main participant in the story, when speaking to his subjects never uses speech act verbs (i.e. performative verbs). Other participants always do, except in the context where there are two or more exchanges within the same speech act (cf. examples (10-14) in section 3.3.).

(4) Daulat Tuanku 'Hail my Lord', besides functioning as a verbal distancing, is also used as a signal of a speech act change, i.e. a change of participants with the same speech act or a change of speech act with the same participants. (Note: this term only occurs in contexts where a king or a ruler is speaking down to his subjects and exclusively in the addressee part of the exchange, and not in the speaker part of the exchange.)

4.1.3. In discussing naming and etymologizing I disclosed the following:

(1) Etymologizing about names - the acts of naming of the main participant and of the settlement which are explicated in and by the text - is a text-building strategy.

(2) Names in this text are used by the narrators to give a sense of completeness to the text, i.e. the name of the main participant is given at the beginning of the text as a base or topic from which the text is developed and the name of the settlement, i.e. the explication of how it was arrived at, is given at the end of the story as a concluding point. In other words, this act of giving a sense of completeness to the text by means of names at the beginning and at the end of the text is another text-building strategy that should be distinguished from the one listed in (1) above.

4.1.4. In evaluating particles I discovered the following information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICLE</th>
<th>FEATURES/COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hatta</td>
<td>- marks a change in the action or the event in an episode. The change usually has to do with the change in participant orientation or in the scene of location. The change in participant orientation may involve the change of backgrounded major participant with the foregrounded major participant; it may also involve the introduction of a significant participant while the major participant is still the same, with a change in the scene - usually occurs at the beginning of the episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARTICLE</td>
<td>FEATURES/COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maka</td>
<td>- operates on the clause and sentence levels; in terms of its function slot it is an initial punctuation; in terms of its function role it is an event sequence sentence (or clause) marker in a text; in terms of its filler class it is a connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syahdan</td>
<td>- functions as an evaluation marker and occurs always at the beginning of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ini      | - modifies speaker or other entities that are close to the speaker  
- proximity is temporal if the noun it modifies is abstract  
- proximity is physical if the noun it modifies is concrete  
- is cataphoric and exocentric if it is followed by a noun  
- is anaphoric and endocentric if it is preceded by a noun  
- is neither anaphoric nor cataphoric if it refers to an entity that is non-textual, i.e. an entity that is part of nature (ostensive reference)  
- signals immediate time before or after a speech act is performed |
| Itu      | - types: 1) presupposed or script itu; 2) non-presupposed or anaphoric itu  
- signals distant time whether in the past or in the future |
| Arakian  | - conclusion marker of a sentence, paragraph or an episode of a descriptive indirect speech within the story  
- always occurs at the beginning of the concluding unit, i.e. in the preframe part of a Frame Content construction  
- not modified by comment marker -lah |
| Demikian | - conclusion marker of a Dialogue Paragraph or a Complex Dialogue Paragraph level, and also of a story as a discourse unit. |

To my knowledge most of the definitions or information given above are not found in any old or current Malay or Indonesian dictionary. This is due to the fact that most definitions in dictionaries I have consulted tend to be lexically centred rather than textually or discourse centred.

4.1.5. The following are the construction types that I discovered:
(1) pun-lah constructions  
(2) Frame-Content constructions  
(3) -lah constructions  
(4) Other constructions  
(5) Embedded structures.
(For a detailed summary see section 3.6.6.)
Note that the -lah and the pun-lah construction types have one thing in common. That is the constituent that is modified by the enclitic lah usually contains new information. Their difference is in the commented entity, the object of the -lah constituent (the commenting entity). In the pun-lah construction the commented entity, marked by the topic marker pun, usually carries old information, whereas in the -lah construction, the commented entity, not marked by pun and usually occurring as a separate text unit (either as a clause, sentence, sentence cluster, paragraph or discourse) preceding or following the commenting entity depending on the deictic particle used, usually carries new information.

In Hopper (1976:9), clauses marked with -lah are viewed as the crucial foci of the narrative, i.e. they provide a synopsis of the dynamic line of the episode. In my work I take a different view regarding this. I view the enclitic particle -lah as a comment marker, that is the text unit it modifies usually carries new information. The newness of the information based on my work operates on two levels: on the content (or lexical) level and on the metalevel.

4.2. PROBLEMS FOR LATER WORKS

In conclusion, I will point out issues that need further verification by later works.

(1) The widespreadness of the patterns - the pun-lah constructions, the frame-content constructions, the -lah constructions, the other constructions, and the embedded constructions - i.e. how common and how widespread they were in different Classical Malay texts, needs to be investigated.

(2) The widespreadness of the particles, i.e. the conclusion markers arakian and demikian, the definite articles ini 'this' and itu 'that', the event sequence sentence marker maka, the evaluation marker syahdan, hatta as the marker of the change in the action or the event in an episode, the topic marker pun and the comment marker -lah, needs to be investigated.

(3) The widespreadness of some text-building strategies2 - the use of introductory and concluding sentences as quotative strategy, the use of temporal adverbials to mark the outline of the text, the use of frame and frame-content construction type to foreground the content as theme or the topic sentence of the text - needs to be investigated.

(4) Except for the terms (or notions) that occur in point (2) and a few others such as topic, comment, precore, core, elaboration, most of the terms I use in describing and illustrating the embedded structures in section 3.6.5. (consult the list of abbreviations immediately preceding Chapter 1 for this) and section 1.1., have not been justified. In other words, these notions need to be investigated in further detailed works on clause level and levels below clause, i.e. phrase level, word level and morpheme level. For this reason, some of the cells of the nodes in the tree diagrams have been left unfilled.
NOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. This is not an exhaustive list of all the particles, deictic or connective, in my text.

2. The widespreadness of etymologizing about names as a text-building strategy is one of the few that has been pretty much investigated. See Becker's essay on 'Text building, epistemology, and aesthetics in Javanese shadow theatre' (to appear).
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