1. **Abstract**

“Papuan Malay” denotes the variety of Malay spoken in coastal Papua (eastern Indonesia). This paper discusses the demonstrative system of Papuan Malay as spoken along Papua’s north-east coast. This description is based on recordings of narratives and spontaneous conversations between Papuan Malay speakers.

There are only two demonstratives, *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’, as well as their optionally shortened forms, *ni* and *tu*. In their anaphoric function, *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’ can be used as adnominal modifiers, modifying noun phrases of any type, including proper nouns and pronouns. Furthermore, both demonstratives can function as independent referential pronouns or can substitute for a clause.

In addition, there are non-anaphoric uses of *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’. Both demonstratives can indicate the relative temporal (as in (1)) or spatial setting of an event.

(1) **Marker of spatial and temporal settings**  
[Context: During a trip the speaker urges his companions to hurry up]  
\[
\text{mandi cepat-cepat, } \text{ini } \text{tong mo lanjut lagi}
\]
\[
\text{bathe RDP-fast DEM.PROX 1PL want.to continue again}
\]
\[
‘\text{bathe very quickly, right now we want to continue further}’ (Lit. ‘\text{this (is when)}’)
\]

A second non-anaphoric function is that *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’ add emphasis to an utterance. When in post-verbal position, as in (2), the demonstrative emphasizes the action as a whole. When in post-adverbial position it emphasizes the temporal setting of the event.

(2) **Emphasizer in post-verbal position**  
[Context: Narrative about a youth retreat]  
\[
\text{kamu jalang ini untuk, apa pekerjaan Tuhan}
\]
\[
\text{2PL walk DEM.PROX for what work God}
\]
\[
‘\text{your very traveling is for, what, God’s work}’
\]

A third non-anaphoric function of *itu* ‘that’ is as a marker of reason-result relations as illustrated in (3). The demonstrative *itu* ‘that’ stands alone when introducing a reason clause as in (3a), while it co-occurs with *yang* ‘REL’ when introducing a result clause as in (3b).

(3) **Introducing causal conjunctions**  
\[ \text{a. } \text{itu} ‘\text{that}’ – Causal conjunction marking reason} \]
\[ [\text{Context: A doctor’s reply after the speaker had a motorbike accident}] \]
\[
\text{a mama itu hanya ko jatu kaget ah! mother DEM.DIST only 2SG fall startled}
\]
\[
‘\text{ah, mother that is just because you’re under shock}’
\]
\[ \text{b. } \text{itu} ‘\text{that}’ – Causal conjunction marking result} \]
\[ [\text{Context: Conversation about the speaker’s son}] \]
\[
\text{lapa, itu yan de sakit}
\]
\[
\text{hungry DEM.DIST. REL 3SG sick}
\]
\[
‘\text{(he was) hungry, that’s why he’s sick}’
\]

Finally, both demonstratives are used at the discourse level as topic markers and as participant-tracking devices. In (4), the demonstrative *itu* ‘that’ modifies the head nominal *setang* ‘evil spirit’, thereby marking it as the topic of the subsequent utterance.

(4) **Discourse level topic markers**  
[Context: A conversation about a shipwreck]  
\[
\text{Setang itu yang sink}.
\]
\[
\text{evil spirit DEM.DIST that sink}
\]
\[
‘\text{the evil spirit that sank}’
\]
As participant tracking devices, demonstratives seem to have two major functions. They highlight main participants in a story and participants that are re-entering the scene.