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Abstract
Sasak language is spoken by approximately 3,352,888 people in Lombok, Indonesia. Typologically, it is a complex language because of its dual word orders. With its six dialectal varieties Meriaq-Meriqu, Menu-Meni, Ngeno-Ngene, Nggeto-Nggete, Meno-Men and Kuto-Kute, Sasak language shows its unique properties in the use of demonstratives. This study dealt with Sasak demonstratives in Lombok with the aims to (a) syntactically and semantically examine their phenomena of demonstrative systems on six dialectal varieties, and (b) promote a typologically conceptual framework for assessing demonstratives. Data were gathered through interpretative elicitation, semi-interview to clarify the data, interpretative text by translating a document. Two fundamental concepts of Halliday & Hasan (1976), Diessel (1999), and Dixon (1988) on English demonstratives were used to analyze Sasak syntactic categories and semantic distinctions. The results showed that Sasak demonstratives are almost identical with English demonstratives in terms of their syntactic categories, but they are completely different in their semantic distinctions. Therefore, a new theoretical framework on the usage of demonstrative analyses across languages is recommended.
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Typologically, Sasak language belongs to a Malayo-Polynesian language group (Austin 2011). This language bears dual word-orders, SVO and OVS, respectively accusative and syntactically ergative (Artawa, 1994; Hanafi & Udin, 2016). With its six dialectal varieties: Meno-Mene, Ngeno-Ngene, Meriaq-Meriqu, Nggeto-Nggete, Menu-Meni and Kuto-Kute (Sutarman, 2010), Sasak language is considered complex shown by its unique properties of demonstratives in all available dialects (Sutarman, 2014). This language is spoken by 3.352.888 people in Lombok (https://ntb.bps.go.id 2019).

Demonstratives have a vital role across languages. Frank (1972) stated the importance of English demonstrative pronouns in pointing out someone and something. She showed the most common demonstrative pronouns this (plural these) and that (plural those) for respectively near at hand and farther away. The distinctions occurred because of adverbs here and there in the clauses. Halliday & Hasan (1976) noted three systematic distinctions: (a) semantic (proximal and distal); (b) grammatical (singular and plural); and (c) syntactic (determiner and pronoun).

Diessel (1999) further classified demonstrative into three criteria: (a) syntactically, it is a deictic expression which serves a particular function, (b) pragmatically, it is used to focus hearer’s attention on an object or location and also functions to manage the information flow of the ongoing discourse, (c) semantically, it is deictically contrastive. For instance, English has two contrastive demonstratives: proximal this and distal that. Proximal denotes to entity near the deictic center and distal refers to some distances to the deictic center.

Dixon (2003) outlined demonstrative as an item having deictic reference which functions to focus hearer’s attention on elements in the speech situation. Caldano & Coventry (2019) augmented that demonstratives are often found in almost all languages in the binary system like proximal and distal terms individually indicating near and far distances.

Suciani (2016), in her study on A Deictic System in Rean Dialect Spoken in Boyotan Sub-Village of North Lombok, discovered five types of deixis following Fillmore’s theory (1971): person, spatial, temporal, discourse and social. In order to examine their semantic features and pragmatic functions, she adopted the theories of Diessel (1999), Ingram (1971), Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski (1993) and Mahyuni (2006).

Semantically she analyzed gender and number of the person, spatial with three demonstrative systems of three zones close to the speaker, temporal with the articulated lexical expression of adverbial time and other elements, discourse with the use of demonstrative pronoun, social deixis addressing system in terms of kinship, education, occupation and religion.

Then she pragmatically elaborated the functions of person deixis mostly about social status of the speaker and relationship among the interlocutors, spatial deixis serving exoporic and recognition functions, temporal deixis available in the use of auxiliary particle, discourse deixis represented by demonstrative pronoun related to upcoming portion of discourse, social deixis exposing social status of the participant to designate intimacy and politeness. Suciani finally
concludes that learning deixis in Rean Dialect is remarkable for it requires understanding on both semantic and pragmatic knowledge to find appropriate interpretation upon utterances.

This paper deals with The Syntactic-Semantic Analyses of Sasak Demonstratives in Lombok with the aims to (a) syntactically and semantically examine their phenomena of demonstrative systems on six dialectal varieties, and (b) promote a typologically conceptual framework for assessing demonstratives. Two fundamental concepts of Halliday & Hasan (1976), Diessel (1999) and Dixon (1988) on English demonstratives were adopted to analyze Sasak syntactic categories and semantic distinctions. Halliday & Hasan (1976) pointed out two syntactic demonstratives: determiner and pronoun, Diessel (1999) categorized demonstratives into four: pronominal, adnominal, identification and adverbial, whereas Dixon (2003) put them into three: nominal, adverbial and verbal. In other words, English develops five types of syntactic categories (Spears, 1991) with two kinds of semantic distinction: proximal and distal (Frank, 1972).

**Method**

The current study is qualitatively descriptive in nature. It describes the facts or characteristics of a population or phenomena being studied (Berg, 2001). This study depicts the use of Sasak demonstratives in six dialectal varieties. The data were gathered through: (a) interpretative elicitation in the form of syntactic questions and discourse completion test (DCT) to pick up some expressions related to demonstratives in various contexts, (b) semi-interview for clarifying the data after undertaking elicitation, and (c) interpretive text aiming at translating a document in order to get some additional information on Sasak demonstratives. The data were taken in West Lombok, Central Lombok, and East Lombok. Then, two conceptual frameworks of Halliday & Hasan (1976), Diessel (1999), and Dixon (1988) on English demonstratives were adopted to analyze Sasak syntactic categories and semantic distinctions. A comparison of syntactic and semantic analyses between Sasak and English demonstratives was also made.

**Results**

The results of this study showed that Sasak demonstratives are almost identical with English demonstratives in terms of their syntactic categories but completely different in their semantic distinctions. They are verified by the fact that each dialect in Sasak language is capable of introducing six to seven types of demonstrative whereas English only displays five types of demonstratives (lacking for quantifier and referential). Semantically, most dialects in Sasak took a three-way distinction: proximal, medial and distal like Italian, Portuguese and Spanish (Amfo, 2007). One outstanding dialect of Sasak, Kuto-Kute, is capable of displaying seven syntactic demonstratives with a four-way semantic distinction like Tlingit (North West American) and Samal (Philippines) (Levinson, 1983). Conversely, English is just like Chinese creating a two-way distinction: proximal and distal. Amplification of these analyses is put forwarded in the discussion.

---

1 Spears (1991) classifies adnominal, nominal and pronominal of the same category.
Discussion

Six dialectal varieties of Sasak demonstratives, *Meriaq-Meriqu*, *Menu-Meni*, *Ngeno-Ngene*, *Nggeto-Nggete*, *Meno-Meno* and *Kuto-Kute*, with their unique properties are presented in turn.

**MERIAQ-MERIQU DIALECT**

*Meriaq-Meriqu Dialect* achieved seven types of demonstratives, namely: determiner, pronoun, identifier, adverbial, verbal, quantifier and referential. Five out of seven are syntactically identical with English demonstratives in *Halliday & Hasan* (1976), *Diessel* (1999) and *Dixon* (2003) as follows:

The first is a demonstrative determiner. In this dialect, it is represented by *iaq* ‘this’ which is semantically proximal. Its position comes after HP (*hand-phone*) in the imperative form of the clause. Example [1] demonstrates proximal demonstrative determiner with the gloss PDD.

[1]  
Koloq HP *iaq* anak-*qe*  
Put HP PDD son.1sg.POSS  
“Put this HP my son”

*Diessel* (1999) argues that such a demonstrative refers to adnominal in which traditional grammar assumes as a noun modifier. This type of demonstrative co-occurs with a noun in a noun phrase. Some other identical demonstratives in this dialect are *iqu* ‘this’ and *taoh* ‘that’ for medial and distal.

The second is a demonstrative pronoun. *Amfo* (2007) agrees that it behaves like a determiner and takes place independently in an argument position of the verb. This pronoun *iqu* ‘that’ does not co-occur with a noun *barang* ‘goods’ or a possessor *ité* ‘our’. Its function is to point out something which is semantically medial. However, *ité* ‘our’ (1pl.POSS) that comes after *barang* ‘goods’ is a modifier of it. Consider example [2] with MDP for medial demonstrative pronoun.

[2]  
*iqu* *barang* *ité*  
MDP goods 1pl.POSS  
“That is our goods”

The third is a demonstrative identifier. It attracts the hearer’s attention on entities in the surrounding situation. *Diessel* (1999) claims that identifier often occurs in copular and non-verbal clauses but again he adds if demonstrative pronoun and identifier are identical, they may belong to the same category. Example [3] below projects *iaq* ‘that’ as an identifier which is semantically proximal (PDI).

[3]  
*iaq* *buku*-m  
PDI book.2sg.POSS  
“That is your book”

The fourth is a demonstrative adverb. It chiefly consists of three types: (a) adverb of location, (b) adverb of manner, and (c) adverb of direction. The adverb of location semantically shows proximal *niaq*, medial *té* and distal *tó*. A proximal example in [4] demonstrates this:
Similarly, the adverb of manner semantically projects proximal meriaq, medial meriqu, and distal mento. One of them is presented in [5] to explicate a medial example.

**[5]**

```
Meriqu nten ken papuk mek
MDA way to grandpa. 2sg.POSS
```

“You do like that to your grandpa!”

Proximal niaq laik, medial té lai, and distal tó laik can be seen in the adverb of direction. In this respect, the position of direction adverb is at the beginning of the clause that proceeds ‘bareh’. A proximal niaq laik in [6] proves this.

**[6]**

```
Niaq laik bareh ndeh
PDA later yes
```

“Please come here later”

The verbal demonstrative and determiner plausibly appear within the clause. If pemeriaq occurs at the beginning of the clause, then iqua occupies the final position right after the object ‘kelambi-kelambi’. Some verbal demonstratives may take pemeriaq or meriaqan marked with a nasal prefix for proximal, a basic verb ‘pemeriq’ or a nasal prefix memeriq for medial, pementó or mentóan with a nasal prefix for distal. Example [7] gives to proximal pemeriaq followed by a medial demonstrative determiner iqua. Note that PVD and MDD are glosses corresponding to pemeriq and iqua.

**[7]**

```
Pemeriaq kelambi-kelambi iqua²
PVD. shirt.PL. MDD
```

“Make those shirts like that”

In contrast to the syntactic functions in Halliday & Hasan (1979), Diessel (1999) and Dixon (2003), Meriaq-Meriqu exhibits two other syntactic forms of demonstrative: quantifier and referential which exclusively assign a three-way semantic distinction.

Quantifier is another type of demonstrative denoting to the amount of thing. The following quantifiers are semeriaq, semeriq and semente which semantically meet the criteria for proximal, medial, and distal differences. Distal example in [8] is shown.

**[8]**

```
Sementó kepeng-qe to bale
DDQ. money.1sg.POSS at home
```

“I have the same amount of money with that”

Referential implies something or at least things that allocate identical characteristics with the speaker has in mind. Equal to quantifier, this demonstrative possesses proximal meriniq, medial meriqu, and distal meretoq. One referential example of proximal meriniq is given in [9]:

---

²*iqua* is often pronounced when it appears at the final position of a clause.
**MENU-MENI DIALECT**

*Menu-Meni Dialect* provides six types of demonstratives: (a) nominal, (b) identification, (c) adverbal, (d) verbal, (e) quantifier, and (f) referential. Four of them are syntactically identical with English demonstratives.

The nominal demonstrative serving syntactic categorizations as proposed by Halliday & Hasan (1979), Diessel (1999) and Dixon (2003) allows a three-way semantic distinction. This nominal falls into (a) determiner and (b) pronoun.

Determiner is functionally a noun modifier shown by *niqng* for proximal, *tieqng* for medial and *nuqng* for distal. Example [10] exposes *nuqng* as modifier of the noun *atom* ‘pen’. It is glossed DDD for distal demonstrative determiner.

> Where is the pen, brother?

*Ning, tieng* and *nung* belongs to demonstrative pronoun used to pinpoint something. It fulfills three semantic discrepancies. It is sometimes called a demonstrative derivation because some categories of demonstrative can derive from demonstrative pronoun as in Chinese (Xing, 2017). Note that *nung* is a pronoun for distal as in [11]:

> Use that bicycle!

Identifier is used to recognize something the speaker denotes to. Amfo (2007) states that identifier occurs in the non-verbal clause. Diessel (1999) adds that a demonstrative identifier and a demonstrative pronoun are sometimes hard to distinguish because they share the same features. However, as he claims if the similarity happens in the types of demonstrative, they definitely belong to the same category. Example [12] proves *ning* for proximal:

> This is my brother’s house

A demonstrative adverb is classified into: (a) location, (b) direction, and (c) manner. Adverb of location implies a location where the speaker refers to. This demonstrative bears three semantic idiosyncrasies: *té* for proximal, *te* for medial and *tó* for distal. The following example of the demonstrative *té* for proximal is in [13]. It is given a gloss PDA (proximal demonstrative adverb).

> Here they play
In the same way, an adverb of direction indicates the direction that the speaker has to point out. This demonstrative meets three semantic features: lite’ for proximal, lite for medial and litó for distal. Here is an example of lite for medial in [14]:

[14] Nane-qo lite, anteh seberak
    Now.1sg MDA wait a moment
    “I will come there, wait a moment”

Adverb of manner exhibites three semantic functions, namely: meni for proximal, mentie for medial and menu for distal are demonstrated. Here, example [15] is given in lieu of meni for proximal. Note that a determiner nuqng for distal (DDD) appears in this clause.

[15] Meni ntan-qo jagur kanak nuqng tuwik
    PDA way.1sg hit son DDD yesterday
    “I hit him like this”

Verbal demonstratives in Menu-Menı Dialect are mostly marked with verb markers like: prefix pe- and suffixes -ang and -q. These demonstratives exhibit three ways of semantic distinctions: pemeniq, meniq, meniqang for proximal, pementiaq, mentiaq, mentiaqang for medial and pemenuq, menuq, menuqang for distal. Others are pelitéq for proximal, peliteq for medial and pelitóq for distal. Consider pementiaq for medial in [16] is followed by tieqng for MDD (medial demonstrative determiner).

[16] Dendek pementiaq buku tieqng arik
    NEG MVD book MDD brother
    “Brother! Don’t make the book like that”

Halliday & Hasan (1979), Diessel (1999) and Dixon (2003) did not include quantifier and referential in English demonstratives. In contrast, this dialect provides quantifier and referential to state something. In order to understand the quantification, the hearer needs to speak face to face with the speaker or the referent around the speech situation (Sutarman, 2014). In this case, the quantifier holds a three-way distinction: proximal semenq, medial semenq and distal semen. Example [17] illustrates semenq as proximal.

[17] Semeni qo-beng kepeng jari bekel-de
    PDQ 1sg give money for provision.2sg.HON
    “I give you this amount of money for your provision”

Referential represents an object assigning some characteristics with the thing in the mind of the speaker. It takes three semantic distinctions: proximal semeniq and semeniqan, medial semeniq and semeniqan, and distal semenuq and semenuqan. Example (18) illustrates semeniqan as proximal.

[18] Beli-angq semeniqan amak
    Buy.LINK.1sg PDE father
    “Father, buy me like this one”
NGENO-NGENÉ DIALECT

*Ngeno-Ngene Dialect* performs seven types of demonstrative to show their syntactic categories: (a) determiner, (b) pronoun, (c) identification, (d) adverbial, (e) verbal, (f) quantifier, and (g) referential.

Determiner, pronoun and identification demonstratives allocate identical forms: proximal *né/ine* ‘this’, medial *ni/ini* ‘that’ (further than proximal) and distal *nó/ino* ‘that’. Although they have the same forms, their functions exist semantically different. The following examples are *né* for proximal, *nó* for distal and *né* for proximal in [19]-[21] with respective PDD, DDP and PDI.

[19]  
*Ngené* kepeng *né*  
Much. money PDD  
“This money is too much”

[20]  
*Nó* kadu  
DDP use  
“Use that”

[21]  
*Né* bale-ng *kakak-qu*  
PDI house.LINK brother.1sg.POSS  
“This is my brother’s house”

Demonstrative adverb is made up of three types; (a) location, (b) manner, and (c) direction. The demonstrative of location assigns location or a place and bears a three-way semantic dissimilarity: proximal *téne* ‘here’, medial *tini* ‘there (close to hearer)’ and distal *tóno* ‘there’. Example [22] displays *tóno* for distal.

[22]  
*Lek* *tóno* taok te *mangan*  
At DDA place.2pl eat  
“We eat there”

Demonstrative of manner stands for someone who does something. Proximal *ngené* ‘like this’, medial *ngeni* ‘like that’ and distal *ngenó* ‘like that’ are shown semantically. Similarly, the demonstrative directions designate a direction for proximal *keteq* ‘come here’, medial *ketiq* ‘come there’ and distal *ketoq* ‘come there’. Examples [23]- [24] are respectively for proximal *ngené* and distal *keteq*.

[23]  
*Ngené* *ntan* peririq *tangkong* *ne*  
PDA way tidy clothes PDD  
“This is how to tidy this cloth”

[24]  
*Keteq* *bareh* kepетeng  
PDA later night  
“Come here tonight”
Verbal demonstratives in *Ngeno-Ngene Dialect* fall into (a) directional meaning (indicating direction) and (b) manner meaning (indicating manner). Directional meaning involves proximal *beketéq* ‘come here’, medial *beketiq* ‘come there’ and distal *beketoq* ‘come there.’ The meaning of manner holds proximal *keneqang* ‘make like this’, medial *keniqang* ‘make like that’ and distal *kenoqang* ‘make like that’. Here are two examples of PVD (proximal verbal demonstrative of directional meaning) and PVM (proximal verbal demonstrative of manner meaning) in [25] – [26]:

[25]  
*beketéq* jemak
PVD   tomorrow

“Come here tomorrow”

[26]  
*keneqang* tangkong-meq
PVM   shirt.2sg.POSS

“Make your shirt like this”

Demonstrative quantifiers semantically have three way distinctions: proximal *sekené* ‘this amount’, medial *sekeni* ‘that amount’ and distal *sekenó* ‘that amount’. The use of proximal demonstrative quantifier *sekené* should involve the speaker and the hearer in the speech situation while the later may not need the referent in there but it should have been understood by both speaker and hearer (Sutarman 2014). Consider example [27] for proximal (PDQ).

[27]  
*sekené* geres  nó
PDQ   sand  DDD

“This is the amount of sand”

A proximal of demonstrative referential *sekenéq* ‘something like this’ refers to the closest object to the speaker. Medial demonstrative referential *sekeniq* ‘something like that’ denotes to object closer to hearer while distal demonstrative referential *sekenoq* ‘something like that’ stands for the object that is far from both speaker and hearer. This is an illustration of demonstrative referential in reference with a three-way distinction explicated in [28] for distal *sekenoq*.

[28]  
*bait-ang-aqu* sekenoq
Take.LINK.1sg  DDR

“Take me a thing like that”

**NGGETO-NGGETÉ DIALECT**

Sutarman (2014) and Suciani (2016) claimed that *Nggeto-Nggete Dialect* is *Rean dialect*. This dialect performs six types of demonstratives: determiner, identifier, pronoun, quantifier, adverb and verbal.

Both determiner and identifier accept a three-way semantic distinction: proximal *néné*, medial *nini*, and distal *nónó*. Examples of PDD in [29] and PDI in (30) have identical reference to proximal *néné*.
In contrast to PPD [29] whose néné is used to signify proximal, the distinctions of demonstrative pronoun (DP) are marked by néné, nini and nónó. They individually show proximal, medial and distal that behave differently. Here, nónó registers proximal for PDP. Consider example [31] below:

[31]  Nónó kelambim pe amaq
      PDP cloth.LINK.2sg.POSS father
      “Father! That is your cloth”

A three-way distinction of demonstrative quantifier is semantically represented by respective ahketé ‘this amount’ is for proximal, ahketi ‘that amount’ for medial and ahketo ‘that amount’ distal. This is illustrated in [32] for proximal (PDQ):

[32]  Ahketé kepeng-qu mbale
      PDQ money.1sg.POSS house
      “I have the same amount of money like this”

Demonstrative adverbs in Nggetó-Nggeté Dialect exhibit three semantic features: (a) location for proximal téné kolan ‘here’, medial tini kolan ‘there’ and distal tónó kolan ‘there’. (b) manner for proximal nggete, medial nggeti and distal nggeto, and (c) direction for proximal ketéq “come here”, medial ketiq ‘come there’ and distal ketoq ‘go there’.

When expressing adverbs of location, people living in Dasan Lekong and Sembalun Lawang will say them differently. Some tend to use ite kolan, ito kolan and tónó kolan for distal deixes especially in Dasan Lekong [33]. Meanwhile, others in Sembalun Lawang prefer to take [34] nggeté for medial and ketéq for distal deixes in [35].
Some words found in Dasan Lekong and Sembalun Lawang are semantically identical. For instance: *nggetéq* and *nguteq* ‘do like this’ are spoken respectively in Dasan Lekong and Sembalun Lawang. Similarly, *ketéqang/ketóqang* and *kutóq ia/ketóq ia* whose meanings are ‘bring here/there’ are pronounced separately in Dasan Lekong and Sembalun Lawang. Examples [36] - [37] are provided for a comparison. Note that clause [37] is registered with *nónó* (DDD for distal demonstrative of direction).

[36]  
*Ketéqang* sandel-*q*  
PVD sandal. 1sg.POSS  
“Bring my sandal her

[37]  
*Ketóq ia meong nónó*  
DVD 3sg cat DDD  
“That cat comes there”

A demonstrative referential in *Nggetó-Nggeté Dialect* is not available. However, in order to express it, the native speakers of this dialect will say *nggetó néné* for proximal and *nggetó nónó* for distal distances as their strategies. Example [38] shows that *nggetó nónó* marked with MDA (medial demonstrative adverb) and DDD (distal demonstrative determiner) are actually describing for a demonstrative referential.

[38]  
*Ardue aqu nggetó nónó mbale*  
Have.1sg MDA DDD at home  
“I have something like that at home”

**MENO-MENÉ DIALECT**

The use of demonstrative in *Meno-Mene’ Dialect* involves in all syntactic categorizations of demonstrative. Similar to some other dialects, it allows three types of demonstratives: determiner, pronoun, and identifier. They all share the same forms but distinguishable by their positions and functions in the clause structures. For example, these *ne/tie/no* can fully function as determiners when they modify nouns or they become demonstrative pronouns when pointing to something. Additionally, they turn to identifiers if they identify something. Examples of PDD in [39], PDP in [40] and PDI [41] are respectively showing *né, no and né* for proximal distances.

[39]  
*Keluek manok né*  
Many chick PDD  
“These chicken are so many”

[40]  
*No kadu tangkong*  
DDP use shirt  
“Use this shirt”

[41]  
*Né manok de*  
PDI chicken.2sg.POSS  
“Here are your chicken”
Quantifier semantically takes three forms: proximal *semene*, medial *sementie* and distal *seno*. In this respect, *Meno-Mene* is identical with *Menu-Meni* in terms of their vocabulary and structure. Example [42] for distal is registered by *seno* (DDQ).

[42]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Semeno} & \text{geresq lek bale} \\
\text{DDQ} & \text{sand.1sg.POSS at home} \\
\text{“I have that amount of sand at home”} 
\end{array}\]

Adverbial demonstratives are syntactically divided into three types, namely: location, manner and direction. Some examples are as follows: (a) *tē* as adverbial of location, *mené* as adverbial of manner, *lite* as adverbial of direction, (b) *te* as adverbial of location, *mentie* as adverbial of location, *litó* as adverbial of direction, and (c) *litó* as adverbial of location, *meno* adverbial of manner and *litó* as adverbial of direction.

Additionally, if adverbial demonstratives of direction function as adverbs in some clause structures, *jok, té/jok, te/jok* to are applied. However, when they are used as verbs in sentences, *lité/lite/lito* are employed. In short, *lité/lite/lito* are categorized as verbal demonstratives (see Sutarman, 2014).

Each type of adverbials promotes a three-way semantic distinction. An adverbial of location (LDA) is represented by proximal *tē*, medial *te* and distal *litó*. The following example [43] is for proximal. On the other hand, an adverbial of manner (MDA) is verified by proximal *mené*, medial *mentie* dan distal *mento*. Examples [43]-[44] are for proximal marked individually with *tē* and *mené*.

[43]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Bekedek} & \text{tē kance batur-mh} \\
\text{Play} & \text{PDA with friend.2sg.POSS} \\
\text{“Go playing with your friends”} 
\end{array}\]

[44]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Mené} & \text{ntan dengan piyak kerangkeng} \\
PDA & \text{way someone make nest} \\
\text{“This is how to make nest”} 
\end{array}\]

The adverbial of direction has *lite* and *litó* for respective medial and distal in [45]-[46]:

[45]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Lemak} & \text{lité ndeh} \\
\text{Tomorrow MDA yes} \\
\text{“Please come here tomorrow”} 
\end{array}\]

[46]  
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Bekedek jok litó ndeh} \\
\text{Play DDA yes} \\
\text{“Please come here sometimes”} 
\end{array}\]

Verbal demonstratives in *Meno-Mene Dialect* occur in a three-way semantic discrepancy: (a) proximal *pelitēq/tēang ‘bring here’, pemeneq ‘make it like this’, meneang ‘make it like this’), (b) medial *peliteq/tieqang ‘bring there’, pementiaq ‘make like that’, mentiaqang ‘make like that’ and (c) distal *pelitöq/tosang ‘bring there’, pemene‘k ‘make like that’, menugang ‘make like that’. In the examples below, they are shown for proximal distances in [47]-[49]: 
Têang sepede adik-m
PVD bicycle sister.2sg.POSS
“Bring your sister’s bicycle here”

Pelitéq kursi tie
PVD chair DDD
“Bring the chair here”

Pemenèq buku-n bapakm
PVD book.LINK father.2sg.POSS
“Do like this to your father’s book”

In this respect Mêno-Mène Dialect has no demonstrative referential. To say it, the native speakers of this dialect prefer to say sak mene for proximal, sak mentie for medial and sak meno for distal.

**KUTO-KUTÉ DIALECT**

This dialect presents syntactic categories as follows: demonstrative determiner (DD), demonstrative pronoun (DP), demonstrative quantifier (DQ), demonstrative identifier (DI), demonstrative adverb (DA) and verbal demonstrative (VD). It also offers a four-way semantic distinction: proximal, mesio-proximal (MP), mesio-distal (MD) and distal. Unfortunately, no medial distinction is discovered in this dialect.

A demonstrative determiner (DD) semantically introduces a four-way distinction: ne/ne for proximal, chia/chiao for mesio-proximal, cha/chao mesio-distal and nu/nuo distal. The demonstrative determiner in this dialect employs all forms of demonstrative of Kuto-Kute Dialect. It is noted that additional o occurs in pronominal demonstrative but it is used at the end of a sentence. Consider examples [50]-[51] for mesio-proximal and distal respectively:

Luek kepeng chia-o
Much money MPPD
“That money is too much”

Tamang montor nuo
Take in motorcycle DDD
“Take that motorcycle in”

A demonstrative pronoun (DP) manipulates different structure of demonstratives when nuo occupies the position at the end of the sentence. However, when the two forms are combined into one, the first form initiates the sentence and the nuo at the end of the sentence, it becomes identification demonstrative. See [52] for demonstrative pronoun and [53] for demonstrative identifier.

Nu keang montor o
DDP use motorcycle
“Use that motorcycle”
Different from demonstrative pronoun, this quantifier shows three different semantic functions: proximal sekuté, medial sekucha and distal sekutó. It seems that sekucha is another form of expression chao and chia for medial. See examples [54]-[55] for illustration.

*Kuto-Kute Dialect* also introduces three types of demonstrative adverbs: (a) location, (b) manner and (c) determiner. Adverb of location in *Kuto-Kute Dialect* includes proximal kolan ite, mesio-proximal kolan chaci, mesio-distal kolan ito and distal kolan nu. The use of kolan can be positioned at the initial and post position. Examples [56] is for mesio-proximal and [57] for mesio-distal.

Adverb of determiner also follows a four-way distinctions: proximal jok ite, mesio-proximal jok chaci, mesio-distal jok ito and distal jok nu. Sometimes, the use of verbal demonstrative is applied in this type because of its verbal meaning. Proximal, mesio-proximal and distal are shown respectively in [58], [59] and [60].
Adverb of manner in this dialect has two way distinctions: proximal *kute* and distal *kuto*. Have a look at example [61] for proximal and [62] for distal distance.

[61]  
\begin{verbatim}
Kute ntan piyak pager  
MDA way make fence
``Make a fence like this``
\end{verbatim}

[62]  
\begin{verbatim}
Kuto nta-kolang kelambi  
MDA way.1pl put shirt
``That is how to put our shirt``
\end{verbatim}

Verbal demonstratives in *Kuto-kute Dialect* has two forms with two way distinctions; proximal *kuteang* (make like this), *keteang* (bring here) and distal *kutoang* (make like that) and *ketoang* (bring there). Usually, the proximal *kuteang* and its counterpart *kutoang* are suffixed by -e as the third singular pronoun. See examples [63]-[64] for proximal and [65] for distal:

[63]  
\begin{verbatim}
Kuteange kelambi-nde nuo  
PVD shirt-2sg.HON.POSS DDD
``Make your shirt like this``
\end{verbatim}

[64]  
\begin{verbatim}
Keteang tas-qu nuo  
PVD bag-1sg.POSS DDD
``Bring my bag here``
\end{verbatim}

[65]  
\begin{verbatim}
Ketoang boton chiao  
DVD bottle MOD
``Move the bottle there``
\end{verbatim}

Demonstrative referential in this dialect occurs in a two-way distinction: proximal *sekuteq* and distal *sekutoq* although this dialect semantically serves four-way distinctions of demonstratives. The systems of demonstratives in this dialect are inconsistent which means that not all types of demonstratives can serve the same semantic systems. Example [66] is for proximal and [67] is for distal. Note that the imperative verb *lako-* is coded by a suffix -ang for applicative marker.

[66]  
\begin{verbatim}
Jari apa sekuteq  
For what PDR
``What is that for?``
\end{verbatim}

[67]  
\begin{verbatim}
Lako-ang aku sekutoq  
Ask-APPL 1sg DDR
``Ask something like that for?``
\end{verbatim}
Conclusion

Two fundamental concepts of Halliday & Hasan (1976), Diessel (1999) and Dixon (1988) on English demonstratives have been used to analyze Sasak syntactic categories and semantic distinctions. It turned up with Sasak demonstratives whose syntactic categories are almost identical with English demonstratives, but they are completely different in their semantic distinctions. On the basis of Sasak demonstrative analyses, a new theoretical framework on the usage of demonstrative analyses across languages is recommended.
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**List of Abbreviations**

1, 2, 3pl = First, second, third person plural

1, 2, 3sg = First, second, third person singular

APPL = Applicative

DDA = Directional demonstrative adverb

DDD = Distal demonstrative determiner

DDP = Distal demonstrative pronoun

DDQ = Distal demonstrative quantifier

DDR = Distal demonstrative referential

DEM = Demonstrative

DET = Determiner

DID = Demonstrative identifier

DVD = Distal verbal demonstrative

PDI = Proximal demonstrative identifier

DVD = Distal verbal demonstratives

EMP = Emphatic

HON = Honoric

LDA = Locational demonstrative adverb

LINK = Linker

MD = Mesio-distal

MDP = Medial demonstrative pronoun

MDD = Medial demonstrative pronoun

MDA = Medial demonstrative adverb

MDQ = Medial demonstrative adverb

MDR = Medial demonstrative referential

MPD = Mesio-proximal demonstrative

MPPD = Mesio-proximal pronominal demonstrative.

MVD = Medial verbal demonstrative

NEG = Negation

PDA = Proximal demonstrative adverb

PDD = Proximal demonstrative determiner

PDP = Proximal demonstrative pronoun

PDR = Proximal demonstrative referential

POSS = Possessor

PVD = Proximal verbal demonstrative