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Abstract

In this study, I will investigate the demonstrative system in Mukri Sorani Kurdish based on a discourse-pragmatic perspective. The data for this study has been published by (Öpengin 2016) and it includes a corpus of non-conversational (natural monologue narrative) discourse data from 10 speakers. In addition, a set of conversational data plus extra monologue corpus of personal fieldwork has been analyzed for this study. The core function of demonstratives in Mukri, mainly refer to less accessible entities through the narratives but they have also used for referential use i.e. recognition by a specificity or shared knowledge. Moreover, they play an important role in text-structuring. According to Öpengin (2016: 101), Mukri has only one distance-neutral several nominal demonstrative determiners (ew..e) while MacKenzie (1961: 82, 174) considers some Kurdish dialects of Iraq (mainly central Kurdish which Mukri is a variety of Central Kurdish) have three demonstratives: 1. Near deixis. 2. Far deixis. 3. Anaphoric e.g. (awa ‘this’, awēhē ‘that over there’ and aw ‘that (absent)’). Based on my own fieldwork, I found that Mukri dialects in west part of Mukriyan and even in Mahabad, have 6 degrees of deixis for singular. The appearance of these determiners depend on a special context and discourse and also the informant. These 6 demonstratives are ewe ‘that’, eweha ‘that over there’, eme ‘this’, emeha ‘this over there’, ew ‘that absent’ and em ‘this absent’. These 6 singular degrees can also be used for plural. The results of this study also show that demonstratives in Mukri have several other functions e.g. they are often used in different contexts and narratives, especially the distal demonstratives. One of the problems in Mukri demonstrative is the ambiguity of distinguishing the demonstratives as a 3rd person and definite articles esp. -e. They can be used for exophoric deixis referring to an entity in the speech setting. In addition, the distal demonstratives can be used as an anaphoric reference. Moreover, the study shows that demonstratives indicate topic and focus shifts e.g. highlighting a certain referent for indicating focus and drawing the attention to indicate topicality and contrastive topic, tail head linkage, and they are used at episode boundaries (two different anaphoricity 1) direct anaphora and 2) reactivating the anaphor).

Key Words: Demonstrative, Information Structure, Definiteness, Mukri Sorani Kurdish, Text-Structuring

References


**Stsíkíistsí ki stsíkíistsí: The ubiquity of Blackfoot demonstratives in discourse**

Heather Bliss (University of Victoria) and Martina Wiltschko (University of British Columbia)

**Puzzle.** Blackfoot demonstratives can be used pronominally or as determiners, but their distribution is also much wider: they are ubiquitous in sentence-peripheral positions in oral stories (Bliss 2018), typically forming their own intonational unit, without a clear referent or nominal complement, and often difficult to translate. In such contexts, rhetorical lengthening (1) and repetition (2) are common.

(1) N-aadhs-yi ná-issomat-ok-a-áyi míi ná-o’tap-ssapi ot-ádk-ikamotaa.
1-grandma-OBV EVID-cover-INV-PROX-PRN DIST.DEM EVID-return-look.AI 3-FUT-give.birth.AI

“He covered my grandmother … ?? …. He returned to seeking help for her to give birth.”

(2) Anni anni anni it-á’p-ihtsoohkit-ok-wa om-isti ot-nínsskss-oaawa-yi.
NEAR.ADDR.DEM (x3) LOC-around-chase.TA-INV-PROX DEM-PL 3-song-3PL-OBV

“?? … He was chased around by their song.”

**Proposal.** We propose that Blackfoot demonstratives can function as discourse markers, serving to ground the utterance in the ongoing discourse. When they function as discourse markers, demonstratives do not contribute to the propositional content of an utterance, but rather relate the propositional content to the narrative or interactional structure of the discourse.

**Supporting evidence.** The morphological properties of Blackfoot demonstratives support their use as discourse markers. Demonstrative roots are coded for three degrees of spatial proximity, and can take up to five suffixes encoding distinctions such as number, animacy, obviation, visibility, movement, and temporality. The combinations yield an inventory of 900 unique demonstrative forms (Bliss 2013), and the choice of form is conditioned by syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic factors (Schupbach 2013). Their morphological richness allows demonstratives to encode a wide array of pragmatic functions; they can be used to reflect the complexities of the interlocutors’ spatiotemporal perspectives on the discourse.

Other types of discourse markers are strikingly rare in Blackfoot. Unlike many languages with a plethora of discourse particles, Blackfoot has very few. The dictionary lists fewer than 30 particles (Frantz & Russell 2017), and only a small subset of these are simplex. The majority are derived forms which almost exclusively involve demonstrative morphology in one of three ways:

(3) Inflected demonstratives as discourse particles

a. ánn-yi-áyi
   DEM-INAN-PRED DEM-RESTRICTED-INVISIBLE
   ‘that’s enough’

b. ann-o-hk
   ‘right now’

(4) Particle + demonstrative

a. ki-ann
   PART-DEM PART-DEM-INAN-MOVING
   ‘that’s all’

b. há-ann-yi-ya
   ‘all right’

(5) Particle with demonstrative suffixes

a. sáá-hk-áyi
   PART-INVISIBLE-PRED PART-OTHER.TIME
   ‘just kidding’

b. kí-ka
   ‘wait’

**Conclusions.** A discourse marker analysis accounts for the otherwise puzzling distribution of Blackfoot demonstratives. Their internal composition sheds light on their pragmatic contributions, and suggests a natural class of discourse markers consisting of particles and demonstratives.
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A typology of clause-combining demonstratives
Merlijn Breunesse and Holger Diessel

Analyzing cross-linguistic data from a stratified sample of 180 languages, this paper offers a typology of grammaticalized demonstratives in clause-combining functions. It distinguishes between two main types, based on the demonstratives’ different original syntactic positions and the different cognitive processes they invoke. Additionally, this study explores the way in which the distance feature of a demonstrative is preserved in its clause-combining function. Finally, it considers how the demonstrative’s connecting function interacts with its information structuring property.

The first main type of clause-combining demonstrative includes forms that originally occurred in pronominal or adverbial position and that have a pointing (or deictic) function. The demonstratives of this type refer endophorically to a preceding or following proposition (a process called “discourse deixis” by Himmelmann 1996). Two subgroups can be distinguished for this first main type. The first subgroup includes expressions such as English *therefore* (or German *deshalb*), which combine a demonstrative with a case marker or adposition to a complex clause linker (cf. Amele *eu nu* ‘for that’ = ‘because’). The second subgroup consists of a manner deictic such as English *thus* (or German *so*), which many languages use as a sentence connective in certain semantic types of adverbial clauses (cf. East Futunan *fela’aki* ‘be.like.that’ = ‘if.only’, cf. König 2015) or in quotative constructions (cf. Epenaa Pedee *maga/maa* ‘like that’; cf. Güldemann 2008).

The second main type does not involve pointing of any kind, but consists of a demonstrative that originally occurred as a determiner in a noun phrase (cf. Diessel 2018+). In clause-combining function, however, these demonstratives determine a clause (or verbal phrase), which results in a nominalized construction. The nominalization can function as a complement clause, a relative clause, or as an adverbial clause, and may include a case marker, an adposition or a definite article in addition to the demonstrative to indicate its function within the main clause (e.g. in Lakotha, Amele, Menya, Maricopa).

Additionally, the present paper considers the interaction between the clause-combining function of demonstratives and their use in space. First, it suggests that there is a tendency for medial terms, as opposed to proximal or distal terms, to develop a clause-combining function. Second, it shows that clause-combining demonstratives may map their deictic contrast onto e.g. the temporal or textual domain, marking temporally or textually close and distant events or entities (cf. Schapper and San Roque 2011). Finally, it explores the use of the relevant demonstratives as markers of information structure, arguing that they typically indicate a topical status of the referent or nominalized element (cf. De Vries 1999; François 2005).

Languages typically have at least two demonstratives, with a proximal vs. distal contrast, which are deployed as deictic elements not only within the spatio-temporal domain but also within the socio-interactional domain to express the speaker’s subjective and intersubjective stance in the course of interactive talk. In this paper, we identify a wide range of functions of proximal demonstrative (i)neh and distal demonstrative (i)toh in Kerinci Malay, and using a phrasal alternation test, we show how their functions have extended from referential uses to non-referential ones. Our findings reveal that, when used as determiners within the referential domain, both demonstratives (i)neh and (i)toh are immediately preceded by elements in their Oblique (O) form as in (1), but when grammaticalized and pragmaticalized beyond the referential domain as markers of subordinate clauses and sentence-final mood markers, both demonstratives are instead immediately preceded by elements in their Absolute (A) form, as seen in (2) and (3). Topic marking uses of (i)neh and (i)toh, as intermediate bridging forms between the referential and non-referential uses, are also preceded by elements in their Absolute form, as in (4). Unlike English, Kerinci demonstratives (i)neh and (i)toh can occur after person pronouns (e.g. diyee ‘he/she’), often not only to reinforce a definiteness reading but also to serve as a focus marker, as in (5). These pronouns lack alternating forms, hence allowing for ambiguity or duality between the definiteness and focus marking functions.

Using a contextual analysis and interactional linguistic framework, we focus on examining the pragmatic functions of both demonstratives (i)neh and (i)toh in post-pronominal position and in sentence-final position. Among the functions identified are focus marking and mood marking (e.g. approval, assertion). Data for our analysis come from 7.5 hours of free conversations among Kerinci native speakers, with topics ranging from traditional festivals, rice-planting techniques, life experiences, educational issues, government policies, among others.

(308 words)

Examples

1. kakei *ineh/toh* lah sakai
   leg.O DET:PROX/DET:DIST PFV hurt.A
   ‘This/that leg hurt.’

2. lah *suduah jago roah toh lahai ba-ladua*
   already finish.A sell.O rice.A SUB run QUA.field.A
   ‘After (I) sold rice, (I) worked on a farm.’
   ba-ladua di gunun karensao ateh
   QUA.field.A PREP mountain.O Karensao.A above
   ‘Working on a farm on Karensao Mountain up there.’
   [The speaker is talking about her work experience in the past]

3. uha *alo padua uleu kan *ineh jalua*
   people go Padang.A past PRT DEM road.A
   ‘People going to Padang in the past, you know, this (was) the route.’
This road has been recently built by the people,

‘in the year (nineteen) twenty seven.’

‘This was built by the Dutch in the past, this road.’

‘So, (people) went through the forest.’ [uttered with approval]

‘It didn’t (even) take one day.’

‘As for Limbau soap, (it) is available at the metal plating craftsman’s (shop).’

‘It’s just that with him, he didn’t get angry at all.’

‘He didn’t get bored seeing all his grandchildren.

‘That’s what our Grandpa is like.’

[The speaker refers to her father as “Grandpa”, the way her children do.]
Demonstrative pronouns in German are an important attention-orienting device in discourse. In particular, they can have two functions: i) they can be used to refer back and draw attention to less prominent referents from preceding discourse (backward function). ii) They can be used as “warning signals” [1] indicating to the hearer or reader that the current focus of attention will be shifted away from the prominent entity towards a less prominent one in the upcoming discourse, thus initiating a topic shift (forward function).

Most research so far has focused on the backward function, trying to identify the factors that contribute to a referent’s accessibility. However, little research has focused on the forward potential of German demonstrative pronouns. To our knowledge, the only study available is a text continuation task [2]. In this study, participants were asked to continue a story for which the first two sentences were given – the first one introducing two masculine characters and the second one containing an ambiguous pronoun (the masculine personal pronoun er or the masculine demonstrative pronoun der). Participants were then asked to add up to six sentences. The authors found that when the second sentence contained the demonstrative pronoun der, participants more often wrote a story about the character that can be considered less prominent in the first sentence (on the basis of grammatical function, thematic role, order of mention) than when the second sentence contained the personal pronoun er. These results therefore confirm that the demonstrative pronoun der in German is understood as an instruction to change the topic of the current discourse. Notably, German has two types of demonstrative pronouns (der vs. dieser), but there are conflicting accounts in the literature with regard to which demonstrative pronoun has the stronger topic shift potential [3] and there are no empirical studies that directly compare the two types of demonstrative pronouns.

Therefore we designed two experiments to investigate the differences between the two demonstrative pronouns in German (der vs dieser). Across experiments, we used sentence pairs with the first introducing two masculine referents and the second containing an ambiguous pronoun (dieser vs der vs er). First, we conducted an event-related potential (ERP) study to compare the online processing of the three pronouns. The ERPs showed that the demonstrative pronoun dieser elicited a biphasic effect (negativity followed by late positivity) compared to the demonstrative pronoun der (and the personal pronoun er). The negativity has been linked to the backward function – which is not the focus of this talk [see 2]. The positive deflection has previously been related to discourse updating costs [4]. The higher amplitude for dieser is thus interpreted as processing costs associated with the topic shift potential. It suggests that the demonstrative pronoun dieser carries the strongest change potential for the upcoming discourse. We hypothesize that dieser affects the upcoming discourse more strongly by changing the topic permanently (while der does not have a long-lasting influence in subsequent discourse [contra 1]). To test this prediction, we are currently carrying out a second experiment utilizing the text continuation task mentioned above. This will complement the picture by adding production data on the development of subsequent discourse.

On the basis of our current results, we conclude that German demonstrative pronouns are not only used to refer back to less prominent referents from preceding discourse but also to initiate a topic shift in the upcoming discourse. The data further indicate that the German demonstrative pronoun dieser might have a stronger topic shift potential than the demonstrative pronoun der.

Determiners in Salish languages encode a rich set of semantic concepts (cf. Gerdts 2013, Gillon 2013, Matthewson 1998). Drawing on data from Hul’q’umi’num’, the Island dialect of Halkomelem Salish (ISO code: hur), we give a synopsis of the determiner system, illustrating the key role that demonstratives play in establishing and tracking reference.

Hul’q’umi’num’ has four dozen determiners—some are very common (one per clause on average) and some extremely rare (one per 4000 lines). Determiners can be divided into articles, which must be followed by an NP, and demonstratives, which appear with or without an NP. We divide articles into two types. Deictic articles (tthu, lhu, etc.), encode gender, number, and viewpoint deixis (indicating visibility to speaker/narrator). Non-deictic articles (tu, kw’, etc.) are used for speech participants (first and second person), other fixed designation referents (personal names, place names), non-individuated referents (generics, mass nouns, partitives), and irrealis referents (abstract, hypothetical, non-existent).

Demonstratives are compositional: they are formed from articles plus additional elements. Deictic articles form discourse demonstratives (tthey’, lhey’, etc.) that point to a particular referent within a context, usually aforementioned referents or inferables, but not main characters. Non-deictic articles are combined with auxiliaries (’i ‘be here’, ni ‘be there’, etc.) to form spatial-temporal demonstratives (tu’i ‘here’, kw’uni’ ‘over there’, etc.) expressing situational deixis. No demonstrative form encodes both viewpoint and situational deixis. An even more complex type of demonstrative, pro-determiners, consists of a deictic article or either type of demonstrative and a third-person pro-form (nilh (sg.), ne’ulh (pl.), etc.). The pro-determiners are anaphoric and topic-centered—they cannot occur out-of-the-blue, they refer only to aforementioned referents, and they are used to track the main character across long stretches of discourse (Gerdts & Hukari 2004). We refer to such uses of demonstratives as referential deixis.

To illustrate and compare the different determiners, quantify them in terms of markedness, and show their uses in long stretches of discourse, we will report on data from a corpus of 660 pages/ 8000 Hul’q’umi’num’ lines. Hul’q’umi’num’ is described as having low referential density: verbs are more frequent than nouns and NPs are often omitted (Gerdts & Hukari 2008). In contrast, determiners are ubiquitous—five appear in (1), each with multiple meanings that enrich the interpretation the utterance.

(1)  kwu na’nuts’a’ ni’ tswe’ ’u  tuni’nullh, sel’ts’  ts’u  tey’ smeent
D  one.person  AUX  own  OB  DEM.PRO  surround  QUOT  DEM  mountain

ni’ shsun’iw’ s  tthuw’nilh st’e  ’u  kw’ lelum’.
AUX  OB.inside.3POS  D.PRO  be.like  OB  D  house

“The (male, out of view) one person used the (at a short distance from here, aforementioned) place, surrounded by the (visible to deictic center of narration, aforementioned) mountain, that the (male, visible to deictic center of narration, aforementioned main character) one was inside of a (de facto) house.” (WiS ts’usqun’)

By elaborating three types of deixis—viewpoint deixis, situational deixis, and referential deixis—we provide an insightful analysis of Hul’q’umi’num’ demonstratives. Our study thus contributes to a better understanding of types of deixis and reference and to the typology of determiner systems.
Psychologically distal demonstratives

Janne Bondi Johannessen
MultiLing, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, University of Oslo

According to Johannessen (2008), the Scandinavian languages Norwegian, Swedish and Danish have a set of demonstratives that is used to characterize the person they refer to as somebody unknown or even disliked. These are coined psychologically distal demonstratives (PDDs), and in Norwegian have the form of the personal pronouns han (‘he’) and hun (‘she’), as illustrated in (1).

(1) ...og så hun kvinnelige solisten og Bocelli
and then she female soloist.DEF and Bocelli

som sang duetter
who sang duets

‘... and then that female soloist and Bocelli who sang duets’ (Johannessen 2008:162)

The most important conditions for their use are listed below:

PDD CONDITION 1: THE SPEAKER DOES NOT PERSONALLY KNOW THE PERSON REFERRED TO
PDD CONDITION 2: THE ADDRESSEE DOES NOT PERSONALLY KNOW THE PERSON REFERRED TO
PDD CONDITION 3: THE SPEAKER HAS A NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TO THE PERSON REFERRED TO

Lie (2010:70, footnote 15) claims that we would get a better understanding of these demonstratives if we see them in terms of background deixis, referring to Dissel what (1999) calls “discourse new and hearer old”, and a similar understanding in SAG (1999: 2:317) for Swedish: to actualise referents that are not present in the concrete discourse, but who both speaker and hearer have in their world of concepts.

Though there may be many situations in which it will be difficult to ascertain whether the demonstrative is used as psychologically distal or picks out a referent from a common background, it should be possible. I suggest that one way is to look for discourses in which the demonstrative is used about a referent more than once in succession. If the function of the demonstrative were to actualise a referent from a common background, doing it once would be enough. Assuming the addressee to be of normal intelligence and listening somewhat attentively, repeating the referent-picking would be unnecessary and almost rude. A PDD does not have this restriction, and can be used several times, for example for politeness.

I will use speech corpora containing conversations (The Nordic Dialect Corpus and the NoTa Oslo Corpus) and show that the demonstrative is indeed repeated in the discourse, which supports the hypothesis that the demonstrative is a psychologically distal demonstrative.
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Demonstrative pronouns with non-referential antecedents: Bound variables and referential form

Elsi Kaiser emkaiser@usc.edu University of Southern California

According to many theories of reference resolution, referring expression form is connected to referent accessibility: The most reduced referring expressions (e.g. pronouns in English) refer to highly accessible referents; more marked expressions (e.g. demonstratives) refer to less accessible referents (e.g. Ariel’90, Gundel et al’93). However, pronouns can also be used non-referentially: In semantics, a distinction is made between (co)referential uses of pronouns (a pronoun refers to a specific entity in the discourse storage) and non-referential, bound variable uses of pronouns (a pronoun is a variable bound by a λ-operator, e.g. Reinhart’82, Heim’93). Crucially, it has been claimed that only the most reduced, most default pronominal forms can be bound variables (Montalbetti’84, Alonso-Ovalle/D’Intorno’00, Witschko’98). However, I use data from Finnish, German, Dutch and French to argue that, contrary to these claims, more marked forms – specifically, demonstrative pronouns – can also receive non-referential, bound variable interpretations.

Consider ex(1). It is widely accepted that because the subject is a quantified NP (every boy) and the fathers covary with the boys, there is no specific referent in the discourse storage for a pronoun to point to, and only non-referential, bound-variable (BV) interpretations are possible. (1) is ambiguous between two BV interpretations: Every boy said that he needs a new tie (1a), and every boy told his father that the father needs a new tie (1b). If he is bound by the higher λ-operator, we get reading (1a). If the binder is the lower λ-operator, we get reading (1b).

(1) Every boy told his father that he needs a new tie. (assume the covarying reading: each boy talks to his own father)

(1a) Every boy (Ax (x told x’s father that x needs a new tie)). = boy needs a new tie (higher λ-operator binds)

(1b) Every boy (Ay (x told [x’s father], that (Ay (y needs a new tie))). = father needs a new tie (local λ-operator binds)

Crucially, Finnish, German, Dutch and French can use a more marked anaphoric form to encode the second bound-variable interpretation in (1b), as shown in (2-5). In the first three languages, it is a demonstrative anaphor that accomplishes this, and in French ce dernier ‘the latter’ or the demonstrative celui-ci can be used. Let’s look more closely.

In Finnish, the basic pronoun is bain ‘he/she’, but the proximal demonstrative tämä ‘this’ can also refer to humans. The most natural way of expressing reading (1a) is with bain. Use of demonstrative tämä generates reading (1b). Thus, the same demonstrative used for physical and discourse deixis is used in non-referential bound-variable contexts where there is no clear deixis. This shows that a proximal demonstrative can retrieve its antecedent through non-deictic, non-referential means. Further support comes from German and Dutch. In addition to the personal pronouns er/sie ‘he/she’ [G] and hij/zij ‘he/she’ [D], the proximal demonstrative dieser(r) ‘this’ [G] and the distal demonstrative die ‘that’ [D] can also be used for humans. Use of these demonstratives (ex.3-4) generates reading (1b). (Hinterwimmer ’12 investigated BV uses of German d-pronouns der/die/das, but as Patel-Grosz/Grosz’17 point out, it not clear whether these are demonstratives.) The finding that bound variable readings are possible with both proximal and distal demonstratives shows that both can retrieve their antecedents through a non-deictic mechanism. In French, reading (1b) is expressed naturally with ce dernier (the latter); the hybrid demonstrative celui-ci is also possible. Moreover, in all four languages, personal pronouns are biased towards (1a) but often also permit (1b), whereas demonstratives generate (1b).

I argue that the choice of whether a personal pronoun or a demonstrative pronoun is used for the surface realization of a bound variable depends on the nature of the relationship between the binder and the bound variable. For most cases of variable binding, the default pronominal form is sufficient, but in the presence of more than one BV construal, and when the intended meaning involves the more embedded binder (his father in 1), a marked form (demonstrative) can be used.

To understand the discourse functions of demonstrative pronouns, we need to consider both referential uses and bound variable uses. Acknowledging bound variable uses of demonstratives requires us to rethink models of reference resolution: Work on reference resolution widely assumes that use of different forms is triggered by referents’ discourse-accessibility, but extending this notion to bound variables is problematic (but see Hara’02): It is unclear how to attribute different levels of discourse-accessibility to non-referential, quantified antecedents. Although demonstratives are known to be sensitive to discourse-salience in referential usage, I suggest that to explain use of personal pronouns vs. demonstratives in non-referential, bound-variable usage, we need to consider the structural properties of the binding configuration.
From recognitional function to topicalization and pragmatic backgrounding: discourse functions of demonstratives in Mano, Southern Mande

This paper focuses on discourse functions of demonstratives in Máá (Mano), a Southern Mande language spoken in Guinea and Liberia by approximately 400,000 speakers. The paper is based on fieldwork data from a variety of spoken genres, including traditional narratives, conversations, traditional and Christian ritual speech, as well as on elicited examples suggested by native speakers.

Mano has five demonstratives: tɔ́ɔ̄, dḭ̀ā̰̀, wɛ̄ ~ ɓɛ̄, yā ~ ā ~ yāā (there are also variants assimilated by place of articulation and by nasality to the previous vowel: à̰, ɔ̄, ɛ̄, ɔ̰̄̀, ɛ̰̄̀) and kílīā ~ kílīɓɛ̄. Tɔ́ɔ̄ and dḭ̀ā̰̀ are a proximal and a distal demonstratives, respectively, used to refer to objects visible to both interlocutors, kílīā ~ kílīɓɛ̄ are used as anaphoric markers. Wɛ̄ and yā will be the main focus of this paper.

Although in discussions speakers interpret wɛ̄ as more proximal than yā (and translate by French terms celui-ci ‘this’ and celui-là ‘that’, respectively), the two markers are largely interchangeable in discourse. When used adnominally, wɛ̄ and yā cover all the demonstrative functions suggested by Himmelmann (1996): they are used both in exophoric and endophoric functions, including discourse-referential, anaphoric, recognitional, but also cataphoric functions. Ex. 1 illustrates an exophoric usage.

1 yíí yā?
water DEM
‘(Speaker A: Go fetch some water!) Speaker B: That water? (pointing across the wall to the room where the mineral water is stored)’

As opposed to tɔ́ɔ̄ and dḭ̀ā̰̀, yā and wɛ̄ are typically used to attract attention to referents which are at least to some extent familiar and cognitively available (Hanks 2011). Thus, one of the central functions of the demonstratives wɛ̄ and yā in discourse is the recognitional function. In the following example taken from a conversation between two best friends, the first mention of a referent was ŋ̄ nàáyīà yā ‘the one who keeps bugging me, lit.: this bugger of mine’. As it became clear later on in the conversation, the referent is perfectly available to both interlocutors.

2 ŋ̄ nàáyīà a,..., àà ŋ̄ súò kɛ.
1SG bugger DEM 3sg.JNT 1SG call do:JNT
That guy that bothers me,... he called me’

Wɛ̄ and yā can also function as sentence-final markers. In particular, when used as markers of relative clauses, their function can be assimilated to that of an adnominal marker, because relative clauses in Mano as in some other Mande languages occupy a position structurally identical to that of a NP topic (Creissels 2009, Nikitina 2012). However, since these demonstratives can be used with other types of dependent clauses unrelated to NP topicalization, like conditional clauses, it should be concluded that in these positions they grammaticalized into clause-topicalizers. Although both markers can be used in that context, is seems that yā is much more frequently used.

3 é pā-ú lēē nėfù dó kɔ mɔ wā mɛ.
2PL.CONJ>3SG touch:COND-COND woman go:IPFV INDEF hand PP TOP 3PL.PRET>3SG beat
‘If he touches a woman (they beat him)’

A further step of grammaticalization of the marker wɛ̄ is that can be used as a sentence-final marker accompanying non-subordinate clauses, especially imperatives. Note that here again there is an effect of pragmatic backgrounding, as the marker is typically used in repeated or expected requests (ex. 4).
4 nū wē
   come DEM.PROX

‘(A hostess informed her guest that she had put water on fire for her guest to take shower with. Now that the water for the shower is ready, she invites her guest to take a bath): Now you can come!’

Finally, the marker/variant wē can also be used with the presentative copula gɛ̀ derived from an imperative form of the verb gɛ̀ ‘to see’. Here the referent is to a certain degree cognitively accessible already and its existence is presupposed (ex. 5). In that position, wē is in contrast with the marker ẉ which is also used with the presentational copula (ex. 6). The difference is that with ẉ, either the existence of the referent is not presupposed but asserted in the predication, or its appearance comes as a surprise, as in 6.

5 sùwà wē gɛ̀ wē
   work DEM COP.DEICT DEM

‘(A contractual worker engaged in clearing a field is showing the result of his work to the master). Here is the work (we agreed upon).’

6 á gɛ̀ wē!
   3SG COP.DEICT EXI

‘Here he is (finally)!’
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TAM marking in demonstrative systems
Don Killian
University of Helsinki

TAM marking is considered a prototypical category of the verbal domain; however, a number of languages are able to mark tense, aspect, or mood on demonstratives. While nominal tense has received a very small amount of discussion in the literature (see e.g. Krasnoukhova 2014), aspect and mood are almost completely absent. Although all three categories are relatively rare on demonstratives, they do occur in a wide variety of languages across the world.

In Wichi for instance, there is a five-way tense distinction on demonstratives which indicates local temporal reference (Nercesian 2011).

(1). Wichi (Matacoan; Nercesian 2011:249)

```
hal'o-y = mathi   iyej      n'-w'et
```

tree-PL = DEM.PST.DIST 3SBJ:be_next_to 1POSS-house

‘The tree (branches) from the other day are next to my house.’

In Barupu, there is a single demonstrative used specifically for irrealis functions, such as hypothetical referents, interrogatives, or negatives (Corris 2005). In example (2), the place is first established as a place that no living person has ever seen, followed by a spatial demonstrative.

(2) Barupu (Sko, Papua New Guinea; Corris 2005: 157)

```
K-a-ore-ki <r> é
REAL-3SG.M-search- <AGR> away
```

‘He looked all around

```
bo bió biá víří k-e-no <p> i=éro bo bére
place man person die.PL.S REAL-3PL.M- <3PL.M> go = DEM.IRREAL place DIST.DEIC
```

the place where dead people go, that place.’[DC-CA:03]

This talk investigates some preliminary characteristics of TAM marking in demonstrative systems from a cross-linguistic perspective, in particular highlighting the connection between cognitive accessibility and TAM.


Beyond exophoric and endophoric uses: Additional discourse functions of demonstratives

Ekkehard Koenig (Freie Universität Berlin & Universität Freiburg)

It is generally acknowledged that in addition to their exophoric (deictic, gestural) use, demonstratives typically also have endophoric uses, which can be regarded as a first step in their further grammaticalization. Based on the thematic specifications of the workshop and on a variety of previous studies (Koenig, 2015; Koenig, 2017; Koenig & Nishina, 2015), the present paper aims to identify and analyze additional discourse functions of demonstratives, so far neglected in cross-linguistic studies, (i) on the basis of data from European languages, as representatives of languages with few deictic differentiations, and (ii) data from Japanese and Armenian, as representatives of languages with a rich system of relevant differentiations. Moreover, a-typical demonstratives denoting the ontological dimensions of MANNER, QUALITY and DEGREE will receive specific attention. Three major types of discourse uses will be distinguished, which cannot simply be subsumed under the exophoric or endophoric use types: (i) adverbs expressing rhetorical relations. (b) idiomatic combinations and (c) motivated specializations. The first group can best be exemplified by the adverbial use of Engl. so, by French ainsi and related expressions in other European languages. The following examples illustrates the ability of English so (< OE swa), to express a variety of rhetorical relations:

(1)a. I did not like it. So I wrote to him. (causal)
   b. The whole thing was tied up in knots, so that we were not able to undo it. (resultative)
   c. He went into lower gear, so (that) his car would slow down. (purposive)
   d. He is very sick. Even so he goes to work. (concessive)
   e. So you are a linguist, eh? So what? (inferential)

(b) Idiomatic combinations of demonstratives (now then, so there, here goes, that’s that, here we go again, there he was, there and then, here is to you, this and that, so what, etc.) could at first sight be analyzed as expressing specific illocutions, but such an analysis would not do justice to their functions of introducing or closing an interaction and thus of structuring a discourse.

(2)a. Now then (attention getter or topic change)
   b. So there (closing an argument by maintaining a decision or view)

(c) The subgroup of ‘motivated specializations’ addresses the question raised in the conference program of “how the structure of a demonstrative paradigm interacts with discourse functions”. In languages with three-term deictic distinctions like Japanese, for example, it is the hearer proximal manner demonstrative soo, which is used as a propositional anaphor, whereas the speaker-proximal anaphor koo is used as a quotative marker.
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Maintenance of joint attention and expression of stance and perspective: discourse functions of Abui demonstratives

František Kratochvíl, Palacký University Olomouc

This paper provides a synthesis of the functions of the Abui demonstrative paradigms in maintenance of joint attention, information flow, and encoding of stance and perspective. Abui (Papuan, Eastern Indonesia) possesses a rich inventory of demonstrative roots (adnominal, adverbial, and equative/similative) organized in a three-way system multiplied by a systematic viewpoint alternation for adnominal and adverbial paradigm. The basic system was described in (Kratochvíl 2007). Discourse structuring role of the adnominal paradigm was discussed in (Kratochvíl 2011a). Kratochvíl and Delpada (2015) documented the role of adnominal demonstratives in encoding the cognitive status of referents (familiar, activated, identifiable). The grammaticalisation of adverbial demonstratives is described in (Kratochvíl 2011b). A case is presented for the single system analysis where the system and interpretation of the distance scale arises from the scope of the demonstrative (i.e. its syntactic position within the sentence).

Finally, Abui possesses a three-member set of equative and similative demonstrative roots (n-, w-, h-), which operate along the principles as the other demonstrative, but refer to properties associated with referents (kind) and events (manner, degree). The three-way scale attends to the knowledge imbalance among interlocutors (shared, asymmetrical, no shared knowledge).

Evans et al (2017a, b) used some of the above observations in support of their proposal of engagement, a grammatical system, which encodes ‘the relative accessibility or state of affairs to the speaker and addressee’. Kratochvíl (2017) discusses the grammaticalisation of engagement marking in Abui, and concludes that the single gram behavior suggests an alternative grammaticalisation for demonstratives, which preserve the viewpoint alternation and the distance scale.

The paper draws on a rich corpus of naturalistic and elicited data, with particular attention to negotiations and interviews, where the joint attention-coordinating role of Abui demonstrative is most apparent. We will focus the conditions under which viewpoint alternations occur and discuss several interesting parallels with other languages. We will show that the main function of the viewpoint alternation is to attend to the information disparity between the speaker and hearer, whether real or constructed.
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Managing conversation: the manner demonstrative *gitu* in spoken Indonesian
Simon Musgrave, Gede Primaari Wijaya Rajeg, Howard Manns (Monash University)

Indonesian has a pair of manner demonstratives: *begini* ‘like this’ and *begitu* ‘like that’, which derive from demonstratives *ini* ‘this’ and *itu* ‘that’. In informal usage, especially in speech, these manner demonstratives are commonly reduced to the forms *gini* and *gitu*. We first examine the occurrence of these forms in corpora of written and spoken Indonesian. All of them are more common in speech, but in the case of *gitu* the difference is massive; it is the sixth most common item in the corpus of spoken Jakarta Indonesian collected by the MPI Jakarta Field Station.\(^1\) We then argue that *gitu* is used so extensively in conversation because it has been transformed into a discourse marker central to the management of turn-taking and sequentiality. We suggest that *gitu* has at least three functions in structuring the discourse and moving the conversation forward: (1) It can indicate the end of a turn, reported speech and/or a topic (example 1); (2) it can function as a response token, indicating listener engagement, requesting clarification or the uptake of clarification (example 2); and, (3) less commonly, it can be used at the start of a turn to indicate that preceding discourse is the point of departure for the new speaker.

(1) MPI Corpus: BTJ-010607
   BTJTIS tapiq dia diarak keliling itu sesuda duaq hariq, tigaq hariq sunat, *gituq*.  
   ‘but (s)he goes around there two days, three days after circumcision, *like that*.’
   EXPERN oh jadiq sunat duluq, baruq nantiq itu bikin pèstaq.  
   ‘oh so circumcision first, then soon after you have a party.’

(2) MPI Corpus: BTJ-240607
   BTJFEB duaq rébuq sebulan?  
   ‘two thousand a month?’
   BTJFEB enggaq, satuq kambing dijualnya duaq rébuq.  
   ‘no, one goat is sold for two thousand’
   BTJFEB *oh gituq*.  
   ‘oh like that’

The first function is the most common: almost two thirds of the tokens of *gitu* in the spoken corpus occur at the end of an intonation unit, nearly half of all the tokens occur before a change of speaker. This data suggests that *gitu* is central to the trajectory of Indonesian conversation. In the short examples above, it is clear that *gitu* can refer to previous discourse, but our analysis will demonstrate that the range of possibilities for addressee uptake of this manner demonstrative-cum-discourse marker show that it is also important in structuring following interaction.

\(^1\) [https://corpus1.mpi.nl/ds/asv/;jsessionid=60CF71CF0C4914E2537691B6151CFFA0?0](https://corpus1.mpi.nl/ds/asv/;jsessionid=60CF71CF0C4914E2537691B6151CFFA0?0)
Demonstratives with fixed reference in narrative texts in Wan

Tatiana Nikitina (CNRS-LLACAN)

Across languages demonstratives help speakers keep track of a story’s multiple characters. Their use in narrative texts is commonly determined by discourse factors such as topicality, accessibility, activation state, discourse prominence, and distance to previous mention (Himmelmann 1996: 226-229; Diessel 1999: 95-105). This study presents evidence for a different kind of use of demonstratives, which has not received much attention in typological literature.

In Wan (Mande; Cote d’Ivoire), two types of anaphor are used to refer to previously introduced participants: 3rd person pronouns, and demonstratives. The use of demonstratives is typologically unusual in that their reference remains fixed throughout long stretches of discourse, in a way independent of any contextual factors. The alternating use of demonstratives and 3rd person pronouns is illustrated in (1): the storyteller consistently refers to one character (a male hornbill) by 3rd person pronouns, and to another character (the hornbill’s mother-in-law) by demonstratives. The reference remains fixed throughout the episode, and does not depend on such factors as the distance to the character’s prior mention, topicality or the pronoun’s grammatical function. In this particular excerpt, the contrast between demonstratives and third person pronouns is the only clue – in the absence of gender-sensitive pronouns – for distinguishing between the two characters (Nikitina forthc.).

(1) ké [bɛ̃ yrë̃ kɛ̀ ɛ̃ kɛ̀ mɔ̀ mɔ̃], bɛ̀ gà̀ ɛ̀
DEICT.SHIFT that work this DEF gave to PRT that go CVN
dỗ mɔ̀, ké ɛ̀ ɲ bɔ̀ ɲɛ̀!
one PRT DEICT.SHIFT 3SG PERF finish IDPH

‘And sheDEM gave him that work, then when sheDEM once went [to the field] – heSg had already finished, preng!’

ké ɛ̀ bɛ̀ ɛŋ mɔ̃ yā̃ gɛ̃, parce-que bɛ̀
DEICT.SHIFT 3SG that voice heard here PRT because that
á zɔ̃ lé cɔŋ̃, sâ gɛ̃, bɛ̀ bɛ̀ é̃ dîŋŋ̃
COP come PROG far.away there PRT then that REFL stopped
wāŋ̃ ʔjɛ̃ dɔ̃ ʔjɛ̃, there greetings! CNJ greetings!

‘[for] heSg had heard herDEM voice there, since sheDEM comes from far away there, then sheDEM stops down there: greetings-oh-greetings!’

bɛ̀ ñ̃ lẫ ɛ̃ kâŋ̃ mʊ̀ ɛ̃ yrɔ̀ blɛyã̀, bɛ̀ ɡ̀
then 3SG PRT REFL hair PL DEF called quickly then 3PL
zɔ̀ klầ à mì
PROSP put 3SG at

‘then heSg quickly calls his hair, in order for them to place themselves [back] on himmse’

The analysis of narrative data reveals that the choice of an anaphoric element depends on the antecedent’s narrative role: the story’s protagonist is consistently referred to by 3rd person pronouns, while secondary participants are referred to by demonstratives (see also Perekhvalskaya 2016). The demonstrative’s reference only changes between episodes, and only when secondary participants change. The only exception to this rule is presented by clause-internal uses where the demonstrative refers back to another constituent within the same clause.

The fact that long-distance uses of demonstratives are assigned fixed values in a way that is independent of the antecedent’s prior mention has profound implications for syntactic theory. It suggests that pronominal binding need not take into account the participant’s discourse status or the
antecedent’s grammatical or informational properties. It may depend instead on distinctions that are grounded in the little-explored level of narrative structure, such as the distinction between main and secondary characters.
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Demonstratives in Pilagá discourse: Pragmatic uses and grammaticalization

Doris L. Payne
University of Oregon & SIL Intl
dlpayne@uoregon.edu

Alejandra Vidal
Universidad Formosa & CONICET
vidal.alejandra@conicet.gov.ar

Guaykuruan languages of the South American Chaco have rich sets of demonstrative words. Past studies address their morphology and syntactic distribution (Vidal 2001, Carpio 2012, González 2015, Messineo, et al. 2016). This paper begins to address their discourse profiles by examining the Pilagá demonstrative root (=)mʔe, which has a distinctive discourse use compared to other demonstrative roots, and has grammaticalized as a relativizer.

In a corpus of over 30,000 words (over 70 texts plus elicited data, gathered in the field), (=)mʔe is the second-most frequent demonstrative root, found in 22% of demonstrative tokens. It forms a paradigm with (=)hoʔ ‘proximate visible’, =tfʔaʔa ‘distal visible’, and =maʔa which some speakers say means the same as (=)mʔe. Words with these roots have the structure (GENDER)-(CLASSIFIER=) DEMONSTRATIVE.ROOT, as in (1). Synchronically, (=)mʔe arguably does not have a spatially contrastive meaning within the paradigm of (=)hoʔ ‘proximate’ and =tfʔaʔa ‘distal’. Some elicited examples suggest it may mark ‘medial distance’; but it is best viewed as ‘distance neutral’ (Himmelmann 1996: 211) since it can occur with a deictic CLASSIFIER to mark a referent as ‘proximal/in the visual field’ (1a), ‘distal/(going) out of the visual field’ (1b), ‘never seen’, or with a non-deictic CLASSIFIER to show a ‘horizontal, vertical’, or ‘bunched up’ referent.

(1) a. ha-na=mʔe  owaʔae
   FEM-CLF:PROX=DEM  peccary
   ‘these/this (female) peccary/peccaries’

   b. so=mʔe  wayaʔa
     CLF:DISTAL=DEM  fox
     ‘that fox’

Despite shared structure, demonstrative words vary in distribution depending on the root. Demonstratives with the (=)hoʔ ‘proximal’ and =tfʔaʔa ‘distal’ roots function as pronouns and adnominal determiners, but a demonstrative with (=)mʔe can function as a pronoun, adnominal determiner, or as a subordinating relativizer. (=)mʔe demonstratives can be used cataphorically, but in discourse they usually mark anaphoric known participants – unless (=)mʔe combines with the ‘absent/out of visual field’ or ‘never seen’ classifier, enabling the demonstrative word to indicate a non-referential or non-specific item. As a relativizer, (=)mʔe cannot occur with gender or classifier morphemes, as seen in (2).

(2) naegaʔ  waʔa-ege  ngəʔ  gaʔ=nadik  mʔe  yi-lotʔa  gaʔ=Joel
   INT  be-LOC:FORWARD  when  CLF:ABSENT=road  REL  A3-see-OBJ.SG  CLF:ABSENT=Joel
   ‘Where is the road that goes directly to (lit. sees) (the house of) Joel?’ (Sentences 03: 1.8)

If (=)mʔe historically was a mid-distance root, its modern discourse distribution suggests it broadened semantically and become associated largely with anaphoricity. From this usage, it then became the unmarked means to refer to a participant in an adjoined clause which modified a just-mentioned referent, e.g. for (2) the structure would have been ‘Where is the road, the.o.n.e (i.e. ‘road’) sees Joel?’ The relativizer function developed by embedding the modifying clause. Contra Himmelmann (1996), it is not the distal member of the demonstrative paradigm which has extended its meaning to become grammaticalized in this way.


Discourse functions of demonstrative adverbs in Estonian, Finnish and Russian in spatial reference setting
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Numerous studies in discourse reference have shown that there is a connection between the demonstrative pronoun use and the accessibility/information status of the referent in different languages (e.g. Ariel 2001; Khalfaoui 2007; Gundel et al. 2010). The great number of such studies shows that the focus in demonstrative research has been mainly on demonstrative pronouns. However, demonstrative adverbs have an important role in languages with one-term demonstrative pronoun systems, such as French, in conveying distance contrast (Diessel 2013). This suggests that demonstrative adverbs could fulfil similar functions as demonstrative pronouns in discourse reference, like they do in spatial reference. Nevertheless, there are only a few studies which focus on demonstrative adverbs (Laury 1996; Reile 2015).

The aim of this study is to explore referential functions of demonstrative adverbs in languages with different demonstrative pronoun systems. We compare two kindred languages, Estonian (one- and two-term system) and Finnish (three-term system), with Russian (two-term system) – a contact language to both. We test whether there is a difference in the functions that demonstrative adverbs fulfil and whether there could be an influence of the elaborateness of demonstrative pronoun systems on the use and function of demonstrative adverbs in discourse reference.

The data of the study comes from a production experiment, originally conducted to elicit different referential devices (including demonstratives) in a spatial context. In the experiment, participants were asked in a semi-interactional setting to describe and compare two pre-defined houses that they saw from a window. The houses were referred to sequentially in an uninterrupted manner. This enabled us to gather data on discourse and spatial reference at the same time. We analysed 33 Estonian, 28 Finnish and 25 Russian native speakers’ use of demonstratives.

Preliminary results show that when referring to object that can be conceptualised as location, such as a house, demonstrative adverbs serve also the function to indicate the information status of that particular referent. However, there is a difference in how these languages use demonstrative adverbs to convey the information status. In Finnish and Estonian data, demonstrative adverbs are used also as determiners, but in Russian data, demonstrative adverbs are never used in this function. Therefore, there seem to be differences in how languages convey the information status with demonstrative adverbs and this, in turn, could be associated with the demonstrative pronoun system that they use.
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Morphosyntactic and functional asymmetries in Vatlongos demonstratives

Eleanor Ridge; SOAS, University of London

Demonstratives in Vatlongos (Oceanic, Vanuatu) exhibit a two-way distinction between the proximal ak and distal -e, and both have functions that extend beyond physical distance. The proximal ak is more frequent (~1 every 60 words) and the unmarked choice when a demonstrative is used. The distal -e is less frequent (~1 every 180 words) and is usually only used with the primary meaning of situational distance in contrastive contexts.

This asymmetry is reflected in morphosyntactic status of each demonstrative. ak is an independent phonological word that usually occurs at the end of noun phrase (though it is occasionally followed by a relative clause or mun ‘also’), so can follow a noun, adjective, quantifier, possessive classifier or any word class that happens to occur at the end of a relative clause. -e is a suffix that can only attach to pronouns or quantifiers derived from pronouns. To be used in noun phrases that do not contain a quantifier or a pronoun, it is usually attached to the third person singular pronoun xi (1, 2).

In their endophoric uses, the distinction between these demonstratives has taken on different extensions of the deictic contrast. The use of -e forms in discourse usually conveys an affective distance: for example it often modifies the enemy of the heroes in a narrative, such as the dwarf whose breadfruits the rat is stealing in 1). ak remains the unmarked form, but the decision to use ak rather than a bare noun phrase conveys familiarity, both for the speaker and listener, and stylistically encourages a listener to feel familiarity with a referent.

1) meletin xa vetei san xi-e
   person REL breadfruit his 3SG-DIST
   ‘the person whose breadfruit it was’

The forms xi-e ‘3SG-DIST’ and xi-ak ‘3SG-PROX’, and to a lesser extent ak ‘PROX’, also seem to have lexicalised as adverbs of time and place. While temporal distance is an expected extension of deictic distance in this semantic area, the affective distance component still seems to be important in the use of these forms. Thus, dangerous occasions in the past or in narratives are marked with xi-e 2), which is also often used for forbidden or otherwise negative places.

2) mu-lul vatang xi-e
   3SG.NFUT-shake a_lot 3SG-DIST
   ‘It [the earthquake] shook a lot then.’

There are also two verb forms derived from these demonstratives: mak and mue. Proximal mak can either be used as a main verb meaning ‘be like this’ or, more usually, to modify the manner of another predicate. It is often used deictically when speakers are demonstrating a procedure (3). It is also used endophorically to reference a manner explicitly stated earlier in the discourse. Otherwise it conveys familiarity: when serialised to another verb it suggests that the action was performed in the commonly expected manner. Distal mue on the other hand has a very restricted function as a fully inflected hesitation marker when searching for a verbal lexeme (4). This is an extreme instance of lack of familiarity on the part of both the speaker and addressee.

3) o-pol-ni mak
   2SG.NFUT-do-TR 3SG.NFUT.like_this
   ‘You do it like this.’

4) di la-mue neta
   CONT 3PL.NFUT-like_that what
   ‘They were um…’
Information-packaging effects of attention focus in Vera’a narrative discourse

Stefan Schnell
Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language & University of Melbourne

The use of three demonstrative forms is investigated in narrative discourse from the Oceanic language Vera’a (North Vanuatu). Vera’a possesses a person-based system that is essentially interactional rather than strictly speaking localising in exophoric use, similar to what Enfield (2003) observes in the use of demonstratives in Lao. Vera’a demonstratives function to engage the addressee in joint attention to referents of different awareness states (Diessel 2006): speaker-oriented forms establish a new attention focus; addressee-oriented forms maintain an established attention focus; outsider-oriented forms delay or background attention (Schnell f/c). Evidence for this comes from video data where for instance addressee-oriented forms are regularly used with referents in the here-space of the speaker, or speaker-oriented forms with referents in great distance from both participants’ here-spaces.

In narrative discourse, Vera’a demonstratives do not have topic- or focus-marking functions, or any discourse-structuring functions, as such: for instance one and the same form is attested in NPs with referents in topic or focus relation. Conversely, different forms are used in complex sentence constructions where they mark a proposition as presupposed to the assertion at hand. These patterns of use are analysed here in the context of newer work in information structure that emphasises the fundamental distinction between the generalised function of distinct structural devices and their specific effects in particular contexts of usage (Matić & Wedgwood 2013; Ozerov 2014, 2015), so that the same attention-focus functions of demonstratives in exophoric use play out in endophoric uses in such a way that they produce the mentioned information-packaging effects. Drawing on an extensive text corpus stemming from first-hand documentary fieldwork, specific types of effect are shown to be brought about by the structural position of demonstratives as well as their co-occurrence with other elements, like emphatic markers or personal pronouns.
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Manner deictics as quotative indexes in Finno-Ugric
Denys Teptiuk (University of Tartu)

Abstract
In colloquial Finnish and Estonian, manner deictics (Fin. sillee(n) ‘so, like that’, Est. nii et ‘so, thus’) are used as quotative indexes, introducing reported discourse. In Hungarian and Permic (Komi and Udmurt), adverbial deictics (Hung. így ‘thus, like this’, úgy ‘thus, like that’; Ko. tadj(i) ‘so, like this’; Udm. taźy ‘thus, like this’, oźy ‘thus, like that’) collocate with speech and mental verbs to mark stretches of reported discourse:

**Hungarian**

(1) így szólt: “Ember, bűneid bocsánatot nyertek.”
    thus say.PST.3SG man sin.PL.2SG forgiveness.ACC win.PST.3PL
    ‘He said so: “Human, your sins were forgiven”’ (emmausz.blog.hu).

(2) ...úgy gondoltam, hogy most minden meg fog változni.
    thus think.PST.1SG COMP now everything PRE FUT.AUX.PRS.3SG change.INF
    ‘… I thought so that now everything will change’ (MNSz).

Previous studies and my primary results show that the functions of deictics in these quotative constructions are associated with a cataphoric use that “relate(s) to stretches of following discourse” (König & Umbach, forthcoming: 8; see also Güldemann 2008, König 2013). However, it is not yet clear, why Hungarian, cf. (1)–(2), and Udmurt relatively equally use in similar types of constructions different deictics (Hung. így vs. úgy, Udm. taźy vs. oźy) and what functions motivate the choice of one deictic over another in the quotative constructions of these languages. My primary hypothesis suggests that the use of deictics in the quotative domain besides the referential cataphoric use can also be associated with attitudes towards a proposition, i.e., reported discourse. Hence, by choosing the proximal pair of deictics, a reporter shows a stronger commitment towards the accuracy of reported discourse, while more distal might be associated with lesser commitment and approximateness of a quotation. As a result, the appearance of manner deictics in different types of quotative constructions is also of interest here.

To test the hypothesis and answer the research questions, a qualitative analysis investigating the use of manner deictics in the quotative domain of five languages representing three Finno-Ugric areas (Finnic, Permic and Hungarian) is carried out. Data deriving from new media texts are used as a basic material. The choice of material is motivated by the consideration that the language used on the internet is the closest written variant of the actually spoken language, combining both standard and colloquial speech inside one text (Pischlöger 2014b: 144).

**Keywords:** manner deictics, quotative indexes, new quotatives, Finnic, Permic, Hungarian


Instrumental and the Development of Manner Demonstratives in the History of English

Vanja Vasiljevic, Northumbria University

The source of grammaticalized demonstrative forms are anaphoric and discourse deictic uses and the most likely demonstratives in a system to grammaticalize are distance demonstratives (Diessel 1999). Here, the analysis of *thus* proposes that grammaticalization also depends on the original case meaning and form, which is instrumental of *ðis*. Since manner is assimilated in the instrumental (Schlesinger 1979) it is hypothesized that *ðys* influenced the increased use of *ðis* in the manner deixis category in Middle and Early Modern English. Conversely, the instrumental forms of *ðat ðy, þe, þon* are not expected to develop into a manner demonstrative since in form they resemble the definite article.

The data from diachronic corpora indicate that *ðys* in Old English has been used as a determiner in instrumental form as in 1). After instrumental merged with dative, *ðys* as well as *ðis* have been used more frequently as manner adverbs from the 13th century e.g. *in þys wyse*, *in this manner* as in 2). In 3) *thus* alone is used as a manner adverb. The adverb turned into sentence connective because manner is associated with cause or reason (Heine, Claudi, and Hünnemeyer 1991). Unlike *ðis*, *ðat* does not have manner forms until the 15th century e.g. *in that manner*. Instrumental *with that* is used in an ambiguous sense, either temporal or discourse deictic in the 16th and 17th century as in 4) but it does not further grammaticalize as *thus*, because that is not its original instrumental form.

1) Sægede he þys gemete ðætte he geseah,  
   Said he this manner that he saw
2) on þis wise werpeð þe unbileffulle man his agen gilt uppe þe giltyse  
   in this manner cast the impious man his sight guilty onto the guiltless
3) Hyt befell thus, þat this Dioclician spousede a gentyl damysele  
   It happened so that this Dioclician married a gentle lady
4) and God send to vs better lucke, and to you your hearts desire, and with that they departed

This study shows that grammaticalization is influenced by the case form and meaning of a demonstrative, and how *ðis* and *ðat* have been used in the manner category diachronically. It as well accounts for why in English only the proximal demonstrative has a form for manner, while cross-linguistically two or three term systems have two or three manner demonstratives (König 2015).
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Eline Visser - Kalamang *opa*: shifting the attention to common ground

Kalamang, a Papuan language of East Indonesia, has a three-term demonstrative system. There is a proximal term *wa* and a distal term *me*. In addition to this, Kalamang makes extensive use of an adnominal demonstrative *opa*, which is used only when there is some common ground between the speaker and the hearer. In other words, *opa* is used when the speaker assumes the hearer knows which referent the speaker is referring to. Himmelmann (1996) already identified this as *recognitional* use of demonstratives, with the difference that in Kalamang the referent is often already established in discourse, whereas according to Himmelmann it is typically not. Thus, a typical example would be (1), where a man that has featured in the narrative of the speaker has been absent for a few phrases and then reappears. *Opa* may be combined with both proximal *wa* and distal *me*.

(1) ma canam *opa* me koluk
3SG man DEM DIST.DEM meet

‘She meets that man (that I’ve mentioned before).’

This is not just a *tracking* use of the demonstrative, as *opa* may be used to referents that are new in the discourse as well. The requirement for *opa* is that the referent should be accessible to both speaker and hearer. A narrator may also start a story with a referent + *opa*, because the speaker and hearer have seen an image of that referent before, even though they have never talked about it. Or they may add *opa* to a referent’s name to indicate that the speaker knows this person, and that that person is now the topic of discourse.

Why does the speaker not opt for just the distal demonstrative *me*, which can be used anaphorically as well? This can be explained with help of the term *engagement*, recently put (back) on the map by Evans, Bergqvist and San Roque (2017). They argue that many languages – more than thought before – offer grammatical ways of encoding whether a thing or state is accessible to speaker, hearer, neither, or both. Kalamang does not have such an elaborate system, but *opa* is the demonstrative used for referents that are accessible to both speaker and hearer. *Opa* is used when both speakers have engaged with the referent before. More specifically, *opa* is the demonstrative of choice when the speaker assumes the hearer has knowledge of the referent, but has backgrounded it, and when the speaker wants to foreground it again.

In my talk, I will further illustrate the engagement requirement and foregrounding function of *opa*, based on existing Kalamang narratives and conversation and new material to be recorded this spring. I will also show that several languages in the region have similar demonstrative particles with the same syntactic behaviour and the same function as Kalamang *opa*. These include the Alor-languages Teiwa and Kaera (Klamer, 2010; 2014) and the West-Bomberai language Mbaham (Flassy 1983), as well as Papuan Malay, suggesting that the combination of engagement and foregrounding in a single element might be an areal trait.

Discourse functions of the postposed demonstratives in Eastern Finnic languages

Chingduang Yurayong (University of Helsinki)

Eastern Finnic languages (Karelian, Veps and Lude) use two types of demonstrative: 1) a canonical preposed demonstrative that expresses deixis and 2) a non-canonical postposed demonstrative (PostpDem) that establishes non-deictic discourse functions (cf. Larjavaara 1986).

Focusing on PostpDem in Eastern Finnic languages, I identify three main contexts of use on the basis of word order. Firstly, PostpDem can occur in the second position, similar to Wackernagel’s clitic, right after the first stressed constituent of a sentence that is promoted into a sentence topic.

Lude ku mi-na se sua-i-m me-iša-i kāvū-māi ka, hi muoi-t-i, ...
when 1SG DEM get-PST-1SG forest-PART go-INF also please-PST.3SG

‘When I myself got to hunt, I was pleased, …’

PostpDem can also establish contrast between two referents in a close discourse context.

Southern priha-d ne edoo ajo-i-ba, mā se jāl’ghe ajo-i-n.
Veps boy-PL DEM.PL before drive-PST-3PL 1SG DEM after drive-PST-1SG

‘As for the boys, they drove away; as for me, I chased (them).’

Otherwise, PostpDem in other positions can be classified on the basis of anaphora. If there is co-occurrence of anaphor and its antecedent in a close discourse context, PostpDem in this context is interpreted as a definite-anaphoric marker (cf. Kettunen 1943).

Central Minain’ oruž jinga pand-at [19 words] da minain’ ei otand oruži se.
Veps 1SG.ALL gun so put-PASS and 1SG.ALL NEG.3SG take gun DEM

‘A gun was given to me … and I did not take the gun.’

In any case, the anaphor can but does not necessarily need to be identical to the antecedent as long as the demonstrative anchors two referents of the same or closely related topic.

Central Onge-n tač-i-n’, ong se karv-ha tart-i.
Veps rod-GEN throw-PST-1SG rod DEM hair-ILL stick-PST.3SG

‘I threw a fishing rod, the rod stuck in [my] hair.’

Lastly, PostpDem can simply emphasise the head-word without expressing topicality or anaphora as in the previous cases. This type of an emphatic-focus marker (as named in Grünthal 2015) often accompanies a word in the comment articulation.

Olonets ol’i jugei ruado se.
Karelian be.PST.3SG hard work DEM

‘So hard was the work.’

Many times, we find PostpDem following verbs and adverbs, which are not nominal categories and, thus, cannot be interpreted as the anaphoric use of PostpDem.

Central ka kagou hān om se ?
Veps also where 3SG be.PRS.3SG DEM

‘So where is (s)he?’

In terms of geographical distribution, only Veps and Lude employ all three functions. At the same time, Karelian lacks the anaphoric use, while the rest of Finnic languages only have the use of topic marker. As for the Finnic languages in Estonia, the use of PostpDem is not observed, but instead, the preposed demonstrative shows the development towards becoming a definite article (Pajusalu 2009).
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