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Introduction

• Grammatical tense, aspect, and mood are most often expressed through verbal morphology or sentential particles
• A small number of languages show a variety of TAM-like distinctions in the noun phrase
• This talk focuses on how languages mark TAM specifically on demonstratives, and what roles TAM marking plays on demonstratives
• Based on a study of approximately 1400 languages, perhaps 25-35 languages make use of TAM in their demonstrative system

---

1The focus is specifically on morphosyntactic marking, but some instances of pragmatic use are also discussed.
(1) Wichi (Nercesian 2011: 249)

\[ \text{hal’o-y = mathi} \quad \text{iyej} \quad n’-w’et \]
\[ \text{tree-PL = DEM.PST.DIST} \quad \text{3SBJ:be_next_to} \quad \text{1POSS-house} \]

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

(2) Ik (Schrock 2014: 440)

\[ \text{ámá = ‘déé = náa = ne} \]
\[ \text{person = ANPH = REC = MED} \]

‘that person’ (already mentioned, from earlier, over there)
Introduction

Following Diessel (forthcoming), demonstratives are defined here as ‘a particular semantic class of deictic expressions that serve to focus the interlocutors’ attention onto a referent in the surrounding situation or unfolding discourse’.

- Although not commonly included in the categories of demonstratives, articles with temporal and spatial differentiations are also included in this talk.
- TAM-marking may occur on all members of a demonstrative paradigm, or on a subset of them.
- TAM may be encoded morphologically, or there may be individual demonstrative forms with specific temporal-modal semantics.
- TAM meanings are most commonly found in non-visible or non-perceived demonstrative forms.
Introduction

- An important aspect of TAM marking on demonstratives has to do with accessibility, the degree to which a referent is cognitively available to the addressee at a particular stage of discourse (Ariel 1990: 3)
- This includes physical contexts in the immediate surroundings of the discourse, linguistic or discourse-based contexts (e.g. anaphoric), and general knowledge
- A number of languages show TAM distinctions strictly as a pragmatic extension of accessibility; in others, accessibility and TAM are intertwined in a more complex fashion
- The connection between accessibility and pragmatic extensions such as tense and mood appears to be a promising future area of research
TAM marking in demonstratives

• TAM-marking in demonstratives does not stem from a single source
• The simplest situation is when a language has a single (or multiple non-paradigmatic) demonstrative form indicating tense or mood
  • Ticuna, Hoava, and Nuer each have one demonstrative for past tense; Anandilyakwa and Barupu each have one irrealis demonstrative
  • Wembawemba (probably) had two demonstratives, one for past tense and one for present tense; Dii (probably) has two demonstratives, one for future and one for non-future
• A generalization may be made that if a language has only one tensed demonstrative, it marks past tense; if a language has one modal demonstrative, it marks irrealis
TAM marking in demonstratives

- Languages may also extend one semantic domain into another
- Most commonly, this is from space into time
- Accessibility and evidentiality extending into temporal domains also occur
TAM marking in demonstratives

- Languages may also make use of other lexical categories for clausal TAM
- In Guṇu and Bārundji, clausal tense is indicated by the pronoun used (e.g. *widi* ‘this (past)’, *iḏi* ‘this (present)’, and *giḏi* ‘this (future)’) 
- In Murawari, ‘verbal suffixes may attach to other parts of speech, such as nouns, adjectives and adverbs, and convey the same meanings as when they are attached to verbs’ (Oates 1988: 190)
TAM marking in demonstratives

- Finally, languages may make use of paradigmatic distinctions in various ways
- For tense, it is past vs. non-past, past vs. present vs. future, present vs. non-present, and one possible case of future vs. non-future
- For moods, this is generally a two-way realis vs. irrealis distinction
- In one case, it is rather based on epistemic modality
- Aspectual distinctions appear only in past tense clauses of Malagasy, and in limited instances in Blagar and Balantak
• Time as an extension of space is a well-researched and well-established topic
• It has been argued that space is primary and serves as a metaphor for time across many languages (Lyons 1977, Haspelmath 1997)
• However, the degree to which languages may grammaticalize temporal notions varies considerably
Demonstratives in Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec

(3) Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec (Fenton 2010: 135)

\[
tu \ bɛni=\text{re} \quad \text{gu-}\text{zuwa' } a \ \text{rè}
\]
who person = DIST COMPL-be here

“Who was that man who was (just) here?’

(4) Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec (Fenton 2010: 135)

\[
tu \ bɛni=\text{ki} \quad \text{gu-}\text{zuwa' } a \ \text{rè}
\]
who person = INVIS COMPL-be here

“Who was that man who was here (e.g. yesterday)?”

- There are four deictic determiner clitics in Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec (Zapotecan), proximal rè, medial kang, distal re, and distal invisible ki (Fenton 2010)

- The non-visible (but accessible) determiner ki is used when talking about a referent in the past, contrasting with the present tense sense of the other three forms (ibid.)
Demonstratives in Xanthi Pomak

(5) Xanthi Pomak (Adamou 2011: 15)

dve gui'dini na'pref ma'ndili-te
two years ago scarves-DEF.PAST
'beha tfe'rveni 'oti 'bese
were.3SG red because was.3SG
ai'tos 'moda-ta
that.PAST fashion-DEF.PAST

‘Two years ago, the scarves were red because that was the fashion.’

• In Xanthi Pomak (Slavic, Greece) deictic articles and demonstratives are divided three ways for spatio-temporal/modal reference (Adamou 2011)

• When the referent situation is the same as the utterance situation, -s- refers to something in the speaker’s domain, -t- refers to something in the addressee’s domain, and -n- refers to something removed from both (ibid.)

• When the referent situation is something else, -s- refers to the present time, -t- refers to the past, and -n- has a future, irrealis, or habitual notion (ibid.)

• Fictional situations exclusively use -n-, and do not use -s- or -t- for either spatial or temporal meanings (ibid.)
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TAM from accessibility and evidentiality

Pilagá (Vidal and Klein 1998: 183)

\[ \text{am-sa-nem} \quad \text{so'} \quad \text{paan} \]

\( 2\text{SG-1SG-give} \quad \text{CL.absent/going.away} \quad \text{bread} \)

‘I gave you bread.’ (The bread is not there, but both the speaker and hearer know that it was.)

Pilagá (Vidal and Klein 1998: 183)

\[ \text{am-sa-nem} \quad \text{ga'} \quad \text{paan} \]

\( 2\text{SG-1SG-give} \quad \text{CL.distal} \quad \text{bread} \)

‘I’ll give you bread.’ (There is no bread out there, but the speaker implies that there will be some, and then she/he will give it to the hearer.)

- In all living Guaycuruan languages (Kadiweu, Pilagá, Toba, and Mocovi), demonstratives (and determiners) are divided into six categories: absent, coming, going, standing, sitting, lying

- Demonstratives and determiners do not semantically encode TAM, but they... ‘may contribute pragmatically to the temporal location of the entity the nominal describes, and also of the whole proposition’ (Carol 2015: 890)

- In Pilagá, \textit{na’} (present or coming, accessible) is used for present tense reference, \textit{so’} (leaving, accessible) is used for past reference, and \textit{ga’} (absent, inaccessible) is used in irrealis situations such as future or interrogatives
TAM from accessibility and evidentiality

(8) Choroté, (Carol 2015: 905)

\[
\begin{align*}
Ka & \quad p_0-ye \quad ja-pa \\
\text{COMP} & \quad 3.\text{SUBJ.exist-IRR} \quad \text{FEM-D6}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
ji-ka-makinaj-a', \quad y-am-taj-’ni
\]
3.POSS-AL-car-IRR 3.SUBJ-leave-FR-ITER

‘If they had a car, they would leave.’

(9) Choroté, (Carol 2011: 242)

\[
\begin{align*}
a-tankyun-i & \quad pa \quad y-as-a' \\
1.\text{SUBJ-think.of-APPL} & \quad D6 \quad 1\text{POSS-child-IRR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I’m thinking of my (future) child.’ (the speaker is hoping for a child.)

(10) Choroté, (Messineo et al 2015: 136)

\[
\begin{align*}
Juan & \quad i-lyan \quad kya \quad ajwénta \\
Juan & \quad 3.\text{SUBJ-kill} \quad D4 \quad \text{hen}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Juan killed the chicken.’

• Three Matacoan languages, Choroté, Nivaclé, and Maká, also have pragmatically inferred TAM
• In Choroté for instance there are three demonstratives in particular that may carry temporal meanings:
  • D4 kya is used for something moving away, or something which has disappeared, changed, or no longer exists
  • D5 ja is used for something which is not currently visible, but has been seen before
  • D6 pa is used for something which is unknown, indefinite, or not accessible
• Kya and ja frequently give a pragmatic interpretation of past tense, and pa may give a pragmatic interpretation of future tense or remote past tense
Non-paradigmatic tensed demonstratives

(11) Hoava, (Davis 2003: 90)
\[ \text{se tago-di ria hope ro?} \]
who own-3PL ART:PL shrine DEM:PAST

‘Who owned the shrines?’

(12) Hoava, (Davis 2003: 90)
\[ \text{se tago-di ria hope ra?} \]
who own-3PL ART:PL shrine DEM

‘Who owns the shrines?’

(13) Nuer, (Crazzolara 1933: 75)
\[ \text{yân-èè ci liu} \]
cow-THAT.PAST PAST has.died

‘That cow (you saw once) is dead.’

• Some languages make use of a single lexeme to mark TAM in demonstratives
• Ticuna (Ticuna-Yuri), Hoava (Oceanic), and Nuer (Nilotic) each have a single demonstrative for marking past tense
Non-paradigmatic tensed demonstratives

In Maa (Nilotic), tensed determiners are derived from some temporal adverbs like *ŋole* ‘yesterday’ or *apa* ‘long ago’ by adding a gender-number proclitic (Tucker & Mpaayei 1955: 18; Doris Payne (p.c.))

In Toqabaqita (Oceanic), ‘situational’ demonstratives mark clausal tense, dividing into a three-way set of non-past (speaker sphere), non-past (addressee sphere), and past (Lichtenberk 2008)

(14) Toqabaqita, (Lichtenberk 2008: 643)

\[ \text{Wane baa qa qafae} \]
\[ \text{man that 3SG.NFUT get.in.bad.mood} \]
\[ \text{nia qasia naqa nabaa} \]
\[ \text{3SG INTS INTS PAST.THEN} \]

‘The man got into a really foul mood (at that point).’
Non-paradigmatic modal demonstratives

(15) Barupu, (Corris 2006: 156)

$bàuni$, $bó = éro$ $beya$ $n-e-nomii$

no, place = DIRR NEG IRR-1PL-go

vai

POL

‘No, that place, we’re not going.’

(16) Barupu, (Corris 2006: 325)

$K-o-m-á$

REAL-2SG.F-2SG.F-want

$n-e-m-yé-mu$ $au = éro$?

IRR-1PL-1PL-hit-2SG.F thing = DIRR

‘Do you want us to hit you over this?’

• Mood may also be marked in demonstratives
• In Barupu (Skou) for instance, there is a single demonstrative $éro$ which appears in ‘negated, questioned, or hypothetical clauses, as well as in declarative clauses to refer to imaginary entities’ (Corris 2006: 146)
• It is not obligatory in any context; rather, speakers can choose to weakly assert the reality of a referent through the use of $éro$ (ibid.)
• Irrealis demonstratives do not have to agree with verbal realis in Barupu
• Future clauses do not always use this demonstrative, nor do imperatives — although these are both examples of irrealis clauses (Corris 2006)
Paradigmatic TAM in demonstratives

• Languages may also have paradigmatic approaches to marking TAM on demonstratives
• In Ik and Wichi, verbal tense clitics may occur on demonstratives (although not entirely systematically)
• In Mauwake, (probably) Sakao, and to some extent Blagar and Balantak, a subset of demonstratives make use of morphological distinctions for realis and irrealis
• In Mparntwe Arrernte, demonstratives show epistemic modality distinctions, depending on the certainty of the speaker (Wilkins 1989)
• In Malagasy, adverbial demonstratives divide into two categories depending on tense and aspectual boundedness
• In Movima, non-perceived demonstratives divide into past vs. present forms
Using verbal tense on demonstratives

- Wichi (Matacoan) has a much more elaborate system of demonstrative forms than the other Matacoan languages.
- Demonstratives are divided according to distance, position (horizontal vs. vertical), evidence, movement, orientation, and tense (Nercesian 2011: 239).
- Unlike other Matacoan languages, tense does not occur as a result of pragmatic inference, but is rather its own distinct category.
- Ik (Kuliak) works somewhat similarly to Wichi; tense clitics overlap only partially between verbs and demonstratives, however (Schrock 2014).

(17) Wichi, (Nercesian 2011: 255)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hin’u} &= \text{mat} = \text{tsi} & \text{tapilh} \\
\text{man} &= \text{DEM.PAST.DIST} = \text{DEM.VENT} & \text{3SUBJ: return} \\
\text{akojli} &= \text{icho} & \text{w’ahat} \\
\text{3SUBJ: be_content} & & \text{3SUBJ: carry fish}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The man from the other day (coming this way) is returning content because he’s carrying (caught) fish.’

(18) Wichi, (Nercesian 2011: 250)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{n’-fwcha} &= \text{p’ante} & \text{they Fidel} \\
\text{1POSS-father} &= \text{DEM.PAST.REM: INVIS} & \text{name Fidel} \\
\text{Eusebio} & & \text{Eusebio}
\end{align*}
\]

‘My father’s name is Fidel Eusebio.’

(19) Ik, (Schrock 2014: 456)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{fiye-íd-a} & \quad \text{dikw-itín-á} = \text{nii} \\
\text{know-2SG-REAL} & \quad \text{song-PL-NOM} = \text{DEM.PL.REC} \\
\text{néé} & \quad \text{karonjó-e} \\
\text{from} & \quad \text{harvest.season-GEN}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Do you know those songs from harvest season?’
Realis distinctions in demonstratives

(20) Potential

\[
\text{Eliw feeke soop-i-yen well here.IRR bury-NP-FUT-1PL}
\]

‘We can bury him here.’ (Berghäll 2015: 121)

(21) Imperative

\[
\text{ni koora epa eefeke 2PL.UNM house place here2.IRR}
\text{ku-eka build-IMP.2PL}
\]

‘Build a/the house over here in this place.’ (Berghäll 2015: 121)

(22) Hypothetical

\[
\text{neeke ik-ek-a-k = na there1.IRR be-CNTF-PAST-3SG = TOP}
\text{iwer(a) iffa = ke ifakim-ek-a-k coconut dry = IRR kill-CNTF-PAST-3SG}
\]

‘If he had been there a (falling) dry coconut would have killed him.’ (Berghäll 2015: 121)

• Mauwake (Madang, Trans New Guinea) shows realis distinctions on locative adverbial demonstratives, marked by the presence or absence of a focus clitic (Berghäll 2015)
• Each distance has a realis and a ‘focused’ irrealis form
• The neutral is used with realis-type verb forms, such as past and present tense
• The ‘focused’ is used with irrealis-type clauses such as future, imperative, and counterfactual
• Mauwake does not differentiate between realis and irrealis in verbal morphology
Epistemic Modality in Mparntwe Arrernte demonstratives

- Mparntwe Arrernte (Arandic, Pama–Nyungan) adnominal demonstratives appear to show some type of epistemic modality distinction, according to the certainty of the speaker (Wilkins 1989: 116-117)
- Depend on whether the speaker has witnessed the event or not; somewhat unclear whether evidentiality or certainty of information are the basis of the distinction

(23) **Nhawerne** twe-rre-me, *pwerte ingkerne-nge* yonder(uncer) hit-RECIP-NPP, hill behind-ABL

‘There’s supposed to be fighting yonder, behind the hill’ (secondhand knowledge, not witnessed)

(24) **Ar-ø-aye!** Artwe *yalange-le* re-nhe *twe-me. Nhengekenhe-le arrpenhe* see-IMP-EMPH! man that[mid](uncert)-ERG 3SG-ACC kill-NPP. this(uncert)-ERG other mape *twe-ke.*

PL(grp) kill-PC

‘Look! That man I think is killing her. This one killed the others (I suppose).’ (Inferred knowledge, while watching a murder mystery film)

(25) **Ngwenhe-me yalange?** Kwementyaye yanhe! who-INTERR there[mid](uncert)? Kwementyaye there[mid]

‘Who (if anyone) is out there?’ ‘Kwementyaye is there!’

(Speaker asks because she heard something that made her think someone was there, uncertain; responder uses certain form because he saw Kwementyaye.)
TAM distinctions in Blagar demonstratives

(26) vaʔaʔal yaŋu kiki ba nu
child female small EMPH one
doʔe te taŋ (be).up.there tree on

‘It was a little girl that was (staying) up there in the tree.’ (Steinhauer 1991: 190)

(27) ?aʔ na ?a urna jasi ba ?uʔe
EXC thing that thing bad EMPH be.there
ʔu
there.for.sure

‘Ah, that thing, it is poison that is there you know.’ (Steinhauer 1991: 196)

(28) ?ana ?ila momo
3SG.SUBJ go be.over.there(visible,level)
te ivaŋ mi mihi
tree bottom in sit

‘He/she went over there where I see him/her now under the tree sitting.’
(Steinhauer 1991: 198)

• Blagar (Alor-Pantar) has TAM meanings expressed primarily by three series of demonstratives: ?aʔe, ?a, and ?aʔa (Steinhauer 1991)
  • Demonstratives in the ?a series localize the referent of a predicate, and are restricted to declarative sentences within one day before or after the speech event
  • Demonstratives in the ?aʔe series express an event’s boundedness, and may also be used in irrealis constructions such as questions, or when referring to time periods more than one day before or after the speech event
  • The ?aʔa series is highly restricted, and may only be used in positive declarative clauses referring to the immediate period of the speech act
• All series of demonstratives with inherent TAM meanings may be predicative, and may also combine with overt verbal aspect markers
TAM distinctions in Balantak demonstratives

(29) Ventive imperfective, van den Berg & Busenitz 2012: 179

*Yaku’ rongor isian mian gor’ra’a-mari*

1SG hear exist person noisy DEM6-VEN

‘I hear there are noisy people coming (this way) from up there.’

(30) Compound allative perfective, van den Berg & Busenitz 2012: 187

*Ka-no’o-waa-ra’a no-s <um> alan-an-mai*

D-DEM.ADV2-ALL-DEM6 REAL-INTR-walk-LV-1PE

‘From there (near you) to up there is where we walked yesterday.’

- Balantak (Celebic, Austronesian) makes use of aspect/modality in some of its derived forms (van den Berg & Busenitz 2012)
  - The ventive suffix -*mari* on pronominal demonstrative bases gives an imperfective (or irrealis) meaning; on locative adverbial demonstrative bases it gives a perfective (or realis) meaning (ibid.)
  - Allative demonstratives have imperfective and perfective forms by using different prefixes, *waa-* (imperfective) and *mbaa-* (perfective) (ibid.)
  - Non-visible demonstratives add yet a third distinction, present vs non-present (ibid.)
  - Both non-visible forms refer to something out of view; non-present forms add a component indicating that the referent is no longer in the location, or not yet in the location (van den Berg & Busenitz 2012: 181)
Tense in Movima demonstratives

• Movima shows tense distinctions both in its articles as well as its demonstrative system (Haude 2004, 2006)
• Articles show a three-way distinction of unmarked vs. absent vs. past, based on accessibility
• Demonstratives show a different distribution; ‘absential’ (e.g. non-perceived) are divided into past vs. non-past, not related to accessibility (Haude 2006)
• Only non-perceived demonstratives may be negated (ibid.)
• Past demonstrative indicates that the entity is not located at the same place as earlier (ibid.)

(31) Movima, Haude 2006: 315
a. *naya’ kus májniwa = n?*  
where ART.MASC.ABS child_of = 2SG?  
‘Where is your son?’

b. *kuro’ n-as Santa Kurus,*  
DEM.MASC.ABS OBL-ART.N Santa Cruz  
a’ko as-na = *us*  
PRO.N sit-DR = MASC.ABS  
‘He is in Santa Cruz, that is where he lives.’

(32) Movima, Haude 2006: 191  
*oso’o 1 dewaj-na ban-sasa:-ne*  
DEM.PAST.N 1 see-DR put-TRC.table-APPL  
‘I saw it on the table.’ [but it is not there anymore]

(33) Movima, Haude 2006: 315  
*kiro’ naya’-ki:s, jankwa che*  
DEM.PL.ABS where-PL.ABS.OBV say and  
*ka < ma: > may*  
yell < MD >  
‘Where are they?’, I said and yelled.
TAM distinctions in Malagasy demonstratives

(34) *Mamaky ny boky any an = tokotany ny*
   AT.read DET book DIST LOC = garden DET
   mpianatra student
   ‘The student is reading the book in the garden.’ (Pearson 2008: 4)

(35) *N-amaky ny boky t-any*
   PAST-AT.read DET book PAST-DIST
   an = tokotany ny mpianatra
   LOC = garden DET student
   ‘The student read the book in the garden.’
   (Pearson 2008: 4)

- In Malagasy (Barito, Austronesian), locative adverbial demonstratives (as well as one preposition and two temporal adverbs, subsumed under the term oblique by Pearson 2008) are differentiated by tense and aspect.
- If the ‘oblique’ functions predicatively, the clause is bare in irrealis or in present tense, and the prefix *t-* marks past tense reference.
- In verbal predicates, obliques (may) take a prefix *t-* when in the past tense, and cannot take a prefix *t-* when in present or future tense.
- Past tense *t-* marks temporally bounded oblique referents; obliques without *t-* are unbounded (e.g. ongoing, habitual) (Pearson 2008)
Conclusions

- Despite their low frequency cross-linguistically, TAM distinctions in demonstratives show a wide variety of diversity in origin and use.
- Descriptions are frequently limited, and in most instances it is not possible to tell whether a TAM-marked demonstrative has local or propositional scope.
- Despite the lack of data, however, it is possible to make some tentative preliminary conclusions.
- Semantic extensions from space into time are varied; proximal is frequently used for present, but medial and distal vary whether they encode future or past.
- From movement into time, approaching seems to correlate with either present or future, and leaving correlates with the past.
- Absence and inaccessibility frequently correlate with irrealis.
Conclusions

- Demonstrative TAM does not necessarily have to agree with verbal TAM, and often can create nuanced interpretations depending on the contexts.
- Clausal TAM can result from the combination of the demonstrative and the verb or other means of marking.
- Multiple languages also show a present vs. non-present distinction, suggesting that this distinction is more important with demonstratives than in verbal tense.
- Sakao, Movima, and Balantak each describe the non-present form as indicating that the entity is no longer in the specified location (or is not yet there, in Sakao and Balantak).
- The Malagasy bounded past locative also indicates that the referent is likely not there any more.
Conclusions

- The rarity of TAM in demonstratives combined with the general lack of description in most instances suggests authors of grammars frequently find TAM-marked demonstratives difficult to understand.

- A number of additional languages have short descriptions of demonstratives in which it is mentioned that they are used in hypothetical situations, or to refer to abstract referents, e.g. Welsh (King 2003), Hup (Epps 2008), Lushootseed (Hess 1995), and Lelepa (Lacrampe 2014).

- Even more languages have descriptions involving non-visible demonstratives, without specifying whether the referent is unable to be perceived, not perceived at that moment, whether visible forms can be used in irrealis clauses, etc.

- Explorations into these areas may uncover additional languages.
Thanks to Kone foundation for making this research possible!
Adamou, Evangelia. 2011. Temporal uses of definite articles and demonstratives in Pomak (Slavic, Greece). Lingua 121: 5.
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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>Absential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Adessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Alienable possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM</td>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANPH</td>
<td>Anaphoric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>Applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>Actor Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>Attitudinal particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>Actor Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNTF</td>
<td>Counterfactual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>Complementizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>Completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONT</td>
<td>Continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRR</td>
<td>Irrealis Deictic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>Distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Bivalent Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMP</td>
<td>Emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>Exclamatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>Frustrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRP</td>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERR</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>Intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTS</td>
<td>Intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVIS</td>
<td>Invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>Iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNK</td>
<td>Linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>Locative Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Middle Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>Medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFUT</td>
<td>Non-future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>Nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPPAST</td>
<td>Non-Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>Non-past Progressive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBV</td>
<td>Obviative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Personal Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Plural Exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFV</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Polarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>Proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>Patient Voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL</td>
<td>Realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Recent Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECIP</td>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REM</td>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td>Truncated Element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Theme Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCER</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNM</td>
<td>Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VENT</td>
<td>Ventive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIS</td>
<td>Visible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Languages may also make use of other lexical categories than the verb to mark clausal TAM

In Guŋu (Yarli-Baagandji, Pama-Nyungan), tense is indicated exclusively by independent pronouns (both personal as well as demonstrative); verbs indicate only aspect (Wurm & Hercus 1976)

In the closely related language Bārundji pronouns also indicate tense, but verbs may optionally mark tense as well (ibid.)

Generally speaking in both varieties, only one pronoun in a clause indicates the tense; other pronouns use the present (or neutral) forms (ibid.)

What governs the choice of pronouns is unclear
Guṇu and Bārundji examples

(36) Guṇu, Wurm & Hercus 1976: 41
\[
diga-la \quad gadi \quad gira \quad gidi-na = miri
\]
return-TOP FUT.3PL country FUT.this-GEN = towards

‘They’ll go back to their country.’

(37) Guṇu, Wurm & Hercus 1976: 41
\[
gandjalga \quad nũŋgu \quad wiди-na
\]
good woman PAST.this-GEN

‘He had a good wife.’

(38) Bārundji, Hercus 1982: 157
\[
mina-mandi \quad njimba \quad bari-bu \quad waŋaga
\]
what-purpose PRES.NOM.2SG come-PERF PAST.here

‘Why did you come here?’

(39) Bārundji, Wurm & Hercus 1976: 44
\[
giugu-wulu \quad wimbadj-a-ulu \quad balgu \quad gulba-nja-la-gađulu
\]
FUT.this-DU man-DU speech speak-CONT-TOP-FUT.3DU

‘These two men will talk (with each other)’