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Diessel (2013, 239) argues that:

...demonstratives provide an important link between gesture, discourse, and grammar that rests on their communicative function to coordinate the interlocutors’ focus of attention. ... 

No other class of linguistic expressions is so closely tied to the speaker’s body and gesture as demonstratives. However, demonstratives are not only used to focus the language users’ attention on concrete entities in the surrounding situation, they are also used to organize the information flow in discourse, which in turn underlies their frequent development into a wide range of grammatical markers, e.g. definite articles, third person pronouns, relative markers, complementizers, subordinate conjunctions, copulas, and focus markers. In this way, demonstratives provide an explicit link between gesture, imitation, and grammar . . .
Deictic expressions presuppose a point of reference (origo, cf. Bühler 1934), which is primarily located in speaker’s (or addressee’s) body (and therefore subjective). Deictic expressions manage *joint attention* and link gesture, communication, and grammar (Diessel, 2013). They require the support of body posture, gestures or gaze in face-to-face conversation to be interpreted (embodiment). Deictic expressions and pointing are acquired very early and can be understood by some animals (dogs, horses, chimps) (various sources).
A directly related to **joint attention** is the category of **engagement** developed by Evans et al. (2017a,b), elaborating Du Bois’ **alignment** (2007, 144).

*Engagement is ‘a grammatical system for encoding the relative mental accessibility of an entity or a state of affairs to the speaker and addressee.’* (Evans et al., 2017a, 2)
Holton et al. (2012) established the genetic coherence of the AP family.
### Abui pronominal demonstratives - (Kratochvíl, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>VIEWPOINT</th>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medial</td>
<td>o, lo</td>
<td>yo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td>oro</td>
<td>wò</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table**: Abui pronominal demonstratives

### Deictic usage

This paradigm is used to point in space. Only its core has extended functions.
Deictic words are extremely common, constituting more than 10% of the entire corpus. The proximal *do* is by far the most common in the Abui Corpus (>200k words). In spoken language the subjective viewpoint is certainly the most common one. Among the addressee-based forms, the medial *yo* stands out. Its relatively higher frequency can be explained by the politeness-related uses and its attention-drawing function to familiar but inactive referents. In interaction with addressee’s viewpoint the medial form is probably perceived as more objective and less face-threatening than the proximal *to*. The number of tokens of *ya* should be in fact much lower (sequential linker *ya* was included in the count).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distance</th>
<th>SPEAKER</th>
<th>tokens</th>
<th>VIEWPOINT</th>
<th>ADDRESSEE</th>
<th>tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRX</td>
<td><em>do</em></td>
<td>5703</td>
<td><em>to</em></td>
<td>878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ma</em></td>
<td>1024</td>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td><em>o/lo</em></td>
<td>981/30</td>
<td><em>yo</em></td>
<td>2588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>1280</td>
<td><em>fa</em></td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DST</td>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
<td>4034</td>
<td><em>hu</em></td>
<td>854</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ya</em></td>
<td>4155 (incl. seq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Corpus frequencies of Abui demonstratives (October 4, 2017)
Spatial contrasts (Kratochvíl, 2011)

(1) a. *do* fala vs. *to* fala
    PROX house       PROX.AD house
‘this house (near me)’ vs. ‘this house (near you)’

b. *o* fala vs. *yo* fala
    MD house         MD.AD house
‘that house (further from me)’ vs. ‘that house (further from you)’

c. *oro* fala
    DST house
‘that house over there (far from us)’
Referential uses (Kratochvíl & Delpada, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COGNITIVE STATUS</th>
<th>VIEWPOINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definite</td>
<td><em>do</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given, old</td>
<td><em>o, lo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Abui anaphoric demonstratives

Givenness, old-information and familiarity

Addressee-based forms highlight the **familiarity** of the referent, as either immediately accessible or accessible with some effort. The specific forms *nu* and *hu* imply a set or a type and presuppose existence. Their interpretation interacts with the type of noun and slightly differs between unique-referent, proper nouns, and common nouns.
Engagement function of medial demonstratives

Context: B is leaving to the market

(2)  
A: *nala nuku bel ba mii*

something one buy PURP take

ne-r=te!

1SG.LOC-reach=PRIOR

A: ‘buy me something!’

(3)  
B: *nala eh?*

what INTER

B: ‘what?’

(4)  
A: *mur yo!*

[ citrus MD.AD]\[NP

A: ‘oranges (you could have guessed, because you know I like them)’

Abui adnominal demonstratives combine with both common and proper nouns and indicate in the postnominal (phrase-final) position the cognitive status of the referent in the givenness hierarchy.
### Overview of adnominal functions - Givenness Hierarchy (Kratochvíl & Delpada, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In Focus</strong></td>
<td><em>di</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>the referent is in short-term memory and at the current center of attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activated</strong></td>
<td><em>do, lo/o, ò, ó, to, yo</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>the referent is represented in current short-term memory and visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Demonstrative]</td>
<td><em>wò, wó, oro</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>the referent is represented in current short-term memory and visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activated</strong></td>
<td><em>CLV do,</em></td>
<td><em>CLV to,</em></td>
<td>the referent is represented in current short-term memory and visible or invisible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Relative Clause]</td>
<td><em>CLV=o,</em></td>
<td><em>CLV yo,</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>CLV nu</em></td>
<td><em>CLV hu</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uniquely Identifiable</strong></td>
<td><em>N do</em></td>
<td><em>N to</em></td>
<td>the hearer can identify the intended object on the basis of the nominal alone, but the identifiability does not have to be based on previous familiarity; the intended object is located within the immediate context (including general knowledge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Uniquely identifiable objects can be marked as familiar with the addressee-based forms. For specific reference (lower end of the same hierarchy), addressee-based forms mark a form of familiarity which we term here as *noteworthiness.*
### Overview of adnominal functions - Givenness Hierarchy

(Kratochvíl & Delpada, 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIQUELY</strong></td>
<td><strong>N o</strong></td>
<td><strong>N yo</strong></td>
<td>the hearer can identify the intended object on the basis of the nominal alone, but the identifiability does not have to be based on previous familiarity; the intended object is located outside the immediate context (but within the general knowledge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFIABLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>N nu</strong></td>
<td><strong>N hu</strong></td>
<td>the speaker intends to refer to a particular object and can indicate where it is located in the context; the hearer has or is able to construct a representation which can be marked as noteworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-IMMEDIATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N do</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N to</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENTIAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N o</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N yo</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE IDENTIFIABLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N nu</strong></td>
<td><strong>heel N hu</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TYPE IDENTIFIABLE</strong></td>
<td><strong>N (nuku)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>the hearer is able to access a representation of object described</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other syntactic positions available to Abui demonstratives

Phrase-final slots
Pronominal demonstratives have been extended into markers of a number of grammatical categories such as anaphora \((a)\), temporal location/tense \((t)\), evidentiality \((e)\), and assertion \((as)\). They occupy the phrase final slot, and the phrase types can be stacked, as we will show below.
Proximal demonstratives indicating temporal location

(5) a. \textit{di de-melang da-wai yaar do} \\
3AGT 3I.AL-village 3I.PAT-return go.PFV PROX$_t$ \\
‘he just went back to his village’

b. \textit{di de-melang da-wai yaar to} \\
3AGT 3I.AL-village 3I.PAT-return go.PFV PROX.AD$_t$ \\
‘[you know that] he just went back to his village’

Extension

Demonstratives in the clause-final position indicate the temporal location of an event in respect of the coding time. This position is available to all demonstratives given in Table 3. Whether the extension is based on a metaphor of the type \textit{SPACE} \rightarrow \textit{TIME} or whether the post-predicate slot is historically associated with tense is unclear. Both forms retain their engagement function, where the to PROX.AD marks the event as accessible to the addressee (and of course also to the speaker).
Medial demonstratives indicating temporal location

(6) a. di de-melang da-wai yaari o
   3AGT 3I.AL-village 3I.PAT-return go.PFV MDt
   ‘he went back to his village some time ago’

b. di de-melang da-wai yaari yo
   3AGT 3I.AL-village 3I.PAT-return go.PFV MD.ADt
   ‘you should know that he went back to his village some time ago’

Engagement

Addressee-based forms present the situation from addressee’s viewpoint, as either ‘familiar’, or ‘potentially familiar’. The meaning-contribution in the domain of tense is the same as in the adnominal domain, where the paradigm encodes referential properties such as definiteness, familiarity, and specificity (cf. Kratochvíl & Delpada, 2015).
Proximal demonstratives in assertions

context: bow practice, participants: grandfather and grandson

(7) na-táng  do, # di  namur  to  do!
1SG.INAL-hand PROX 3AGT wound.PFV PRX.ADe PRXas
‘this hand of mine, it really hurts (you know)!’

Layering of clause-final demonstratives

Clause-final position allows more than one demonstrative. The forms closer to the predicate encode absolute tense and evidentiality. The final position is associated with stance: the proximal form marks strong assertion. The context is required for correct interpretation of the form (whether temporal, evidential or assertive).
Demonstratives in imperatives

context: mother to a child in the evening, suggesting that it is already bed time

(8)  \textit{a-ran} \quad \textit{ba} \quad \textit{taa} \quad \textit{yo!}
\begin{align*}
& \text{2SG.PAT-quiet SIM lie.IPFV MD.AD} \\
& \text{‘you should calm down and sleep!’}
\end{align*}

Layering of clause-final demonstratives
The medial addressee-based form directs addressee’s attention to their ability to access the reasons for the appeal. It mitigates the face threat of a strong command and makes it sound as an attempt to persuade.
Table: Functions of Abui demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>SPACE</th>
<th>DISCOURSE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>near past/future</td>
<td>witnessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>proximal&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>recent&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>near past/future&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>witnessed&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>medial</td>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>further past/future</td>
<td>past witnessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo</td>
<td>medial&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>earlier&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>further past/future&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>past witnessed&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>specific/new</td>
<td>remote past/future</td>
<td>remembered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hu</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>specific/new&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>remote past/future&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>remembered&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Abui adverbial demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>VIEWPOINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>be.PROX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.PROX.AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medial</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.MD.AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be.DST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Inventory of Abui adverbial demonstratives
Proximal adverbial demonstratives with spatial reference

(9)  a. \( di \ ma \ ha\text{-}yeei \)
\( 3\text{AGT be.PROX}_s 3\text{.PAT-fall}.PFV \)
‘it fell here (by me)’

b. \( di \ ta \ ha\text{-}yeei? \)
\( 3\text{A be.PROX.AD}_s 3\text{.PAT-fall}.PFV \)
‘did it fall here (where you are)?’

Syntactic position of adverbial demonstratives
Abui adverbial demonstratives occur in the same syntactic position as locational constituents and are in complementary distribution with them.
Medial adverbial demonstratives with spatial reference

(10) Context: talking on the phone to a relative calling from the town

\textit{a la taa re a-wai?}

2SG.AGT be.MD\textsubscript{s} lie.IPFV or 2SG.PAT-return

‘are you staying the night there (in the town) or are you coming back?’

(11) Context: looking at a photograph outside of \textit{ADD}’s visual field (MPI stimuli set)

\textit{kaanri, bal do fa ayoku}

good.PFV ball PROX be.MD.AD\textsubscript{s} two

‘right, there are (actually) two balls there (you should be able to find a matching picture in your stack)’
The distal form is used when the visual field is separated. In English, we have to use *here* in this case, to attract addressee’s attention, even though the speaker cannot be seen behind the wall.

(12) context: speaker inside the house, not visible to ADD

\[na \quad ya \quad e-afu \quad walangai \quad h-iel\]
\[1SG.AGT \ be.DST_s \ 2SG.AL\text{-fish} \ fresh \quad 3.PAT\text{-roast}.IPFV\]

‘I am roasting you a fish here (lit. over there, i.e. in the kitchen)’
Abui preverbal modal slots

(13) a. *yal di kul miyeei=se*
    now 3AGT must\textsubscript{dy}n come.PFV=PRIOR
    ‘now he must be coming’

b. *a kul yaa!*
    2SG.AGT must\textsubscript{de}o go.IPFV
    ‘you must go!’

c. *kul hedo ha-riik*
    must\textsubscript{ep}i 3.FOC 3.PAT-ill
    ‘surely he is ill’

Layering of modal slots

The modal *kul* may encode all three main types of modality. In (13a), *kul* encodes dynamic modality (marked with \textsubscript{dy}n). The deontic use of the verb *kul* ‘must’ (marked with \textsubscript{de}o) is illustrated in (13b). The modal *kul* may also encode epistemic modality (\textsubscript{ep}i), as shown in (13c).
Dynamic modality

Dynamic modality is usually understood as the capacity of a participant to ‘control’ an event (Nuyts, 2005, 7). The degree of ‘proximity’ corresponds to the speaker’s perspective on control or potential (subjective-objective-general). The addressee-forms add the intersubjective dimension.

\[(14) \text{ama hen ma kalieta do fen-i} \]
\[
\text{person then be.PRX\text{\_dyn} old.person PRX kill.CPL-PFV}
\]

‘people then just killed the old man [without obstacles]’
Dynamic modality and engagement

The demonstrative has a scope over just the modal component of the meaning. The addressee is invited to assess the state of affairs and potentially react.

(15) fu ba afeida ta faaring o, maama
betel.nut REL yesterday be.PROX.AD_{dyn} much MD father
he-ne he-ho-takdi
3.LOC-like.PROX.IPFV 3.LOC-3.REC-consume.PFV
‘the betel nut which there was just plenty of yesterday (according to you), it was father who ate it all by himself’

In questions, the speaker is either unable to assess the state of affairs or wants to confirm joint attention with the addressee. In both cases, the addressee’s access to the state of affairs is given prominence over the speaker’s. This is a bridging context (spatially proximate to ADD as well).

(16) di ta taa?
3AGT be.PROX.AD_{dyn} lie.IPFV
‘is he asleep (according to you)’
Medial forms indicate an assessment of control capacity and are typically used to refer to compulsive or sudden behavior.

(17)  
o-mi  la  ne-l=tahai,  maama?  
2SG.REC-INSIDE be.MD<sub>dyn</sub> 1SG.LOC-GIVE=SEARCH.IPfv father  
‘you (whom I respect) doubt me (now, i.e. you didn’t before)?’

(18)  
ne-kariang  he-n  fa  kaanra  pe  
1SG.AL-work 3.LOC-like.PROX be.MD.AD<sub>dyn</sub> complete.IPfv be.near  
‘my work is [actually] nearly completed (and you can objectively evaluate that this is so).’
Distal forms encoding modality

The distal forms indicate the lack of intention and control, sometimes random or spontaneous occurrence (from speaker’s perspective, the assessment of the potential or control is difficult or impossible). In context where the assessment is possible, the distal form is dismissive or mocking.

(19)  afe  kalieta  loku di  ya  wó  Pido he-amakaang
before old.person PL  3AGT be.DSTdyn DST.H area 3.AL-person
 loku ha-da=ta-loi  do
 PL  3.PAT-JOIN=DISTR.PAT-war.IPFV PROX

‘in the past, our ancestors became embroiled in a war with the Pido people up there’
Deontic modality

Deontic modality indicates the desirability of an event. Deontic modality is a gradual scale running from absolute necessity via desirability to acceptability (Nuyts, 2005, 9). The Abui forms do not map this scale (an earlier analysis that I had), but rather encode speaker’s perspective on the desirability of the event. Proximal forms indicate subjective necessity/desirability. Addressee can be engaged to consider the modal status of the state of affairs.

(20) \textit{di} \quad \textit{ma} \quad \textit{do-laak-e} \quad \textit{wan}
\quad 3\text{AGT} \text{be.PRX}^{\text{deo}} \quad 3\text{I.REC-go.back-PROG} \text{already}
\quad \textit{he-l=he-no-kalenri}
\quad 3\text{LOC-GIVE}=3\text{LOC-1SG.REC-refuse.PFV}
\quad \text{‘he has to go, I am fed up with him’}

Context: \textit{tikak fak} negotiations

(21) \textit{hen} \quad \textit{ta} \quad \textit{aimala} \quad \textit{nuku} \quad \textit{e-l?}
\quad \text{then} \text{be.PROX.AD} \text{drum.type} \text{one} \quad 2\text{SG.LOC-give}
\quad \text{‘it must be (according to YOU) that you will be given an aimala drum, then?’}
Medial forms encoding deontic modality

Medial forms indicate more objective necessity/desirability than the proximate forms.

Context: *tikak fak* negotiations

(22) \( e\text{-}ng \quad \text{la} \quad he\text{-}tulisa=re? \)
2S.LOC-SEE be.MD\textsubscript{deo} 3.LOC-write.IPFV TAG
‘you should just write it, no?’

Context: *tikak fak*, the elder familiar with the custom law suggests the other side that there needs to be a certain amount of cloth included in the payment as well.

(23) *kabala nu fa kasing karnukuwalyeting*

cloth SPC be.MD.\textsubscript{AD}_\textsubscript{deo} bit fifteen
‘there need to be fifteen pieces of cloth’ [objective fact that you should be aware of]
The distal form *ya* indicates that a state of affairs is generally desirable. It can be used sarcastically to dismiss subjective perspective of the addressee.

(24)  

\[ ya \quad te=mi-a-te=mi-a \quad baai, \quad tafaa \quad nu \]
\[ \text{be.DST}_{\text{deo}} \quad \text{RED}[\text{somewhere}=\text{be.in}] \quad \text{ADD} \quad \text{drum} \quad \text{SPC} \]
\[ de-i=da-moida \]
\[ 3i.\text{LOC-PUT}=3i.\text{PAT-sound}.\text{IPFV} \]

‘the drum value must be recognised everywhere’ [excluding any subjectivity]
Epistemic modality

Epistemic modality is estimation, typically (but not necessarily) by the speaker, of the probability of an event (cf. Nuyts 2005:10). It is a gradual scale running from absolute certainty via probability to possibility. The Abui demonstratives encode speaker’s perspective on the possibility, as either subjective (proximal forms), objective, or general. As in the previous cases, examples of irony and sarcasm are plenty.

(25) a. \textit{ma ka anui sei}\newline be.PROX\textsubscript{epi} IRR rain come.down.IPFW

‘probably it is about to rain’ [speaker’s viewpoint]

b. \textit{anui ma ka sei}\newline rain be.PROX\textsubscript{dyn} IRR come.down.IPFW

‘the rain is about to start (by its propensity as rain)’ [assessment focused on the rain]

Some instances show different scope of modal forms, depending whether they precede or follow the argument. The assessment of the event is from different perspectives.
(26) \textit{ta} e-neng \textit{di} he-fanga=ti ko be.PROX.AD_{epi} 2SG.AL-man 3AGT 3.LOC-tell.PFV=REAL.PST FUT \textit{di} moku kaang-kaang ha-yaal ba yo 3AGT kid RED[good] 3.PAT-give.birth.IPFW QUOT MD.AD ‘probably (you remember that) your husband said “she will give birth to a healthy child” (she said)’

In (27), the speaker chooses the proximal addressee-based to effectively contradict the addressee’s expectation, marking a proposition as being entirely addressee’s ‘subjective’ probability judgment, that is not valid.

(27) \textit{ta} h-iénglaka! be.PROX.AD_{epi} 3.PAT-know.IPFW ‘probably (just in your view) he knows! (in fact he does not)’
Stacking of modal slots

Example (28) illustrates the layered structure of Abui modal slots and offers clear evidence that the adverbial demonstratives do not refer to space. The spatial constituent is here *oro nala homing* phrase.

Context: *tikak fak* negotiations, commenting on the presence of the recording equipment capturing all spoken word after one of the elder corrected himself.

(28) \( ah, \ ma \ ya \ oro \ nala \ ho-ming \)
\( \text{INTER be.PROX}_{\text{epi}} \text{ be.DST}_{\text{dyn}} \text{ [DST something 3.REC-INSIDE]goal} \)
\( \text{we-i nu!} \)
\( \text{leave-PFV SPC} \)

‘oh, probably it has already somehow entered that thing over there’

(29) \( hare \ e-ng \ ma \ ka \ la \ na-kol-na-kol-r-i, \)
\( \text{so 2SG.LOC-SEE be.PROX}_{\text{deo}} \text{ IRR be.MD}_{\text{dyn}} \text{ RED[1S.PAT-cheat.PFV]} \)
\( \text{hoo?} \)
\( \text{TAG} \)

‘so you would have to keep cheating me, right?’
Overview of spatial and modal functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>form</th>
<th>SPATIAL</th>
<th>DYNAMIC</th>
<th>DEONTIC</th>
<th>EPISTEMIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>just</td>
<td>want</td>
<td>probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta</td>
<td>proximal&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>just&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>want&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>probably&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spontaneously&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>medial</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>need</td>
<td>apparently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>suddenly</td>
<td></td>
<td>obviously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa</td>
<td>medial&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>be forced&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>need&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>actually&lt;sub&gt;AD&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya</td>
<td>distal</td>
<td>happen to</td>
<td>might</td>
<td>possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>somehow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Functions of Abui adverbial demonstratives
Abui equative and similative demonstratives

Abui has grammatical means to point to quality, manner (auxiliary entities) and its ESD paradigm contains a root for indicating *sameness* (cf. Umbach and Gust 2014) and it is used in equative constructions (cf. Haspelmath et al. 2012). ESD roots take on the morphology associated with the categories they point to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
<th>VIEWPOINT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>$n$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medial</td>
<td>$w$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal</td>
<td>$h$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table:** Inventory of Abui ESD demonstratives

$n$- derived forms: *na, nala, nadi, nil, nir, niri, nidi, ...*

*w*- derived forms: *waha, wala, wiida, wiir, wiiri, wiidi, ...*

*h*- derived forms: *ha, hal, har, hadi, hari, ...*
Similative constructions

Example (30) illustrates the equative construction. The demonstrative is formally marked for its arguments.

(30)  *Fanata do he-maama he-kuopal*

\[ \text{[PN PROX]}_{\text{TARGET}} \text{ 3.POSS-father 3.AL-stingy} \]
\[ \text{tuku } \text{he-ta-} \text{wiida} \]
\[ 3.\text{III-DISTR.I-be.like} \]

‘Fanata is as singy as his uncle, lit. Fanata’s and his uncle’s stinginess is similar?’ [KNYM.30a]

(31)  *He-sepaatu ne-ta-wiida.*

\[ \text{[3POSS-shoe]}_{\text{TARGET}} \text{ 1SG.III-DISTR.I-be.like} \]

‘He has similar shoes with me, lit. as for him, his shoes resemble mine.’ [B7.46.3c]
Equative constructions

Example (30) illustrates the equative construction. The demonstrative is formally marked for its arguments.

(32) \[\text{fala ba oro naa=nu}\]
    house REL [DIST be.like]_{\text{KIND}}=\text{SPC}
    ‘That house is the same (like this) over there.’ [AA.653]

(33) \[\text{he-deki wan di na-r ba}\]
    3.AL-pants already 3AGT do.like.PFV [COMP
    akan-r-i.
    black-reach-PFV]_{\text{MANNER}}
    ‘he already made his trousers in this way (that they are)
    black’ [B07.031.02]
The root \( h^- \) is used in contexts where the speaker has no access to the kind or manner. The descriptions are guesses or suggestions, and prompt agreement.

(34) \textit{Ede} \quad \textit{ha!}
\text{2SG.AGT be.like}
‘It’s up to you, whichever way you wish!’

(35) \textit{he-deki wan di na-r ba}
\text{3.AL-pants already 3AGT do.like.PFV [COMP akan-r-i.]
black-reach-PFV]MANNER}
‘he already made his trousers in this way (that they are)
black’ [B07.031.02]
Conclusion

- engagement/viewpoint is an integral part of the Abui modal system
- there is no evidence that ‘epistemic’ and ‘intersubjective’ meanings grammaticalize later, as shown for English by Traugott & Dasher (2002)
- subjectivity and modality are not correlated (conforms Narrog 2005a)
- participant vs. speaker-oriented modality: *kaang*, *beeka* vs. demonstrative forms discussed here
- relationship to mood & status (Sawila and Abui) - see also (Mithun, 1995)
- phonological bulk remains unreduced
- ESD demonstratives take on verbal morphology (cross-linguistic parallels)


