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Figure 1.1. A classification of spatial concepts
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DEIXIS: A CRASH COURSE

- let’s start with Peirce

Table 2.1. *Peirce’s (1867) classification of signs based on their semiotic properties*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semiotic property</th>
<th>Constitutive relation between sign-vehicle and referent</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iconicity</td>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>Non-abstract paintings; photographs; video clips; maps; toy models and models of any kind; a gesture outlining a figure or tracing a motion path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexicality</td>
<td>Spatiotemporal contiguity and/or causality</td>
<td>Smoke as a sign of fire; footprints on the beach as a sign of somebody having walked there; an arrow or a pointing gesture as a representation of a direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolism</td>
<td>Imputed character stipulated by cultural convention or genetic code</td>
<td>A seagull chick pecking on a parent’s bill in order to induce the parent to regurgitate food for the chick; the hammer-and-sickle sign as a symbol of communism; the numeral <em>four</em> as a representation of the number 4 in English; the cipher 4 as a representation of the number 4 in writing systems that employ Arabic ciphers; the thumbs-up gesture as a sign of approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peirce II: the paradox of symbolic indexicals

### Table 2.2. Deictic expressions: random examples from five languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of deixis</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Yucatec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>I; we</td>
<td>Yo; nosotros</td>
<td>Ja; my</td>
<td>Ben; biz</td>
<td>Tèen; to’n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You</td>
<td>Tú/usted; vosotros/usted</td>
<td>Ty/vy</td>
<td>Sen/siz</td>
<td>Tèech; te’x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatial</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>Est-e/-a/-o</td>
<td>Et-ot/-a/-o</td>
<td>Bu</td>
<td>Le= ...=a’; lela’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That</td>
<td>Es-e/-a/-o</td>
<td>T-ot/-a/-o</td>
<td>0/Şu</td>
<td>Le= ...=o’; lelo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Here</td>
<td>Acqui</td>
<td>Zdes’</td>
<td>Bu-ra-da</td>
<td>Way ...=e’/=a’; te’l ...=a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/Bu-ra-ya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/Bu-ra-si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There</td>
<td>Alli</td>
<td>Vot</td>
<td>O-ra-da</td>
<td>Te’l ...=o’; tolo’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Go</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>İdti/xodit’/ezdit’/exat’</td>
<td>Gitmek/Ilerlemek</td>
<td>Bin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Come</td>
<td>Venir</td>
<td>Pri-İdti/xodit’/ezdit’/exi</td>
<td>Gelmek/varmak</td>
<td>Tàal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Ahora</td>
<td>Sejças</td>
<td>Şu an(da)/ara</td>
<td>be’òora ...=a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Ø/-s (present t)</td>
<td>-O/-as/-a/-amos/-áis/-an // -o/-es/-e/-emos/-éis/-en</td>
<td>-ju/-eş’/-et/-em/-ete/-jut // -(j)u/-iş’/-it/-iš’/-it/-it</td>
<td>-r(a/e)r</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ed (past tense)</td>
<td>perfective (preterite): -él/-aste/-ó/-amos/-asteis/-aron // -i/-iše/-iô/-imos/-isteis/-ieren // imperfec</td>
<td>-l</td>
<td>-di/-ti / -di/-ti / -dû/-tû / -du/-tu</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peirce II: the paradox of symbolic indexicals (cont.)

- as types, linguistic indexicals are actually - *symbolic*
  - = conventional, learned, language-specific
- their indexicality is situated at the *token* level
  - the occurrence of a token in a particular context associates it indexically with a referent
    - this is an indexical relation because the utterance containing the token is contiguous with the context
      - and so is the referent
    - or, in the case of anaphoric expressions, the antecedent - see below
Peirce II: the paradox of symbolic indexicals (cont.)

- the symbolic meaning of linguistic indexicals enables the indexical relation b/w tokens and referents
  - by specifying, not a conceptual classification of the kind of the referent
    - but rather a rule (Kaplan 1989) or ‘search domain’ (Levinson 2016) of sorts for where in the context to pick up the referent
      - e.g., I/we: referent = speaker of the utterance
      - you: referent = addressee
      - here: referent = place of the utterance
      - now: referent = time of the utterance
      - etc.
Kaplan’s (1989) two-tiers semantics of indexicals

“Just as it was convenient to represent contents by functions from possible circumstances to extensions (Carnap’s intensions), so it is convenient to represent characters by functions from possible contexts to contents.”
(Kaplan 1989: 505; emphasis JB)

**content** - the conventional meanings of non-indexical expressions

**character** - the conventional meanings of indexical expressions

**Figure 2.2.** *Kaplan’s theory schematically*
indexicality and deixis

Bühler (1934) introduces the term **deixis** for a subclass of indexicals:

indexicals that pick out referents from the **speech situation**, i.e., the **non-linguistic** utterance context

“Zwei Striche auf dem Papier, die sich senkrecht schneiden, sollen uns ein Koordinatensystem andeuten, O die Origo, den Koordinatenausgangspunkt [cf. Figure 2.3; JB]. Ich behaupte, daß drei Zeigwörter an die Stelle von O gesetzt werden müssen, wenn dies Schema das Zeigfeld der menschlichen Sprache repräsentieren soll, nämlich die Zeigwörter **hier, jetzt, und ich**.”

‘Two lines on the paper, intersecting at right angles, shall stand for a coordinate system and O for the origin, the coordinates of the starting point [cf. Figure 2.3; JB]. I argue that three deictic words must take the place of O if this scheme is to represent the deictic field of human language, namely the deictic words **here, now, and I**.’ (Bühler 1934: 102; emphasis and translation JB)
indexicality and deixis (cont.)

- non-deictic indexicals are in particular **anaphoric** expressions

- i.e., expressions which pick out a referent from the *linguistic* context rather than the speech situation

- in Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) influential classification, deictics are **exophoric**

- i.e., their referents need to be retrieved from *outside* the discourse
indexicality and deixis (cont.)

- H&H have a crazy idiosyncratic notion of ‘reference’ in the sense of one type of textual ‘cohesion’ device

- beside ‘substitution’, ‘ellipsis’, ‘conjunction’, and ‘lexical cohesion’

Figure 2.5. A make-shift attempt at reconciling H&H’s classification with the notion of ‘reference’ in the philosophical tradition (Peirce; Frege - Carnap - Kaplan etc.)
the endophoric-exophoric distinction

- what we commonly call ‘deictic’ expressions are inherently specified for exophoric reference

- in contrast, many (all?) so-called anaphoric expressions appear to really be underspecified indexicals

- allowing both endophoric=anaphoric and exophoric=deictic uses

(2.1) a. A: There’s Floyd. Hey, he took your backpack!
   b. [B is looking for her backpack. A, pointing at Floyd:] HE took your backpack!

(2.2) a. Later, Sally saw Floyd.
   b. I’ll see you later!
language use, indexicality, and identity

any linguistic expression and any feature of speech can become associated in the minds of the members of a speech community with

- a person, or a person's emotional state (e.g., raised pitch as an expression of anxiety)
- a group of people, perceived as members of a social category
  - e.g., (-ing): [-in] with blue collar males in English dialects around the world (Trudgill 1972)
  - more dynamic intonation contours with females in languages around the world

through this association, the expression or feature then becomes an indexical expression

- of the person, the person's emotional state, or the group of people
how many types of deictics?

Table 2.2 has examples of person deixis, spatial deixis, and temporal deixis corresponding to the three dimensions of Bühler’s deictic ‘coordinate system’

Fillmore 1997 [1975] adds a fourth type/dimension:

social deixis

Table 2.2. Deictic expressions: random examples from five languages
social deixis

“(…) I will define **social deixis** as the overt expression, in the actual indexical linguistic forms used, of some parameter(s) of the relative social position of one or more of the linguistic interactants, be it speaker, addressee, or even a bystander in the interaction. It is also possible, as we shall see, to indicate something about the relative social position of a non-interactant, namely some third-person participants referred to in an actual linguistic utterance.” (Foley 1997: 313-314)

“**Social deixis** involves the marking of social relationships in linguistic expressions, with direct or oblique reference to social status or role of participants in the speech event.” (Levinson 2004: 119)

(2.1) a. Deine Hose brennt
GER your(SOL) pants burns
‘Your pants are on fire’

b. Ihre Hose brennt
your(POL) pants burns
‘Your pants are on fire’

**Figure 2.6. A classification of social-deictic expressions**
social deixis (cont.)

social deixis shares with the other types of deictic reference its dependence on the speech situation.

however, rather than to retrieve a referent from the speech situation, it imposes a construal (a categorization) on the social relation between speaker and addressee/referent.

as a result, social deictics are believed not to contribute to the propositional/truth-conditional content of the utterance.

Potts (2005: 153-194) treats them as a form of expressive meanings.
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Figure 3.1. Distance contrasts in demonstratives (Diessel 2013a; http://wals.info/chapter/41)

Figure 3.2. Idealized model of speaker-anchored radial spatial categories (Levinson in press: 5)
(3.1) Give me that (book)!
(3.2) Ts’a’ tèen le=lìibro=o’ / lel=o’

YUC give(B3SG) me DEF=book=D2 DEM=D2

‘Give me that book / that’
Figure 3.4. Third person pronouns and demonstratives (Bhat 2013; http://wals.info/chapter/43)

(3.3) *Ts’a’ tèen le=liibro=o’ / lel=o’ / leti’*

YUC give(B3SG) me DEF=book=D2 DEM=D2 it

‘Give me that book / that / him/her/it’
the Nijmegen demonstratives project (1997-2003)

- a subproject of the Space project at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (1992-2003)

- the bulk of the data collection happened 1997-2000

- results are currently in press (Levinson et al in press)

- focused on spatial = exophoric uses of demonstratives

- we thus did not test, and do not contest, claims to the effect that non-spatial uses may be primary

- in some languages (e.g., Kirsner 1993 for Dutch)
tools: the 1999 Demonstrative Questionnaire (Wilkins 1999a)

- 25 scenes, schematically depicted in the questionnaire

- to be enacted by the researcher with speakers

- at realistic scale to the extent possible

**Figure 3.5.** The first three scenes of the 1999 Demonstrative Questionnaire (Wilkins 2016: 40)
tools: the 1999 Demonstrative Questionnaire (cont.)

- variables manipulated in the design of the scenes
  - proximity/distance of referent to Spkr/Addr
  - pointing
  - discourse status (old/new)
  - perceptual/manual access
  - sociocultural status (possession, personal domains)
tools: the 1999 Demonstrative Questionnaire (cont.)

- weaknesses and companion tools
  - the nature of the task is inadequate for studying the role of attention direction
    - the *Hidden Color Chips* task (Enfield & Bohnemeyer 2001) was an attempt to get better data on this issue
  - the task is not designed to study contrastive demonstrative use
    - the *Walnut Game* task (Wilkins 1999b) was designed to cover this type of use
data collection: Levinson et al (eds.)

Table 3.1. Contributors and sample
(Levinson in press: 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language name</th>
<th>Glottolog reference</th>
<th>Language Family</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Subsistence type</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>lc001294</td>
<td>Tai-Kadai</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Rice growing, market economy</td>
<td>Nick Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalaba</td>
<td>ngal1292</td>
<td>Gur-Winyan</td>
<td>Arnhem Land, Australia</td>
<td>Hunter-gatherer</td>
<td>Sarah Cutfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krantian</td>
<td>htrn1747</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Urban and rural Industrial state</td>
<td>Sergio Melka &amp; Raquel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georomai</td>
<td>goem1240</td>
<td>Afro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Horticulturalists</td>
<td>Birgit Hettwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzeltal</td>
<td>tzel1254</td>
<td>Mayan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Slash &amp; burn cultivators, market economy</td>
<td>Penelope Brown, Stephen Levinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatec Maya</td>
<td>yucm1254</td>
<td>Mayan</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Slash &amp; burn cultivators, market economy</td>
<td>Jürgen Bohnmeyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauklasbun</td>
<td>lavl1241</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>Horticulturalists</td>
<td>Angela Terrill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirikí</td>
<td>tirn1798</td>
<td>Cariban</td>
<td>Brazil, Surinam</td>
<td>Horticulturalists</td>
<td>Sergio Melka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumai</td>
<td>trum1247</td>
<td>isolate</td>
<td>Xingu, Brazil</td>
<td>Horticulturalists</td>
<td>Raquel Guichelle-Damien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selibe</td>
<td>seli1295</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Fishers, horticulturalists</td>
<td>Anna Margolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wara</td>
<td>wars1303</td>
<td>isolate</td>
<td>Venezuela, Guyana</td>
<td>Fishers, horticulturalists</td>
<td>Stefanie Hermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchi</td>
<td>chui1273</td>
<td>Kamchatic</td>
<td>S Siberia, Russia</td>
<td>Hunter gatherers, raindeer herders</td>
<td>Michael Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yapun Uinya</td>
<td>yapl1256</td>
<td>isolate</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Fishers, horticulturalists</td>
<td>Stephen Levinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inseku</td>
<td>inse174x</td>
<td>North Hauleran (West Papuan)</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>traders</td>
<td>Miriam van Staden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahai</td>
<td>jaha1242</td>
<td>Austro-Asiatic</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Hunter-gatherers</td>
<td>Nicolas Durenhult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some results: Levinson et al (eds.)

**Table 3.2.** Systems complexity: in quantitative terms
*(Levinson in press: 14)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Main Deictic Semantic Distinctions in Nominals</th>
<th>Distinct Demonstrative Pronominal Forms</th>
<th>Non-Deictic Semantic Distinctions in Pronominals</th>
<th>Additional dedicated Anaphoric Demonstrative morpheme(s)*</th>
<th>Adverbial Forms (in brackets additional dedicated Anaphoric forms)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lao</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goemai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Number [2], Posture [9]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yucatec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>over 18</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tzelti</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>over 22</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warao</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Location, Existence, Number, Subordination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 (14 including Adverbial combinations)</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saliba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gender, Number</td>
<td>+?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiriyó</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Animacy, Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalabon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 (* cases)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4 * 3 cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavukalave</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Number, Gender</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yéli</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 (+1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidore</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7 (verbal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahai</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
some results: Levinson et al (eds.) (cont.)

Figure 3.6. System architectures (Levinson in press: 22) (Levinson in press: 14)
emerging generalizations: Levinson et al (eds.)

- there are purely speaker-anchored systems, but no purely addressee-anchored systems

- systems w/o speaker-anchored proximal terms are rare but exist (case in point: Lao)

- no evidence for addressee-anchored distal terms

- no evidence for two-term systems that contrast a speaker-anchored and an addressee-anchored term (see below)

- true mid-distance demonstratives are rare

- systems with four or more semantic contrasts are never purely distance-based
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YUCATEC “DEMONSTRATIVES” IN INTERACTION

- bipartite deictics

(4.1) He’l hun-p’íit ts’àak=a’!
PRSV one-bit cure\ATP=D1
‘Here’s some medicine!’

(4.2) K-u=bin Xokempich le=bèeh he’l=a’?
IMPF-A3=go Xokempich DEF=way PRSV=D1
‘Does this way here go to Xokempich?’

(4.3) Ba’x le=he’l=o’? Ba’x u=k’àaba’?
what DEF=PRSV=D2 what(B3SG) A3=name(B3SG)
‘What’s this? What’s its name?’
bipartite deictics (cont.)

(4.4) \[ U=\text{hòol}+\text{nah} \quad \text{ken} \quad u=\text{bin} \]
\[ A3=\text{hole}+\text{house} \quad \text{SR.IRR} \quad A3=\text{go} \]
\[ \text{te’l} \quad t-u=\text{mòoy}=a’. \]
there \quad \text{PREP-A3=apse=D1}
‘The door is what will end up here in the apse’

(4.5) \[ \text{le=liibro} \quad \text{yàan} \quad \text{te’l=0’} \]
\[ \text{DEF=book} \quad [\text{EXIST(B3SG) there=D2}] \]
‘the book that’s there’ (distal or anaphoric!)

(4.6) \[ \text{Le=te’l=a’}, \quad \text{es que} \quad \text{kul-ub}. \]
\[ \text{DEF=there=D1} \quad \text{is.which} \quad \text{sit-INSTR(B3SG)} \]
‘This one here, it’s a pillar (lit. thing for sitting)’
bipartite deictics (cont.)

(4.7) \( A=\text{ti’a’l} \)  \( \text{le}=\text{nah}=\text{a’}? \)  
A2=property(B3SG)  DEF=house=D1  
‘Is this house yours?’

(4.8) \( A=\text{ti’a’l} \)  \( \text{lel}=\text{a’}? \)  
A2=property(B3SG)  DEF=D1  
‘Is this yours?’

(4.9) \( A=\text{ti’a’l} \)  \( \text{le}=\text{liibro}=\text{o’}? \)  
A2=property(B3SG)  DEF=book=D2  
‘Is that book yours?’

(4.10) \( \text{Ba’x k’iin k-uy=úuch-ul lel}=\text{o’}? \)  
what sun IMPF-A3=happen-INC DEF=D2  
‘What day does that usually happen?’
bipartite deictics (cont.)

(4.11) Káa=h-òok
     CON=PRV-enter(B3SG)
     le=x-ch’úup chak u=nòok’=o’, (...) 
     DEF=F-female red(B3SG) A3=garment=D2

‘(And then) the woman dressed in red entered, (...)’
**bipartite deictics (cont.)**

**Table 4.1. Yucatec spatial deixis (based on Hanks 1990: 18-19)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Indexical particle</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he‘l</td>
<td>-a’ (D1)</td>
<td>‘Here it is’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he‘la’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he‘ ...-a’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he‘lo’</td>
<td>‘There it is’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he‘ ...=o’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he‘l</td>
<td>‘There it comes’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...-he’</td>
<td>(audible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adverbial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te‘l</td>
<td>-a’ (D2)</td>
<td>‘Right there/here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>te‘la’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>te‘ ...-a’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>te‘lo’</td>
<td>‘There’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>te‘ ...=o’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti’</td>
<td>ti’</td>
<td>‘There (anaphoric)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...=i’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>way</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘(In) here’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>way ...-e’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tol</td>
<td>tolo’</td>
<td>‘(Out) there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to ... =o’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adnominal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>-a’ (D3)</td>
<td>‘This’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lela’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>le ...-a’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lelo’</td>
<td>‘That’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>le ...=o’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>le ...=e’</td>
<td>‘As for that one’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bipartite deictics: other languages

- **Mopan (Mayan, Yucatecan; Belize, Guatemala)**

(4.12) (…) inw=ätan-t-aj \ ix=ch‘up a la’  
A1SG=wife-APP-CMP(B3SG) DET.F=female DET.N D1  
‘(…) I married this lady.’ (Danziger 1994: 894)

(4.13) Walak u=tz‘aj kolor a viidyo a kana’?  
HAB A3=give(B3SG) color DET.N video DET.N D2  
‘Does that video (camera) take (lit. give) color (pictures)?’ (Danziger 1994: 894)

- **Tseltal (Mayan, Greater Tseltalan; Chiapas)**

(4.14) Lum ay in-e  
there EXIST(B3SG) ?-D2  
‘It’s over there’ (Brown 2006: 239)

(4.15) Li’ ay-i  
here EXIST(B3SG)-D1  
‘Here it is’ (Brown 2006: 240)
bipartite deictics: other languages (cont.)

structures reminiscent of the Mayan bipartite deictics are also documented in

several varieties of Otomí (Western Oto-Manguean, central Mexico)

including Eastern Highland Otomí (Voigtlander and Echegoyen 1985) and Ixtenco Otomí (Lastra 1997)

and in Seri (isolate, Sonora; O’Meara 2010)
bipartite indexicals vs. reinforcers

bipartite indexicals bear a superficial resemblance with ‘reinforcer’ constructions (e.g., Roehrs 2010)

(4.16) a. **This book** here
    b. **That book** (over) there

(4.17) a. **#This book** there
    b. **#That book** here

the key difference

reinforcer constructions involving traditional demonstratives with proper deictic force (or ‘character’; Kaplan 1989) as one constituent

in contrast, no constituent of a bipartite deictic is a European-style demonstrative by itself

the constituent that represents the place of the referent in the semantic composition does not have deictic force

and the element that expresses the ‘character’ is a clause-level functional element, not a determiner or adverbial
bipartite indexicals vs. reinforcers (cont.)

Yucatec in fact employs constructions akin to reinforcers as well

\[(4.18)\]  
\[
\text{Le=ràadyo=o’ (yàan te’l=o’), } \text{hach ma’+lóob.}
\]
\[
\text{DEF=radio=D2 EXIST(B3SG) there=D2 really NEG+bad(B3SG)}
\]
\[
\text{‘That radio (that is over there) is really nice’}
\]

\[(4.19)\]  
\[
\text{A=ti’a’l le=liibro (he’l)=o’?}
\]
\[
\text{A2=property(B3SG) DEF=book PRSV=D2}
\]
\[
\text{‘Is that book (there) yours?’}
\]
bipartite indexicals vs. reinforcers (cont.)

these reinforced forms appear to be primarily used for referents

on which joint attention has not already been established

and to which the speaker cannot easily draw the addressee’s attention

Figure 4.1. Anchoring and attention calling in Yucatec spatial deictics
Table 4.2. All together now: Yucatec spatial, temporal, and person deictics in one epic table (Hanks 1990: 18-19)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1 Synopsis of Maya Deictics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal Deictics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSTEV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aGrammatical categories of IDS: OSTEV (ostensive evidential adverb); DMOD (deictic modal auxiliary); DLOC (deictic locative adverb); DLOM (deictic nominal); PART (participant deictic); DTEMP (deictic temporal adverb); DMAN (deictic manner adverb).*

*bPartial display of DTEMPS.
The two schemas differ “in two details: (i) the relative remoteness of the points standing for possible referents, and (ii) the foregrounding of the addressee rather than the speaker. The second feature is motivated by the fairly consistent association between the ‘there’ of te’lo’ and the addressee’s location.” (Hanks 1990: 437)
Hanks (1990) (cont.)

however, D2 = o’ is not inherently exophoric: Bohnemeyer (2012)

Figure 4.4. Summary of responses to eight of the 25 Demonstrative Scenes (Wilkins 1999)

the system submits to a scalar implicature analysis based on Grice’s second Maxim of Quantity
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