

**Elena Mihas**

(Cairns Institute, James Cook University, Australia)

**Spatial deixis in Ashéninka Perené (Arawak):  
Semantics, pragmatics, and syntax of the demonstrative  
markers =ka, =ra, and =nta**

**ABSTRACT:** The paper reports on the speaker-oriented demonstrative clitics =ka ‘near speaker’, =ra ‘not in the speaker’s interactional space’, and =nta ‘far from the speaker’. It is shown that in situational (deictic) use, the most relevant criteria for the three-way choice are the referent’s spatial contiguity to the speaker, touching or direct contact with the referent, pointing with a hand or chin, and eye gaze. Apart from serving as markers of nominal definiteness, the bound forms are found to be used anaphorically, as well as to introduce new participants and mark ‘discourse-new-but-hearer-old’ information. The bound forms are also used on the syntactic levels of predication and subordination. On the predication level, =ka, =ra, =nta function either as adverbial locality clitics or modal operators, whereas in clause combining the bound forms occur as subordinating temporal or locative conjunctions. **KEYWORDS:** Ashéninka Perené; Arawak; Spatial deixis; Exophoric use; Endophoric use; Syntactic distribution.

**RESUMO:** O estudo analisa os demonstrativos clíticos orientados para o falante =ka ‘próximo do falante’, =ra ‘não no espaço interacional do falante’, e =nta ‘longe do falante’. Demonstra-se que em uso situacional (dêitico), os critérios para a escolha entre as três alternativas são a contiguidade espacial do referente em relação ao falante, o toque ou o contato direto com o referente, apontar com uma mão ou o queixo, e a fixação do olhar. Para além de servirem como marcadores de definição nominal, as formas ligadas são usadas anaforicamente, também como forma de apresentar novos participantes e de definir informação ‘discurso-novo-mas-falante-velho’. As formas ligadas são também usadas nos níveis sintáticos da predicação e da subordinação. No nível da predicação, =ka, =ra, =nta funcionam quer como clíticos adverbiais de localidade quer como operadores modais, enquanto que na combinação de orações as formas ligadas ocorrem como conjunções subordinativas temporais ou espaciais.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Ashéninka Perené; Arawak; Dêixis espacial; Uso exofórico; Uso endofórico; Distribuição sintática.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Ashéninka Perené is an endangered South Arawak language of the Northern Kampan (Campa) subgrouping spoken by about 1,000 people along the Upper Perené River valley which cross-cuts through the subtropical rainforest of the Andes’ eastern foothills of the Chanchamayo Province, Junín Region, Peru.<sup>1</sup> Currently, farming is the main occupation of the native population. Ashéninka Perené speakers grow citrus fruit, pineapple, bananas, and coffee for sale and cultivate vegetable gardens for their own consumption. Hunting is

no longer a viable source of food supply due to the scarcity of game, while fishing and snail harvesting still remains a regular activity.

The Ashéninka Perené language is highly polysynthetic, head-marking, mainly suffixing, with a very complex verbal and nominal morphology. It has an essentially nominative-accusative system of grammatical alignment. The basic word order is VO. Verbal categories include person, number, valence-adjusting/preserving, manner, direction, degree, aspect, reality status, mood, modality, and tense categories. Nominal categories include the locative case *-ki* with a diffuse spatial meaning to mark peripheral constituents (core constituents bear no case marking); morphologically expressed gender (masculine *-ri*, non-masculine *-ro*); optionally expressed plural number; possession; definiteness (encoded by the demonstrative enclitics); and tense.

Spatial reference occupies a prominent part in Ashéninka Perené grammar. Based on the typology of spatial relationships by Talmy (1983) and Levinson (1996, 2003), the language is found to employ the following frames of reference, defined as coordinate systems that speakers use in locating objects in space: (i) absolute or fixed-bearing-oriented, which describes the referent's position relative to the river Perené and its far bank, and other fixed landmarks such as local hills and the jungle, with the directional axes encoded by the terms *katonko* 'upstream' and *kirinka* 'downstream', *intatzikirona* 'the far bank of the river', *tonkariki* 'top of the hill' and *otapiki* 'bottom of the hill', and *niyanki* 'the center of the jungle'; (ii) intrinsic or GROUND-oriented, which describes the position of the referent (also known as FIGURE) in terms of its relationship to the GROUND (which is the reference object used to establish the position of the FIGURE), e.g., *intsompoi-ki tason-ki* [inside-LOC bowl-LOC] 'inside the bowl', *hinoki-ni mesa-ki* [above-DIM table-LOC] 'above the table'; (iii) relative or speaker-oriented, which describes the referent's position from the speaker's perspective, e.g., *yoka tyaapa=ka* [DEM.M chicken=DEM] 'this chicken'; (iv) blended, which describes the referent's position in terms of two features functioning as GROUNDS, *intakiro pankotsi-ki=ra* [outside house-LOC=DEM] 'outside that house', with the speaker-centered deictic perspective combined with the object-centered perspective.

To convey the complexity and richness of the investigated subject, I draw on the comprehensive contextual data from video recordings collected during the 2009-2011 documentary fieldwork in three Ashéninka Perené native communities of the Chanchamayo Province, Peru. The collected corpus shows that the relative speaker-oriented coordinate system permeates Ashéninka Perené discourse. This study's focus is therefore on the speaker-oriented three-term demonstrative system, commonly termed "deictic" due to its reliance on the speaker's body as "the zero point for a system of coordinates" at the utterance time (Fillmore 1982: 45). In particular, this analysis deals with the semantics and pragmatics of the ubiquitous bound demonstrative markers *=ka*, *=ra*, *=nta*, and also briefly surveys distribution of these bound demonstrative forms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Many thanks are due to the Ashéninka Perené community for their participation in this research. In particular, I would like to thank Gregorio Santos Pérez, Raul Martín Bernata, and Delia Rosas Rodríguez for their insights into Ashéninka Perené spatial deixis. I am most grateful to the granting agencies, the National Science Foundation (DDIG #0901196), Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (SG 0002), and Firebird Foundation for Anthropological Research for their support of this study.

Various uses of the demonstrative markers are discussed here in light of the taxonomy proposed by Himmelmann (1996) and further developed by Diessel (1999). Based on the pragmatic functions of demonstratives in human interaction, demonstratives are argued to essentially function either *exophorically*, i.e., reference is made to an entity within the spatial context of the immediate physical situation, or *endophorically*, i.e., reference is made to elements of ongoing discourse (Diessel 1999: 6). This analysis of pragmatic uses of demonstratives considers the term ‘exophoric use’ to be equivalent to ‘situational use’, and ‘endophoric use’ to ‘non-situational use’. I also adopt the terms ‘anaphoric/backward looking tracking use’, ‘discourse deictic use’, ‘recognitional use’ commonly used in the classifications of endophoric or non-situational uses of demonstratives by Diessel (1999: 95-107), Dixon (2003: 83-85), and Himmelmann (1996: 240). Anaphoric or backward-looking tracking use of participants involves reference to the same entity previously mentioned in discourse. For example, in *I will tell you about a man. This man had a wife...* a major participant, after being introduced with an indefinite NP *a man*, is referred to anaphorically by the demonstrative *this* in subsequent discourse. Discourse deictic use is associated with reference to propositions of the ongoing discourse which focuses on certain aspects of meaning, as in *That’s false*, where *that* refers to the propositional content of the previous utterance. Recognitional use concerns reference to specific knowledge shared by speaker and addressee. For example, in *How’s that sister of yours doing? that* refers to the ‘discourse-new-but-hearer-old’ information shared by speaker and hearer due to their common personal experience in the past.

This study of the three bound markers of the Ashéninka Perené demonstrative system is aligned with current research emphasizing the importance of bridging micro-contextual dimensions of situational use of demonstratives, e.g., spatial context, co-articulated gestures, eye gaze, with macro-contextual, interaction-driven factors such as prior discourse, shared memories, and cultural knowledge (Himmelmann 1996: 223). It is argued that for speakers, the resolution of deictic reference (i.e., selection of a certain element from the available inventory of spatial deictics (Levinson 2004:107)) is “part of a unified process of engaging in physically, emotionally, and socially situated talk” (Enfield 2005: 212). According to Hanks,

the selection and understanding of deictics relies on the simultaneous articulation of space, perception, discourse, commonsense and mutual knowledge, anticipation, and the framework of participation in which Sprs [speakers] and Adrs [addressees] orient to one another. Any one of these factors can provide the basis for deictic construal according to the demands of the ongoing relevance structure in which it is produced (2005: 207).

These two approaches, one which makes a basic distinction between situational and non-situational demonstrative uses, and another, which emphasizes the concept of relevance in the deictic construal of reference, form the basis of this investigation of the bound demonstrative markers. In particular, I focus on four major aspects of the investigated phenomenon by asking the following questions.

1. What is the semantic content of *=ka*, *=ra*, and *=nta* ?
2. What are the criteria for the selection of spatial deictic enclitics?
3. What are the uses of the three demonstrative markers?
4. What is the syntactic distribution of these markers?

This presentation will proceed as follows. A brief account of the Ashéninka Perené demonstrative system, with the focus on the semantics of its members, is provided in section 2; sections 3 and 4, respectively, examine situational and non-situational uses of the demonstrative enclitics *=ka*, *=ra*, *=nta* when they occur in noun phrases of simple clauses, as well as address in detail the selection criteria of the demonstrative enclitics in various discourse contexts. An overview of the markers' syntactic distribution, illustrating their pervasiveness in Ashéninka Perené grammar, is given in section 5, followed by conclusions in section 6.

## 2. OVERVIEW OF THE DEMONSTRATIVE SYSTEM

This section presents a brief overview of the Ashéninka Perené demonstrative system, along with a discussion of the semantic content of the *ka*-, *ra*-, and *nta*-forms. The Ashéninka Perené distance-oriented system, which anchors deictic notions by reference to the speaker, was previously described in terms of relative proximity or spatial contiguity of the referent to the speaker (e.g., Reed & Payne 1986; Mihas 2010). At first blush, this three-term system resembles the Spanish demonstrative system, which makes basic distinctions in terms of the referent's relative distance from the speaker, with *este* denoting referent's close proximity to the speaker, *ese* referring to entities farther from the speaker, and *aquel* to remote items. Nonetheless, it is argued here that the Ashéninka Perené speaker-anchored demonstrative system has a two-way distinction holding across the four categories of adverbial demonstratives, demonstrative identifiers, nominal demonstratives, and bound demonstrative forms. The fundamental distinctions made in the conception of this speaker-oriented demonstrative system are between DISTANCE of the referent from the speaker, either proximal or distal, and LOCATION of the proximal referent inside or outside the interactional space of the speaker. As seen in Table 1, the first proximal set consistently exhibits *ka*-endings while the second set of proximal forms is *ra*-final. The *ka*-forms indicate the referent's close proximity to the speaker, being in the speaker's interactional space', whereas the *ra*-forms signal the absence or non-localization of the referent in the speaker's interactional space. With regard to the exact interpretation of *ra*-forms, pragmatic inference typically gives rise to the association of *ra*-forms with referent objects being 'far from the speaker' (cf. Enfield 2003:115).

The third *nta/nto*-set has a distal value of being far from the speaker. The criterion of INVISIBILITY was argued to be associated with Ashéninka demonstrative adverbs distinguishing between reference to distant visible and invisible referents (Reed & Payne 1986:331), but evidence from the Ashéninka Perené corpus shows that the contrast between *(h)anta* and *(h)anto* does not involve invisibility. Rather, an additional physical dimension of the place's BOUNDEDNESS is superimposed on the distal semantics of the *nta*- and *nto*-forms (cf. Denny 1982; Diessel 1999: 49; Anderson & Keenan 1985: 295). Boundedness is

defined here in Jacobson's terms: bounded locations are "comprehensible to the eye in a single glance" and unbounded locations are those "whose entire extent is not comprehensible in a single glance" (1977: 42). In Ashéninka Perené, bounded places are relatively small in extent and have well-defined boundaries, e.g., *anta Marankiari=nta* [over.there.BOUNDED NAME=DEM] 'over there the village of Bajo Marankiari', whereas unbounded places typically involve large expanses of land or water, e.g., *anto intaina=nta* [over.there.UNBOUNDED far away=DEM] 'over there far away'. Thus, *anta* refers to remote bounded places, whereas *anto* is used to convey the unbounded qualitative dimension of the remotely located place.

The contrastive use of the *nta*-form 'bounded' vs. *nto*-form 'unbounded' is limited to the category of demonstrative adverbs, as seen in Table 1. Nonetheless, the corpus contains a few cases of *nto*-forms used interchangeably with *nta*-forms to index remotely located referents of non-masculine gender, e.g., *irona kooya~ironto kooya* 'that woman', *irona chochoki~ironto chochoki* 'that fruit'. The source of *nto*-marking on nominal demonstratives can be traced to the suffix *-nto*, used in quality nominalizations to describe human attributes, e.g., a hard worker, a beauty, a cry-baby, etc. Specifically, these nominalizations are derived from deverbal adjectives or nouns with the help of the gender-sensitive suffixes *-ntzi* (masculine) or *-nto* (non-masculine), e.g., *antavai-ry-a-nto* [work-ADJ-EP-NMZ.N-M] 'female hard worker', *shenka-nto* [crying-NMZ.N-M] 'female cry-baby'. It is hypothesized here that nominal demonstratives, which modify non-masculine referents, are either formed by the addition of *=ka/=ra/=nta* or the quality nominalizer *-nto* to the third person non-masculine pronoun *iroo*.

As mentioned above, the Ashéninka Perené demonstrative system is comprised of adverbial demonstratives, nominal demonstratives, demonstrative identifiers, and polyfunctional bound demonstrative forms. These four categories are formally distinguished on the basis of their morphology and syntactic contexts they occur in. The adverbial demonstratives *aka~haka* 'here', 'close to the speaker', *ara~hara* 'not here', 'not in the speaker's interactional space', *anta~hanta* 'far from the speaker, bounded', *anto~hanto* 'far from the speaker, unbounded' in Table 1 are derived from the root *(h)a*. They typically function as verb modifiers pointing to the location of the event or situation, expressed by the co-occurring verb. Adverbial demonstratives can also have a manner meaning 'like this', as seen in (1) (cf. Diessel 1999: 74; Dixon 2003: 69, 73).

Table 1. Summary of demonstratives

	DEM ADVERBS	DEM IDENTIFIERS/ PRESENTATIVES		DEM NOMINALS		BOUND FORMS
		M	N-M	M	N-M	
p r o x i m a l	(h)aka	nirika~ hirika	niroka~ hiroka	irika~ (i)yoka	iroka~ oka	=ka
	(h)ara	nirira~ hirira	nirira~ hirora	irira~ yora	irora~ ora	=ra
d i s t a l	(h)anta	nirinta~ hirinta	nironta~ hironta	irinta~ yonta	ironta	=nta
	(h)anto					

As manifest in Table 1, the set of demonstrative identifiers or presentatives is composed of the gender-sensitive roots *niri~hiri* (masculine) and *niro~hiro* (non-masculine) with the presentative meaning ‘here is ...’, ‘there are ...’.<sup>2</sup> The roots can be used independently, without the deictic demonstrative forms =ka, =ra, =nta. The presentatives typically occur in nonverbal clauses for the purpose of focusing the addressee’s attention on the referent, as shown in (2). The demonstrative identifiers are also found as stand-alone utterances with the meaning ‘behold’ (cf. Diessel 1999: 78; Anderson & Keenan 1985: 279; Senft 2004:3; Fillmore 1982: 47).

The nominal or adnominal/pronominal demonstratives in Table 1 are derived from the third person singular pronouns *iri* ‘he’ and *iroo* ‘she’. The gender-sensitive bound nominal demonstrative roots *iri~(i)yo* (masculine) and *iro~o* (non-masculine) always co-occur with the distance-specifying demonstrative forms =ka, =ra, =nta. The nominal demonstratives function as modifiers of nouns but can appear by themselves in a core constituent function, when the head noun is ellipsed, as seen in (3). Although the nominal demonstratives always precede the head noun, they may be separated from it by an intervening constituent. When nominal demonstratives appear in nonverbal and copula clauses, they function as presentatives (cf. Diessel 1999: 60-62; Dixon 2003: 65).

<sup>2</sup> The initial element of demonstrative adverbs and demonstrative identifiers exhibits free variation. In particular, in demonstrative adverbs, [a] alternates with [ha]; in demonstrative identifiers, [ni] alternates with [hi].

## (1) ADVERBIAL DEMONSTRATIVE

*Akishitatzi paryantzi aka, oipitsokiro.*  
 akishi-t-atz-i paryantzi aka oi-pitsok-i-ro  
 roast-EP-PROG-REAL plantain DEM.ADV CAUS-turn.around-REAL-3N-M.O  
 ‘She roasted a plantain in the fire like this, she was turning it over.’

## (2) DEMONSTRATIVE IDENTIFIER

*Ookotavakanaka, “Hiroka, hirika shirampari.”*  
 ooko-t-av-ak-an-ak-a hiro=ka hiri=ka shirampari  
 identify-EP-DIR-CAUS-DIR-PFV-REAL DEM.ID.N-M=DEM DEM.ID.M=DEM man  
 ‘Together with those who accompanied her, she identified them [villagers] as witches:  
 “Here she is, here is the man.”’

## (3) NOMINAL DEMONSTRATIVE

*Iyoka, peyari inatzi.*  
 iyoka peyari i-na-tz-i  
 DEM.NOM.M mythical.creature 3M.S-be-EP-REAL  
 ‘This [one], he is Peyari.’

The cliticizing *ka-*, *ra-*, and *nta-*forms in Table 1 are found with the three other categories of the demonstrative system: adverbs, presentatives, and nominal demonstratives. The bound forms, hypothesized to be phonologically reduced forms of the demonstrative adverbs, unlike the independent nominal demonstratives and demonstrative identifiers, are not inflected for gender. However, the bound markers are similar to other demonstrative categories in that they are not obligatory. They are distinguished from independent demonstrative forms in that they fill a specific slot in a noun or verb phrase, typically, on the rim of a noun or verb, or an NP/VP constituent. When the bound demonstrative clitics =*ka*, =*ra*, and =*nta* attach to a noun or NP constituent, they make a singular, definite reference to a referent object. Ashéninka Perené does not have dedicated markers identified as definite and indefinite articles, and its bound demonstratives semantically function like definite articles in being reference indicators (cf. Lyons 1977: 655; Schachter & Shopen 2007: 39-40).

### 3. SITUATIONAL USE OF THE BOUND DEMONSTRATIVE MARKERS

This section deals with the situational or exophoric use of the speaker-centered bound demonstrative markers =*ka*, =*ra*, and =*nta* whose primary function is “to focus the hearer’s attention on entities in the situation surrounding the interlocutors” (Diessel 1999: 94). Their other functions are “to represent the referent in the utterance as a variable of sorts...[and] specify a search domain for the referent in the context” (Bohnenmeyer 2001: 3373). The situational use is argued to have a few characteristic features: (i) it involves the speaker as the deictic center; (ii) it indicates a distance-oriented deictic contrast, e.g., proximal vs. distal; (iii) it is almost always coupled with gestures which support attention direction and narrow down the search domain; (iv) the reference is made to a physically present object (Diessel 1999: 94; Hanks 2005:195). In what follows, each bound form is analyzed in a separate section.



### 3.1. The *ka*-form

The near-speaker *ka*-series of proximal forms are used in contexts when the referent is in the speaker's interactional space, manifested by the object's being within the speaker's reach or being in direct contact with the speaker's body. Eye gaze and touching of the object are typically required, while pointing (with the finger or an open hand) is optional. Touching or any sort of physical manipulation of the referent appears to serve as the criterial property of the *ka*-marked reference. Figure 1 shows the speaker manipulating the bow and an arrow while commenting on their use. The *ka*-form is used in *iroka pyamenika* [DEM BOW=DEM] 'this bow' in (4). In Figure 2, the speaker refers to the root vegetable, which she scrapes with a knife, as *kanirika* 'this cassava root', as cited in (5). In Figure 3, the speaker, while commenting on the recipe's ingredients, makes a slight movement with her right hand, clutching a knife, towards the chicken thigh, soaking in a dish, and uses the *ka*-form in *tyaapaka* 'this chicken', seen in (6).

Figure 1. Direct handling of the referent (the bow) located in the speaker's interactional space is co-expressed with the proximal bound form *ka*



(4) *Iroka ivyamenika inyaakerira kontsaro, inkinteri.*

iroka	i-pyameni= <b>ka</b>	i-nya-ak-e-ri=ra	kontsaro
DEM	3M.POSS-bow= <b>DEM</b>	3M.A-see-PFV-IRR-3M.O=ADV	partridge
	i-n-kint-e-ri		
	3M.A-IRR-pierce-IRR-3M.O		

'This bow, when it targets a partridge, it will kill it.'



Figure 2. Direct handling of the referent (cassava root) located in the speaker's interactional space is co-expressed with the proximal bound form *ka*



- (5) *Nontakiryakiro kanirika.*  
 no-n-taki-ry-ak-e-ro                      kaniri=**ka**  
 1SG.A-IRR-outer.layer-REV-PFV-IRR-3N-M.O      cassava.root=DEM  
 'I will remove the skin from this cassava root.'

Figure 3. The speaker's hand movement towards the referent (the chicken thigh in the white bowl) is co-expressed with the proximal bound form *ka*



- (6) *Antsipatairi yoka tyapaaka.*  
 a-n-tsipa-t-a-e-ri                      yoka                      tyaapa=**ka**  
 1PL.A-join-EP-REGR-IRR-3M.O      DEM.NOM              chicken=DEM  
 'We will combine it with this chicken.'

A subtype of exophoric deictic use of the *ka*-form is ‘deictic projection’, i.e., transposing the speaker’s perspective to the character’s perspective (Diessel 1999: 95). In other words, deictic expressions can be transposed or relativized from the speaker to some other deictic center or *origo*, usually to the central protagonist (Bohnenmeyer 2001: 3372; Levinson 2004:111). When identifiable referents are referred to by the *ka*-form, it is done for the purpose of establishing the referent as a current “vantage point” who will “assume center-stage” in the text (Mithun 1987:189). This ‘perspectivizing’ deictic use is possible in an imagined situation which replaces the actual speech context. It can be accompanied with pointing gestures, just like it occurs in the immediate speech situation. For example, a text about the origin of witchcraft, which involves two main protagonists, an old woman and her grandson, half-way through the story makes a reference to the grandson as *evankarika* ‘this youngster’. This reference is preceded by a scene in which a shaman sees in his vision the grandson performing witchcraft and identifies the grandson as a witch’s helper. By using the form =*ka* with the basic meaning ‘close to the speaker’ in (7), the speaker places the grandson at the center of the imaginary scene for the audience to watch his actions at a close distance. This choice of the form =*ka* has to do with the establishment of the speaker’s perspective or point of view which enables addressees “to imagine themselves seeing the world through the eyes of others” (Chafe 1987: 54).

(7) *Yatsotakiro ishirini, yaminaki, inyaatziri, ah! Iritaki yoka, iritaki kashavaitaintsi imatzikante. Ironyaaka iyoka evankarika ipavyanakiri pashinipaye.*

y-atso-t-ak-i-ro		i-shiri-ni			y-amin-ak-i
3M.A-suck-EP-PFV-REAL-3N-M.O		3M.POSS-tobacco.leaves-POSS			3M.S-see-PFV-REAL
i-nyaa-tz-i-ri	ah	iritaki yoka	iritaki		kasha-vai-t-aintsi
3M.A-see-EP-REAL-3M.O	EXCL	FOC	DEM.NOM	FOC	help-DUR-EP-STAT.IPFV
i-matzik-ant-e		ironyaaka iyoka			evankari= <b>ka</b>
3M.S-cast.spell-APPL.PURP-IRR		now	DEM.NOM		youngster= <b>DEM</b>
i-pavya-an-ak-i-ri		pashini-paye			
3M.A-infect-DIR-PFV-REAL-3M.O		other-PL			

‘He chewed his tobacco leaves, looked, and saw him, ah! “It’s this one, he is the one who has been learning to cast spells.” Now, this young man infected others.’

### 3.2. The *ra*-form

The *ra*-form is used in contexts when the referent is not localized in the speaker’s interactional space, i.e., it is outside the speaker’s reach, up to a few meters away. As convincingly argued in Hanks (1992, 2005) and Enfield (2003), perimeters of the speaker’s interactional space are possibly determined by his or her engagement area, which is the place conceived as the “site of a person’s currently dominant manual and attentional engagement” (Enfield 2003: 89). The perimeter of this conceptually defined area, called *HERE-SPACE*, is hypothesized here to be relevant to the choices of proximal demonstratives in Ashéninka Perené. Apart from not being in the speaker’s *HERE-SPACE*, the *ra*-form is more likely than the *ka*-form to be accompanied by energetic pointing in the direction of the referent with the open hand, in addition to eye gaze. Figures 4-5 illustrate, respectively, the speaker who earns her living as an herbalist or healer, pointing in the direction of her husband, who is seated outside the speaker’s interactional space. The addressee is the

robe-wearing male, shown in Figures 4-5, waiting to be treated with steamed herbs. Apart from the husband and the patient, other interactants include the speaker's son and the linguist. The speaker's articulation of the term *noimi-poroki=ra* [my.husband-group=DEM] 'that husband-bag-of-bones of mine' in (8) is accompanied by eye gaze and the movement of her left hand in the husband's direction.

Figure 4. The speaker makes a pointing gesture towards her husband, co-expressed with the form *ra*



Figure 5. The husband's location outside the speaker's interactional space



(8) *Airorika nantziro, iri anteroni noimiporokira.*

airorika n-ant-tz-i-ro iri ant-e-ro-ni no-ime-poroki=**ra**  
 when.not 1SG.A-DO-EP-REAL-3N-M.O he do-IRR-3N-M.O-REL 1SG.POSS-husband-group=DEM  
 'When I don't do it, he will do it, that husband-bag-of-bones of mine.'

The *ra*-form can be used to refer to an absent referent, located outside the speaker's interactional space but presumed to be close by, e.g., within the perimeter of the house. In example (9), the speaker states that she gave birth to her second daughter, *pashini irora neenstitera* [other NOM.DEM my.child.DEM] 'my other, that daughter', alone at home, rather than in a hospital. The *ra*-form in (9) co-occurs with the demonstrative adverb *ara* with the meaning 'not here/not in the speaker's interactional space'. The utterance's situational context involves the audience which consists of the speaker's mother (seated next to her in Figure 6), stepdad, her daughter, brother-in-law, and the linguist. Shortly after the speaker began the story of her first baby's birth, the daughter, who does not speak Ashéninka, went to the cooking area, located within a few meters from the video shoot site. The cooking area was separated by a curtain from the conversational space, and we couldn't see the daughter. While making a reference to her absent daughter, the speaker looked in the daughter's direction but she neither made a pointing gesture, nor indicated the daughter's location with a chin nod.

Figure 6. The younger female speaker makes a *ra*-marked reference to an absent human entity, known to be located on the premises, accompanied by eye gaze



- (9) *Okimita pashini ironyaaka irora neentsitera saikaintsiri ara, aahatzi notzimiro pankotsiki.*  
 o-kimi-t-a                    pashini ironyaaka irora            n-eentsi-te=**ra**  
 3N-M.S-be.like-EP-REAL    other    now                    NOM.DEM    1SG.POSS-child-POSS=DEM  
 saik-aintsi-ri            ara                    aahatzi no-tzim-i-ro                    pankotsi-ki  
 be.at-STAT.PFV-REL    ADV.DEM            also    1SG.A-give.birth-REAL-3N-M.O    house-LOC  
 'Just like another daughter of mine who sat here, I also gave birth to her at home.'

As far as the contrastive use of demonstratives is concerned, the persistent use of the proximal form *ka* in contrast contexts manifests that the semantics of the two demonstrative markers do not involve distance values. Rather, they both indicate mere location of the referent. In particular, to contrast two replicas of fishing traps, *tsiynarentsi* and *shimperintsi*, both located in the speaker's interactional space, only the *ka*-form is used in *pashinika* 'this other (one)' in (10). Figure 7 shows that the speaker's reference to the fishing trap is co-expressed with the direct manipulation of the miniature trap. The contrast is achieved non-verbally, by eye gaze and by directly handing the object.



Figure 7. The speaker is holding the object to contrast it with the one lying on the table while co-articulating the bound form *ka*



- (10) *Oka, pashinika irotaki ikantaitziri shimperintsi.*  
 oka pashini=**ka** irotaki i-kant-ai-tz-i-ri shimperintsi  
 NOM.DEM.N-M other=**DEM** FOC 3M.A-say-IMP.P-EP-REAL-3M.O fishing.trap  
 ‘This (one), the other (one) is called *shimperintsi*.’

### 3.3. The *nta*-form

The *nta*-form is typically used to make imprecise spatial deictic reference to objects located farther away from the speaker’s engagement area. The object’s spatial contiguity to the speaker may span a range from a few meters to a large-scale geographical distance. The object’s invisibility is not of relevance, i.e., visible, partially visible, and invisible remote objects are encoded with =*nta*, as seen in (11), in which the speaker makes a reference to a remote hill whose view is obstructed by the mature trees and household structures. Neither do qualitative dimensions, e.g., the entity’s number or boundedness, factor into the use of the *nta*-form. The deictic *nta*-reference is generally coupled with a co-articulated energetic pointing gesture or a chin nod, as well as eye gaze in the object’s direction. In Figure 8, the speaker is seen pointing towards a relatively small area on the adjacent hill, reportedly inhabited by a mythical creature.

Figure 8. The speaker is pointing to a small area on the remote hill while co-articulating the distal *nta*-form



(11) *Anta amenaarini pairani otzishikinta.*

anta Ø-amen-a-ri-ni pairani otzishi-ki=**nta**  
 DEM.ADV 1PL.A-SEE-REAL-3M.O-R.PST long.ago hill-LOC=DEM

‘Over there we saw it [the creature] in the past, long ago on that hill over there.’

Some exophoric uses of the *nta*-form show an overlap with the *ra*-series in situations when the object is located within a few meters from the speaker. To gain insight into such uses, the macro-contextual factors should be looked into. For example, in (12), the speaker makes a reference to the fire as *paamari-ki=nta* [fire-LOC=DEM] ‘that fire’ while explaining to the addressees the initial phase of the herbal treatment. The audience includes the speaker’s son, making an audio recording of the healing procedure, husband, the patient, and the linguist. The *nta*-form is selected despite the fire’s close proximity to the speaker’s engagement area, i.e., the area where the herbal treatment is being administered, as seen in Figure 9. The speaker’s choice of *nta* rather than *ra* can be explained by the embeddedness of deictic construals into the daily lived environment where the accessibility of many objects is construed on the basis of multiple series of conversational exchanges which have to do with the maintenance of the fire, animals, surrounding vegetation, and other objects of the salient natural environment (Hanks 2005: 207). In the speakers’ and addressees’ ordinary practice, fire does not have to be mentioned previously in order for it to be salient in discourse, so the deixis in (12) points to “something in the intersubjective experience of common memory of the speaker and addressee” (Lyons 1977: 672). Note that the *nta*-form is typically used in the deictic function of pointing to an “inactive” referent, understood to be contextually available by means of its existence in the physical setting, while being in the addressee’s long-term memory but not in his/her focal or peripheral consciousness (Chafe 1987: 25).

Figure 9. The speaker, who is carrying a bucket of water in her right hand, is pointing to the fire, while co-articulating the deictic *nta*-form

(12) *Novakotero paamarikinta, osaavatanaki.*

no-v-ako-t-e-ro paamari-ki=**nta** o-saava-t-an-ak-e  
 1SG.A-put-APPL-EP-IRR-3N-M.O fire-LOC=DEM 3N-M.S-heat-EP-DIR-PFV-IRR  
 ‘I will put it [the bucket of water] in that fire, it will heat up.’

#### 4. NON-SITUATIONAL USE

This section deals with non-situational uses of the bound demonstrative forms. This type contrasts with situational use, discussed in section 3, on the following grounds: (i) non-situational use disregards the speaker's actual position at the utterance time; (ii) non-spatial contexts such as prior talk, background knowledge, shared values are of relevance; (iii) co-articulation of pointing gestures is not common; (iv) reference is typically made to a physically absent (remembered or imagined) object (Senft 2004: 2; Hanks 2005:197, 201-205). In particular, the following non-situational uses of the bound demonstrative forms have been identified: (i) participant tracking, (ii) introduction of new participants, and (iii) recognitional use. In what follows, a brief overview of each type will be provided.

##### 4.1. Participant tracking

By definition, participant tracking use makes reference to discourse participants in order to help the addressee keep track of what happens to whom (Himmelman 1996: 226; Mithun 1987: 189-190). In the backward-looking participant tracking use, the tendency is to use the form =*ra*, a cross-linguistically common phenomenon when just one demonstrative marker specializes in tracking use (Himmelman 1996: 226). In Ashéninka Perené, the choice of the bound demonstrative marker does not seem to depend on the activation state of the identifiable referent. Based on the taxonomy by Chafe (1987: 25) and Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 200), the *ra*-form is found to refer to any identifiable (given) referent which is either *active* (i.e., the current focus of addressee's consciousness), *accessible* (i.e., not in the current focus but is inferentially and textually available), or *inactive* (i.e., neither in the focus nor periphery of the addressee's consciousness). The pervasive tracking use of the *ra*-form in Ashéninka Perené narratives is found within a discourse node (i.e., a paragraph), at a discourse node boundary, and across a discourse node boundary.

Continuing topics in Ashéninka Perené are typically expressed with unstressed personal pronouns and person markers on verbs. The bound demonstrative =*ra* is taken here to be co-referential with non-topical antecedents which are not currently in the addressee's focus of attention. For example, a story about three major characters, Mapitzi, his rival Kovari, and Kovari's unnamed, unfaithful wife, begins with a male protagonist's introduction, followed by the immediate mention of Mapitzi in a full definite, *ra*-marked NP, *mapitzira*, in the next sentence, as seen in (13). The first mention of Kovari's wife *iinara* 'this wife of his' is also encoded with =*ra*, as shown in (14); in the subsequent discourse nodes, the *ra*-marking of *iina* 'his wife' persists.

- (13) *Tsame akinkitsatakoteri mapitzi. Ironyaaka mapitzira kamoryantzi inatzi.*  
 tsame a-kinkitsa-t-ako-t-e-ri            mapitzi ironyaaka mapitzi=**ra** kamorya-ntzi  
 let's 1PL.A-talk-EP-APPL-EP-IRR-3M.O NAME    now            name=**DEM** erect.dam-NMLZ  
 i-na-tz-i  
 3M.S-be-EP-REAL  
 'Let's talk about Mapitzi. This Mapitzi was an expert at making dams [to trap fish].'



(14) *Ironyaaka iinara Kovari, onintakiri.*

ironyaaka	i-ina= <b>ra</b>	Kovari	o-nint-ak-i-ri
now	3M.POSS-wife= <b>DEM</b>	NAME	3N-M.A-love-PFV-REAL-3M.O

‘This wife of Kovari, she fell in love with him [Mapitzi].’

The use of the *nta*-form for backward-looking participant tracking is also possible, although uncommon. The Ashéninka Perené corpus provides evidence that an identifiable referent in any of the three activation states can be encoded by the *nta*-form, rather than by *=ra*. Example (15), cited from an ethnographic text about the menarche ceremony, is an illustration of the tracking use of the new participant *kompatsiri* ‘spiritual father’. Once established in the preceding discourse, its second mention is encoded with the form *=nta*. For the purpose of forward-looking participant tracking use, either the nominal demonstrative *yora* ‘that.masculine’ or the personal pronoun *iroo* ‘3rd person singular non-masculine’ is found. In (16)-(17), the forward-looking tracking devices, the nominal demonstrative *yora* and the personal pronoun *iroo* are used, respectively. Note that *iroo* is primarily found in the discourse deictic function, when it refers to the preceding stretch of discourse, focusing the addressee’s attention on aspects of meaning.

(15) *Ponya yaminaki aparoni oyompatsirityari. Kompatsirintaha iritaki potsoteroni ovoroki.*

ponya	y-amin-ak-i	aparoni	o-kompatsiri-t-ya-ri
afterwards	3M.S-look.for-PFV-IRR	one	3N-M.POSS-spiritual.father-EP-IRR-NMLZ
kompatsiri= <b>nta</b> =ha	iritaki	potso-t-e-ro-ni	o-poro-ki
spiritual.father= <b>DEM</b> = <b>EMPH</b>	FOC	paint-EP-IRR-3N-M.O-REL	3N-M.POSS-face-LOC

‘Then they will look for a spiritual father. That father is the one who will paint her face.’

(16) *Ironyaaka maaroni ipimantaitziro ovanarontsiki, akante yora: saryomonka, atoonka, porootora.*

ironyaaka	maaroni	i-pimant-ai-tz-i-ro	o-vanarontsi-ki	a-kant-e
now	all	3M.A-sell-IMP.P-EP-REAL-3N-M.O	3N-M.POSS-store-LOC	1PL.S-say-IRR

**yora** saryomonka atoonka porootora  
**NOM.DEM** salmon tuna sardine

‘Now everything is sold in the store, we will cite these: salmon, tuna, sardines.’

(17) *Iroo yookanakiri ashitairi: inyaani.*

<b>iroo</b>	y-ook-an-ak-i-ri	ashi-t-ai-ri	i-nyaa-ni
<b>she/it</b>	3M.A-leave-DIR-PFV-REAL-3M.O	OWN-EP-1PL.O-NMLZ	3M.POSS-word-POSS

‘This our Lord left [for us]: his word.’

#### 4.2. Introduction of new participants

Introduction of new participants or the *new-this* use is a category of its own, viewed as an alternative to the introduction of a new referent with an indefinite NP (Wald 1983: 93). The source of the term ‘*new-this*’ is attributed to the nominal demonstrative *this* in English, used to mark new information, e.g., ‘There’s **this** new girl at school today and she talks really funny’ (Dixon 2003: 85). Some scholars treat the *new-this* use as a feature of proper situational use due to its propensity to firmly establish a new referent in the universe-of-discourse (e.g., Himmelman 1996: 222). In Ashéninka Perené discourse, brand-new, low-topicality animate

and inanimate referents are frequently introduced by the *ra*-form, with the *nta*-form being marginally attested in this function. When the speaker introduces a brand-new entity *Tzivyaarini* or Salt River, in (18), the first reference *nihaara* ‘this river’ is encoded by =*ra*. In a similar vein, in (19), when nomadic men from the mountains are mentioned for the first time in the narrative, the *ra*-form marks *shiramparipayera* ‘these men’.

(18) *Impampitsatzi ironyaaka nihaara, ikantaitziri Tzivyaarini.*

i-m-pampitsa-tz-i	ironyaaka	nihaa= <b>ra</b>
3M.S-IRR-follow-EP-REAL	now	water= <b>DEM</b>
i-kant-ai-tz-i-ri		Tzivyaarini
3M.A-say-IMP.P-EP-REAL-3N-M.O		Salt.River

‘He followed [rafts] along this river, they call it the Salt River.’

(19) *Arika ihatahe shiramparipayera, yaanahero.*

arika	i-ha-t-ah-e	shirampari-paye= <b>ra</b>	y-a-an-ah-e-ro
when	3M.S-go-EP-REGR-IRR	man-PL= <b>DEM</b>	3M.A-take-DIR-REGR-IRR-3N-M.O

‘When these men go back, they will take her along.’

#### 4.3. Recognitional use

Recognitional use is argued to have at least two criterial properties. First, recognitional demonstratives do not have a referent in the preceding discourse or surrounding situation. Instead, they are used to activate information that is “discourse new but hearer old”, shared by the speaker and the hearer due to common experience in the past (Diessel 1999:105-106). Specifically, the interlocutors share a certain type of ‘personalized’ knowledge “due to a common interactional history or supposedly shared experience” (Himmelmann 1996: 233; Fillmore 1982: 54). Typically, once the discourse-new-but-hearer-old object is identified, there will be no other mentions made to this referent in subsequent discourse. In Ashéninka Perené, recognitional use is expressed by the demonstrative form =*ra*. In fact, the recognitional form has composite morphology, comprised of *ra* plus an extra element *nki*, of unknown origin. The *ranki*-marked low topicality referential NP often occurs with the verbs *shiy* ‘be like’ or *kimi* ‘resemble’, as shown in (20)-(21).

Another central feature of the recognitional use is the speaker’s concern with the sufficiency of the shared information, intended to allow the hearer to adequately identify the described referent (Himmelmann 1996: 230). This situation often results in an incorporation of “additional anchoring or descriptive information into a recognitional mention to make the intended referent more accessible” (1996: 230). In particular, relative clauses or other modifiers are a concomitant feature of recognitional uses whose function is to provide supplementary information about the referent in question and facilitate its identification (Diessel 1999: 107). Examples (20)-(22) make evident the syntactic dependency of the *ranki*-form which requires an additional specification. In (20), a temporal subordinate clause is used to facilitate the referent’s identification, whereas in (21)-(22), a paratactic relative strategy is used to express the semantic linkage between the clauses.

(20) *Ishiyari michiiranki arika inkatziye.*

i-shiy-a-ri                      michii=**ranki**    arika    i-n-katziy-e  
 3M.A-be.like-REAL-3M.O    cat=RCG            when    3M.S-IRR-stand.ereect-IRR  
 ‘He was like that cat when it stands up on its hind legs.’

(21) *Ikimitari kiniriranki, hoo ooh ooh iritaki.*

i-kimi-t-a-ri                      kiniri=**ranki**                      hoo    ooh    ooh    iritaki  
 3M.A-resemble-EP-REAL-3M.O    howler.monkey=RCG    IDEO    IDEO    IDEO    FOC  
 ‘He resembles that howler monkey, [which sounds like] exactly *hoo ooh ooh*.’

(22) *Itsova chorito antsipataro ampee kityonkariranki, kameetsarini aahatzita arika osokatya iraani.*

i-tsova                      chorito                      a-n-tsipa-t-a-ro                      ampee  
 3M.POSS-beak    parrot.species    1PL.A-IRR-join-EP-REAL-3N-M.O    cotton  
 kityonka-ri=**ranki**    kameetsa-ri-ni    aahatzita    arika    o-sok-aty-a                      iraani  
 redness-ADJ=RCG    be.good-ADJ-AUG    also                      when    3N-M.S-pour-PROG-REAL    blood  
 ‘We will combine a small parrot’s beak with those red cotton [leaves], which are very good when there is bleeding.’

## 5. SYNTACTIC DISTRIBUTION

This section provides a brief outline of the remarkably diverse syntactic distribution of *=ka*, *=ra*, and *=nta* which are found to function on three basic syntactic levels, namely those of noun phrase, predication, and (subordinate) clause. In this presentation, noun phrases are taken to refer to entities; predication is understood to be the result of a relationship between a predicate (which designates properties or relations) and its arguments (which refer to participants); and clause is defined as a syntactic unit which includes a predicate with arguments and non-arguments, and which encompasses the speech situation as a whole (Van Valin 2001: 205-206; Dik 1997: 78-83; Cristofaro 2003: 109-111). Note that on each level, introduced below, demonstrative reference assumes different functions.

- (i) *Noun phrase.* In a noun phrase, the spatial deictic enclitics attach to the head noun or NP constituent, typically specifying the referent’s contiguity to the speaker in combination with the indication of the individual referent object’s definiteness.
- (ii) *Predication.* In declarative sentences with a verb predicate, the demonstrative markers either attach to the verb host, or the spatial adverb which modifies it, or to the negative particles *te* or *airo*, which immediately precede the verb. In declarative affirmative sentences with a verb predicate, the bound forms tend to function as adverbial locality clitics. In negated declarative clauses, as well as imperative and interrogative sentences, the *ra*-form displays modal senses. Specifically, it expresses either the speaker’s absolute certainty that the described events or situations are unreal in negated declarative clauses, or indicates epistemic possibility that the described events or situations are real in imperative constructions and questions about discourse participants (cf. Nuyts 2006: 6).

- (iii) *Subordinate clause.* In subordinate clauses, the bound markers attach to verb predicates as adverbial subordinators with the generic locative sense ‘where’. Depending on discursive context, the *ra*-form can also have an abstract temporal sense ‘when’, when found in a subordinating function.

Now, I will address the role the bound markers play on each syntactic level in more detail. In noun phrases in (23)-(25), the enclitics occur word-finally, attaching to various operators of nominal morphology: the locative case suffix *-ki*, plural number suffix *-paye*, diminutive suffix *-ni*, and the *ri*-marked nominalized verb, respectively. The deictic bound forms can directly attach to the nominal root. When the bound forms are used for individuated reference, i.e., for singular, definite reference to objects, specifying the referent’s relative distance vis-à-vis the speaker (cf. Hanks 2005:194; Lyons 1977: 647), they are taken here to function as demonstrative determiners.

- (23) *shirampari-paye=ra*  
 man-PL=DEM  
 ‘the men’
- (24) *paamari-ki=nta*  
 fire-LOC=DEM  
 ‘in the fire’
- (25) *otyapi-nya-ki-ni=ka*  
 down-CL:VACUOUS.ROUND-LOC-DIM=DEM  
 ‘the area which is a little bit under the cave’
- (26) *ar-atsi-ri=ka*  
 fly-STAT.IPFV-NMLZ=DEM  
 ‘the one which flies’

The identification of the categorial status of the bound forms is complicated by the fact that the spatial deictic forms frequently co-occur with independent nominal demonstratives and demonstrative identifiers, as seen in (27)-(28). Enclitics are generally expected to be interchangeable with unbound stressed forms, whereas suffixes are obligatory in this context (Diessel 1999: 24-25). Crucially, the bound forms are not obligatory, and either a free nominal demonstrative, or a corresponding enclitic, or both are commonly used in a given pragmatic context. Although the unconstrained co-occurrence of the Ashéninka Perené bound forms with independent demonstratives in noun phrases is suggestive of their intermediate syntactic status, their phrasal nature points to their clitichood, observed in situations when they appear on a nominal constituent rather than on the head noun, as shown in (29) (cf. Anderson 1992: 198-223).

- (27) *iroka kooya=ka*  
 this.N-M woman=DEM  
 ‘this woman’
- (28) *niri=ka yoka otyapinyaaki-ni=ka*  
 DEM.ID=DEM NOM.DEM lower.area-DIM=DEM  
 ‘Here it is, this area a little bit down.’

- (29) *pashini=nta oyaariri*  
 other=DEM her.brother  
 ‘her other brother’

On the predication level, as seen in (30)-(31), the demonstrative clitics point to the event’s or situation’s place, fulfilling the function of adverbial adverbs. The verb predicates, marked with demonstrative enclitics, often co-occur with the demonstrative adverbs used as verb modifiers, as seen in (31).

- (30) *Paita saikatsirinta?*  
 paita saik-atsi-ri=**nta**  
 WH be.at-STAT.IPFV-REL=ADV.DEM  
 ‘What is over there?’
- (31) *Akaha okantakintsitapakaka ironyaaka Maninkanironi.*  
 aka=ha o-kant-a-kintsi-t-ap-ak-a=**ka** ironyaaka Maninkanironi  
 DEM.ADV=EMPH 3N-M.S-be-EP-neck-EP-DIR-PFV-REAL=ADV.DEM NOW NAME  
 ‘Here, the incline of the hill is here, called Maninkanironi.’

In the subordinate clauses in (32)-(33), the *ra*-form occurs on the subordinate verbs in the subordinating adverbial function, expressing the ‘where’ and ‘when’ senses, respectively. Among the bound demonstrative forms, only =*ra* with the core absentive locative sense ‘not here/not in the speaker’s interactional space’, has a temporal subordinating extension ‘when’. The =*ka* and =*nta* forms retain their adverbial locative semantics, while giving rise to an abstract subordinating locative sense of ‘where’, as seen in (34).

- (32) *Ipyaakeri ironyaaka atzinakapakerira.*  
 i-pya-ak-i-ri ironyaaka atzin-ak-ap-ak-i-ri=**ra**  
 3M.S-disappear-PFV-REAL-3M.O now crush-CAUS.SOC-DIR-PFV-REAL-3M.O=SUB  
 ‘He [the tiger] disappeared, where the stone crushed him.’
- (33) *Ironyaaka oyaaripayera imishiyakiri, irira ipasavaitakirira.*  
 ironyaaka o-yaari-ri-paye=**ra** i-mi-shiy-ak-i-ri  
 now 3N-M.POSS-brother-POSS-PL=DEM 3M.A-CAUS-escape-PRF-REAL-3M.O  
 iri=**ra** i-pas-av-ai-t-ak-i-ri=**ra**  
 father=DEM 3M.A-punish-DIR-IMP.P-EP-PFV-REAL-3M.O=SUB  
 ‘When the father punished them, they, her brothers, were forced to leave [the house].’
- (34) *Ari ivaryaantzi ironyaaka, okanta okovenkatzinta.*  
 ari i-vary-ant-tz-i ironyaaka okanta o-kovenka-tz-i=**nta**  
 PP 3M.S-make.fall-CUST-EP-REAL now AUX 3N-M.S-be.dangerous-EP-REAL=SUB  
 ‘He would make [people] fall, where it was dangerous.’

In hortative imperative constructions ‘you will/won’t do that, right?’ in (35)-(36), which express an invitation to the addressee to act, the *ra*-form has a sense of potential modality, or possibility/ hypotheticality of a future action, carried out by the addressee.

Note that in Ashéninka Perené, there is no dedicated imperative paradigm, and commands are expressed via irrealis marking, often in combination with modal morphology, used to modify the force of command (e.g., dubitative =*ma~*=*taima*, counterfactual =(*tya*)*mi*). The imperative is undistinguishable from a polite request since the verb obligatorily takes subject person marker and irrealis inflection to express an unrealized action, as seen in (36). In negated irrealis clauses, including negated imperatives, the verb is marked for realis, as shown in (35). Clearly, Ashéninka Perené speakers use non-indicative modalities as a politeness strategy to soften a command and infuse it with polite overtones (cf. Aikhenvald 2010: 142).

- (35) *Airo pinyaatsavaitarotsira.*  
 airo pi-nyaatsa-vai-t-a-ro-tsi=**ra**  
 NEG.IRR 2s-play-DUR-EP-REAL-3N-M.O-NEG=DEM  
 ‘You won’t play with it, right?’
- (36) *Pisaikera.*  
 pi-saik-e=**ra**  
 2s-sit-IRR=DEM  
 ‘You’ll sit down, won’t you?’

In interrogative sentences, the *ra*-form cliticizes to the interrogative pronoun *tsika* with the basic meaning ‘where’ or *ninka* ‘who’, and is invariably followed by the modal clitic =*tya* which typically expresses the speaker’s impatience, annoyance, or exasperation, e.g., *tsame=tya* [come.ON-EXSP] ‘let’s go, for Pete’s sake’. When used in queries about core and peripheral arguments in propositions relating to the present, =*ra* has an epistemic possibility sense, as seen in (37)-(38). The basic characteristic of the composite morpheme =*ra=tya* is the speaker’s reliance on mere conjecture in lieu of any sensory evidence or logical reasoning as a source of information.

- (37) *Tsikatya ipaitaka?*  
 tsika=**ra=tya** i-pait-a=ka  
 WH=DEM=EXSP 3M.S-be.called-real=Q  
 ‘What could it be?’
- (38) *Ninkaratya ashitariri eentsira?*  
 ninka=**ra=tya** ashi-t-a-ri-ri eentsi=**ra**  
 who=DEM=EXSP OWN-EP-REAL-3M.O-REL child=DEM  
 ‘Who could be that child’s father?’

Yet in the syntactic contexts involving constituent and clausal negation, the *ra*-form is found to express a modal sense of the speaker’s certainty about the truth of the proposition. The negated clause is interpreted as containing a strong emphatic assertion. In particular, when =*ra* is inserted between the negative particles *te* ‘realis negator’ and *airo~eero* ‘irrealis negator’ and the verb, it is translated as ‘never’, ‘absolutely’, as seen in (39)-(40). Typically, no constituent is allowed to intervene between the verb predicate and negative operators. Example (39) is an illustration of the epistemic use of the *ra*-form,

expressing the speaker's absolute certainty about the truth of the proposition in a negated clause. Note that =*ra* also cliticizes to the nominalized verb *yoteroni* 'the one who will know it' to introduce a brand new referent, the speaker's mother-in-law who claimed to know the jungle well and insisted on her companion following her directions. As the story goes, the two women circled around the same spot for hours before the speaker convinced her mother-in-law to consider a different way out. The epistemic certainty function of the form =*ra* is also observed in sentential negation context in (41), expressed with the negative polarity verb *kaari* 'be not the case.'

- (39) *Tera nonintatyeri shiramparira!*  
 te=**ra**                      no-nint-aty-e-ri                      shirampari=**ra**  
 NEG.REAL=DEM                      1SG.A-like-PROG-IRR-3M.O                      man=DEM.NOM  
 'I sure never liked that man!'
- (40) *Eerora nayiri.*  
 airo=**ra**                      n-ayi-ri  
 NEG.IRR=DEM                      1SG.A-take.IRR-3M.O  
 'I'll absolutely never marry him.'
- (41) *Kaarira yoteronira, ari ontzimpinakakai.*  
 kaari=**ra**                      yo-t-e-ro-ni=**ra**                      ari  
 NP=DEM                      know-EP-IRR-3N-M.O-REL.IRR=DEM.NOM                      PP  
 o-n-tzimpin-ak-ak-ai  
 3N-M.A-IRR-get.lost-CAUS.SOC-PFV-1PL.O  
 'It will absolutely not be the case that the one who will know it [the jungle], will make us get lost.'

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

As indicated in the Introduction, this paper's objective was to examine the semantics, pragmatics, and syntactic distribution of the demonstrative enclitics =*ka*, =*ra*, and =*nta*. With regard to the semantic content of the markers, this analysis has demonstrated that the spatial deictic enclitics encode, essentially, a two-way distinction: 'near speaker' (= *ka* and = *ra*) and 'far from speaker' (= *nta*). The two proximal deictic forms = *ka* and = *ra* have been found to have opposing values of 'close to the speaker/in the speaker's interactional space' and 'not close to the speaker/not in the speaker's interactional space (absent)', respectively. The basic function of the bound demonstrative forms is that of markers of nominal definiteness (cf. Dryer 2011: Chapter 37). The two-way distinction, proximal vs. distal, is shown in Table 1 to hold for other categories of the Ashéninka Perené demonstrative system, including demonstrative adverbs, nominal demonstratives, and demonstrative identifiers. Specifically, when the bound demonstrative markers are used in the formation of nominal demonstratives (which function as noun modifiers or arguments) and demonstrative identifiers in verbless clauses, they morphologically specify distance from the speaker to the referent. The historical source of the demonstrative enclitics is attributed to the demonstrative adverbs.



As far as the question of the markers' selection criteria is concerned, this analysis has sufficiently demonstrated that an interactive situation cannot be described in terms of mere spatial values and immediate physical situation surrounding the speaker and the addressee and that the most relevant criteria for demonstrative selection may be linked to shared memories, background knowledge, prior talk, and other factors. To this end, it has been shown that in situational (deictic) use, the most relevant criteria for the ways of identifying the referent is its spatial contiguity to the speaker, touching or direct contact with the referent, pointing with a hand or chin in its direction, and eye gaze. Nonetheless, example (12) has illustrated a peculiar situational use of =*nta* in *paamarikinta* 'in that fire', when the spatial dimension of the physical situation is canceled by the relevance of the referent object's salience and accessibility in the addressee's consciousness. In Ashéninka Perené discourse, the rule of thumb is to use =*ra*, when an object is located within the perimeter of the living area but outside of the speaker's immediate engagement area, but to select =*nta* to refer to remote objects located far from the speaker. In that particular situation, when the speaker made a reference to the fire, the demonstrative selection was based on the "inactive" status of the salient referent, which is typically marked by =*nta*. A detailed summary of the demonstratives' selection criteria is given in Table 2.

As to the demonstratives' uses in nominal reference, it has been revealed that apart from the deictic referential, gestural use, other pragmatic functions of the bound markers are participant-tracking in prior discourse, introduction of new participants, and recognitional use. In particular, =*ra* has been found to occur both situationally and non-situationally whereas =*ka* and =*nta* are essentially used situationally. In the case of =*nta*, data indicate a possibility of its non-situational uses in participant tracking of salient objects of natural environment whose activation status is described as "inactive" in the hearer's focus of attention, as well as in introducing new participants.

In relation to the markers' uses, their functional markedness is considered here in terms of Aikhenvald and Dixon (1998), as relating to the context of use: "the marked terms may be used each in a restricted, specifiable context, with the unmarked term being used in all other circumstances" (60). As seen in Table 2, with respect to =*ka* and =*nta*, =*ra* is a functionally unmarked term. In Table 2, the demonstratives' uses are given in small caps, whereas the selection criteria appear as small bullets.

Table 2. Summary of the demonstrative markers' selection criteria in pragmatic functions

FORM	SELECTION CRITERIA/FUNCTIONS	
	SITUATIONAL (DEICTIC) GESTURAL USE	NON-SITUATIONAL (NON-DEICTIC) USE
= <i>ka</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• close to the speaker, in the speaker's interactional space</li> <li>• touching, direct handling of object, low energy pointing with a hand</li> <li>• eye gaze</li> </ul>	
= <i>ra</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not close to the speaker/not in the speaker's interactional space</li> <li>• energetic pointing with a hand, or a chin nod</li> <li>• eye gaze</li> </ul>	(MAJOR) PARTICIPANT TRACKING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• medium-to-high topicality</li> <li>• "active"/ "accessible"/ "inactive" status in the addressee's consciousness</li> </ul> INTRODUCTION OF NEW PARTICIPANTS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no mention in prior discourse</li> <li>• low topicality</li> <li>• likely to be topic of subsequent discourse</li> </ul> RECOGNITIONAL USE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• low topicality</li> <li>• no mention in prior discourse</li> <li>• unlikely to be topic of subsequent discourse</li> <li>• shared knowledge with the addressee due to personal history or experience</li> </ul>
= <i>nta</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• far from the speaker</li> <li>• energetic pointing with a hand, or a chin nod</li> <li>• eye gaze</li> </ul>	PARTICIPANT TRACKING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• typically, salient object of natural environment</li> <li>• "inactive" status in the addressee's consciousness</li> </ul> INTRODUCTION OF NEW PARTICIPANTS (UNCOMMON) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no mention in prior discourse</li> <li>• low topicality</li> <li>• likely to be topic of subsequent discourse</li> </ul>

Finally, this analysis of the demonstrative bound forms has demonstrated that spatial deictic anchoring in Ashéninka Perené is remarkably pervasive. The spatial deictic enclitics appear in an intricate system of localizations exhibiting various links between location in space and the organization of syntactic structure (cf. Robert 2006 on the semantics and syntax of the Wolof spatially indeterminate demonstrative *-u*). The close examination of presented data has shown that functions of the Ashéninka Perené bound markers are not limited to nominal reference. They are also used with verb predicates as either adverbial locality clitics or modal operators, and in clause combining as subordinating temporal and locative conjunctions. The summary of the syntactic distribution and functions of the bound demonstrative markers is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of distribution and functions of the bound demonstratives

SYNTACTIC LEVEL	FORM	FUNCTION	MOOD AND POLARITY VALUES
Noun phrase	=ka, =ra, =nta	demonstrative determiner	
Predication	=ka, = ra, =nta	adverbial modifier of place	affirmative declarative
	=ra, =nta	epistemic certainty	negated declarative
	=ra	epistemic possibility	negated and non-negated imperative; content questions
Subordinate clause	=ka, =ra, =nta	locative subordinator 'where'	non-negated
	=ra	temporal subordinator 'when'	

## REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD, Alexandra (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; DIXON, R. M. W. (1998). Dependencies between grammatical systems. *Language* 74 (1): 56-80.
- ANDERSON, Stephen (1992). *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; KEENAN, Edward (1985). Deixis. In Timothy Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. 3*, pp. 259-308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BOHNEMEYER, Jürgen (2001). Deixis. In Neil J. Smelser, Paul B. Baltes (eds.). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 5*, pp. 3371-3375. Oxford: Elsevier.
- CHAFE, Wallace (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In Russell Tomlin (ed.). *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, pp. 21-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- CRISTOFARO, Sonia (2003). *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DENNY, J. Peter (1982). Semantics of the Inuktitut (Eskimo) spatial deictics. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48 (4): 359-384.
- DIK, Simon C. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar: Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition, ed. Kees Hengeveld. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DIESSEL, Holger (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DIXON, R. M. W. (2003). Demonstratives: A cross-linguistic typology. *Studies in Language* 27 (1): 61-112.
- DRYER, Mathew (2011). Definite articles. Chapter 37. In Matthew Dryer, Martin Haspelmath (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Available at: <http://wals.info/chapter/37/>. Accessed: 06/02/2012.
- ENFIELD, Nicholas (2003). Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79 (1): 82-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (2005). Comments on William Hanks' "Explorations in the deictic field". *Current Anthropology* 46 (2): 212.

- FILLMORE, Charles (1982). Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. In Robert J. Jarvella, Wolfgang Klein (eds.). *Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deictics and Related Topics*, pp. 31-39. London: Wiley.
- HANKS, William (1992). The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Alessandro Duranti, Charles Goodwin (eds.). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, pp. 43-77. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(2005). Explorations in the deictic field. *Current Anthropology* 46 (3): 191-212.
- HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus (1996). Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.). *Studies in Anaphora*, pp. 205-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- JACOBSON, Steven (1977). *A Grammatical Sketch of Siberian Yupik Eskimo*. Fairbanks: Alaska Native Language Center.
- LEVINSON, Stephen (1996). Language and space. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25: 353-382.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(2003). *Space in Language and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_.(2004). Deixis. In Laurence Horn, Gregory Ward (eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, pp. 97-121. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- LYONS, John (1977). *Semantics, Vol. 2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MIHAS, Elena (2010). Essentials of Ashéninka Perené Grammar. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin dissertation.
- MITHUN, Marianne (1987). The grammatical nature and discourse power of demonstratives. *Berkeley Linguistics Society Proceedings* 13: 184-194.
- NUYTS, Jan (2006). Introduction. In William Frawley (ed.). *The Expression of Modality*, pp. 1-25. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- REED, Judy; PAYNE, David (1986). Ashéninka (Campa) pronominals. In Ursula Wiesemann (ed.). *Pronominal Systems*, pp. 323-31. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- ROBERT, Stéphane (2006). Deictic space in Wolof: Discourse, syntax and the importance of absence. In Maya Hickmann, Stéphane Robert (eds.). *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, pp. 155-174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- SENF, Günter (2004). Introduction. In Günter Senft (ed.). *Deixis and Demonstratives in Oceanic Languages*, pp. 1-13. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- SCHACHTER, Paul; SHOPEN, Timothy (2007). Parts-of-speech systems. In Timothy Shopen (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. 1: Clause Structure*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp.1-60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TALMY, Leonard (1983). How language structures space. In Herbert Pick, Linda Acredolo (eds.). *Spatial Orientation: Theory, Research, and Application*, pp. 225-282. New York: Plenum Press.
- VAN VALIN, Robert (2001). *An Introduction to Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_; LaPOLL, Randy (1997). *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WALD, Benji (1983). Referents and topic within and across discourse units: Observations from current vernacular English. In Flora Klein-Andreu (ed.). *Discourse-Perspectives on Syntax*, pp. 91-116. New York: Academic Press.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

A-subject of transitive verb; ADJ-adjectivizer; ADV-adverbial; APPL-applicative; AUG-augmentative; AUX-auxiliary; CAUS-causative; CL-classifier; CNT.F-counterfactual; COP-copula; DEM-demonstrative; DIM-diminutive; DIR-directional; DUB-dubitative; DUR-durative; EMPH-emphatic; EP-epenthetic; EXCL-exclamation; EXSP-exasperation; FOC-focus; FRUS-frustrative; ID-identifier; IDEO-ideophone; IMP.P-impersonal passive; IPFV-imperfective; ICPL-incompletive; IRR-irrealis; LOC-locative; M-masculine; NEG-negative; N-M-non-masculine; NMLZ-nominalizer; NOM-nominal; NP-negative polarity; O-object of transitive verb; PFV-perfective; PL-plural; POSS-possessive; PP-positive polarity; PROG-progressive; PURP-purpose; Q-interrogative; R.PST-remote past; REAL-realis; RCG-recognitional; REGR-regressive; REL-relativizer; REP-repetitive; S-subject of intransitive verb; SG-singular; SOC-sociative; STAT-stative; SUB-subordinator; WH-content interrogative.

Recebido: 21/2/2012

Versão revista: 8/5/2012

Aceito: 30/5/2012.