1 *Introduction*

GUNTER SENFT

Demonstrare necesse est
Karl Bühler

When we communicate we communicate in a certain context, and this context shapes our utterances. Natural languages are context-bound — and it is deixis that 'concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalise features of the **context of utterance** or **speech event**, and thus also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance' (Levinson 1983:54). In this introduction I shall first define and discuss the phenomenon of deixis, especially of spatial deixis in language in general, and present the means languages offer their speakers for spatial deictic reference. Then I will make a few remarks on why I think this volume is an important contribution to linguistic research on deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages, and briefly summarise the papers presented in this book.

The term 'deixis' is borrowed from the Greek word for pointing or indicating (Bühler 1934:36ff., 1990:44ff.). The term was first used in the second century AD by Apollonios Dyskolos, the '*princeps grammaticorum*', in his œuvre on Greek grammar (Ehlich 1993:124). Fillmore defines it as follows:

> Deixis is the name given to uses of items and categories of lexicon and grammar that are controlled by certain details of the interactional situation in which the utterances are produced. These details include especially the identity of the participants in the communicating situation, their locations and orientation in space, whatever on-going indexing acts the participants may be performing, and the time at which the utterance containing the items is produced. (Fillmore 1982:35)

Ever since Karl Bühler's (1934, 1990) classic work *Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache,* the study of deixis has been an important subfield within (psycho-) linguistics, because, as Levinson (1997:219) points out, 'most sentences in most natural languages are deictically anchored, that is, they contain linguistic expressions with inbuilt contextual parameters whose interpretation is relative to the context of utterance'. Thus, as Bohnemeyer (2001:3371) emphasises, 'to know what exactly is meant by *She brought this flower for me yesterday* and whether this statement is true, one first needs to know who uttered it, on what day, and where'.[1] Ehrich (1992) understands 'deixis' as the

[1] For 'unanchored' sentences see Fillmore (1975:39): 'The worst possible case I can imagine for a totally unanchored occasion-sentence is that of finding afloat in the ocean a bottle with a note which reads, 'Meet me here at noon tomorrow with a stick about this big''.

Gunter Senft, ed. *Deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages*, 1–13.
Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 2004.

general term for Bühler's various '*Zeigarten*' or 'kinds of pointing' (Bühler 1934:83, 1990:97), and '*Zeigmodi*' or 'modi of pointing' (Bühler 1934:80, 1990:94). The following kinds of pointing (Bühler's '*Zeigarten*') can be differentiated:

- Personal deixis allows distinctions among the speaker, the addressee and everyone else.
- Social deixis encodes 'the speaker's social relationship to another party, frequently but not always the addressee, on a dimension of rank' (Levinson 1997:218).
- Temporal deixis 'allows the speaker to point in time' (Trask 1999:68).
- Spatial deixis allows the speaker to point to spatial locations.

The following modi of pointing ('*Zeigmodi*') are differentiated:

- In the situative modus, situative deictic reference is made to referents within the perceived space of speaker and hearer (i.e. reference 'ad oculos' in Bühler's terms).
- Anaphoric deixis refers to a referent or segment mentioned earlier in an utterance, discourse, or text (see Dixon 2003:111ff.).
- Cataphoric deixis refers to a forthcoming referent or segment that will be explicitly introduced in an utterance, discourse or text (see Dixon 2003:111ff.).
- And imaginative deixis or transposed deixis (Bühler's 'Deixis am Phantasma') refers to an imagined situation.

Ehrich refers to anaphoric, cataphoric and imaginative deixis as 'discourse deixis'. Moreover, with situative deixis she distinguishes between the positional system of reference — *here* and *there* in English, *hier*, *da*, *dort* in German — and the dimensional system of reference — *before (in front of)/behind, left/right, above, below* in English. In what follows I will concentrate on spatial deixis,[2] because the contributions to this book focus on this kind of pointing.[3]

The positional system of reference localises areas in space in relation to, and dependent on, the speaker's or the hearer's position. The dimensional system of reference defines relations in space dependent on the speaker's or hearer's position and orientation. Discussing these two systems, the difference between primary deixis, i.e. the primary '*hic et nunc*' of actual speech — or, if you like, the primary '*origo*' (Bühler 1934:102, 1990:117) on which speaker and hearer must have agreed, however — and of secondary deixis, or secondary '*origines*' that are displaced, shifted or additional points of reference in the three dimensions of space — and thus presuppose primary deixis — becomes extremely important. For in secondary deixis, the positional and the dimensional system of reference are used differently. With respect to discourse deixis (i.e. anaphoric, cataphoric, and imaginative deixis), the positional system disregards the speaker's/hearer's actual position in secondary deixis. With respect to the situation-independent or 'intrinsic' use of deixis, the dimensional system of reference disregards the speaker's/hearer's actual orientation in secondary deixis. Here the differentiation between deictic and intrinsic orientation or

---

2 In what follows I heavily draw on Senft (1997:6–9).

3 With respect to the problem of space and time and personal/social deixis I refer the interested reader to the literature: see, for example Anderson, Keenan (1985); Clark (1973:48–50); Ehrich (1992); Fillmore (1975:28); Lyons (1982:114ff., 121); Weissenborn, Klein (1982).

perspective comes in. The following example from Clark (1973:46) illustrates this distinction: consider a speaker standing not far from the side of the car saying, 'There is a ball in front of the car'. In deictic, i.e. observer/speaker-dependent orientation or perspective, we understand this utterance as 'the ball is between the car and the speaker'. In intrinsic, i.e. observer/speaker-independent orientation or perspective, we understand this utterance as 'the ball is near the front bumper of the car' (see also Levelt 1986). However, Ehrich (1992:19) notes that we have to subcategorise the deictic perspective further into a speaker-oriented, a hearer-oriented and a third person–oriented perspective. This differentiation reminds of Bühler's differentiation of the four '*Zeigarten*' or 'kinds of demonstration' he calls 'der-deixis [this-deixis] ... Ort des Ich [place of the I] ... Ort des Du [place of the thou] ... and ... jener-Deixis [yonder-deixis]' on the basis of Brugmann's and Wackernagel's differentiation of '*hic-*, *iste-*, and *ille*-deixis' (Bühler 1934:83–86, 1990:97–100).[4]

Finally we also have to mention that there is a difference between positional and dimensional deixis when used in indirect, reported speech. In reported speech, expressions of positional deixis must be translated from the perspective of the speaker quoted into the perspective of the person who quotes. Again, Ehrich (1992:21) clarifies this observation with the following examples: assuming that the person who quotes and the person who is quoted are not at the same place, a speaker's utterance like 'It is cold here' must be translated in reported speech into: 'He said it was cold there'. With expressions of dimensional deixis this translation is not possible. Anderson and Keenan refer to these phenomena with the technical term 'relativized deixis' and emphasise that the 'nature of this process of relativisation, and the syntactic and discourse contexts which condition it, are highly complex and poorly understood' (Anderson, Keenan 1985:301).

Having mentioned most of the relevant concepts with respect to the phenomenon of deixis, especially of spatial deixis, I would like to deal now with the actual means languages offer their speakers for spatial deictic reference.[5] In many languages the repertoire of elementary linguistic means for spatial deictic reference encompasses

- prepositions or postpositions (e.g. *at, on, in* [topological prepositions], *in front of, behind, to the right* [projective prepositions]),
- locatives, i.e. local or place adverbs (e.g. *here, there*) and local nouns (referring to regions or areas),
- directionals (e.g. *to, into*),
- positional and motion verbs or verbal roots (e.g. *to stand, to come, to go, to bring, to take*),
- presentatives (e.g. *voici, voilà, ecce, there is* ...), and
- demonstratives (e.g. *this, that*).

---

4 With dimensional deixis we should also consider the ambiguity caused by different points of view from which spatial configurations can be seen. Hill (1982; see also 1978) differentiates between the mode he calls 'facing' which is similar to the observation of one's own mirror image and the mode he calls 'aligning' which is similar to a tandem configuration. Hill claims that Indo-European languages describe static configurations using the facing mode and dynamic configurations using the aligning mode (for criticism see Levelt 1986:198–200).

5 Note that Anderson and Keenan (1985:277) emphasise that the 'elements most commonly cited as "deictics" are those designating spatial location relative to that of the speech event'.

Moreover, we also find deictic gestures in all speech communities. People may point to something or someone with their index finger, with their eyes, with puckered lips, etc. Dixon even notes

> that some languages have different deictic gestures for relating to varying distances and visibility. In the Tucano and Arawak languages of the Vaupes River basin (spanning the border between Brazil and Colombia), for instance, we find (i) pointing with the lips for "visible and near"; (ii) pointing with the lips plus a backwards tilt of the head for "visible and not near"; (iii) pointing with the index finger for "not visible" (if the direction in which the object lies is known). (Dixon 2003:87)

The function of all these means is to localise (see Wunderlich 1986:227), to inform about, and to identify objects in space (see Fillmore 1982:45; Bühler 1934:146ff. (=1990: 163–165)). However, we have to keep in mind that with verbal deictic expressions we must differentiate between deictic and non-deictic usages. As Levinson (1983:65–68) nicely illustrates, we have to distinguish two kinds of deictic usage, namely gestural and symbolic usage. Within non-deictic usages, we also have to distinguish anaphoric from non-anaphoric usages. To give examples:

'This bush-knife is sharp' (deictic, gestural usage)

'This village stinks' (deictic, symbolic usage)

'I drove the car to the parking lot and left it there' (anaphoric usage).

'There we go' (non-anaphoric usage).

Levinson (1983:67) also gives an example where a deictic term (*there*) is used both anaphorically and deictically, namely in the sentence:

'I was born in London and lived there ever since'.

In the languages of the world we find different systems of demonstrative elements. In their survey on deixis in various languages Anderson and Keenan (1985; for criticism see Hanks 1987) present systems of spatial deictics that consist of two terms (e.g. English *this, that/these, those, here, there*), three terms (e.g. Latin *hic, iste, ille*), and more than three terms — such as Sre (spoken in Vietnam — 4 terms), Daga (spoken in Papua New Guinea (Milne Bay Province) — 14 terms), and Alaskan Yup'ik Eskimo (over 30 terms). Denny (1985:113, 117–120; revised version of Denny 1978) mentions even 88 terms in East-Eskimo that is spoken in the Western Hudson Bay and on Baffin Island. Anderson and Keenan (1985:308) draw the conclusion that 'a minimal person/number system and at least a two-term spatial demonstrative system seem to be universal'.[6]

With respect to the development of these systems Heeschen — in connection with his research on the Mek languages of Irian Jaya — presents the following interesting hypothesis:

> At the origin we have a pure deictic system... These deictics can be substituted, or accompanied ... by a pointing gesture. The more the ... formations assume discourse functions — i.e. the more they refer not to points in concrete space but to items previously mentioned in the linguistic context — the more they lose their potential for pointing to those things which are truly "up there" or "down there". (Heeschen 1982:92)

Denny attempts to explain the differences between deictic systems for spatial reference as follows:

---

6 See also van den Berg's (1997) detailed description of the seven-term system in Muna (Sulawesi).

> In a natural environment of non-human spaces one way to relate space to human activity is to use deictic spatial concepts, to center space on the speaker (or other participant). In a man-made environment this is less necessary — non-deictic locatives such as *down the road, through the door* and *around the corner* will relate space to human acts quite directly since the places mentioned are all artifacts designed to aid such acts ... as the degree to which the spatial environment is man-made increases, the size of the spatial deictic system decreases. (Denny 1978:80; see also 1985:123–125)

However, I would like to point out that this hypothesis is not undisputed.[7]

Of all these various means languages offer their speakers for spatial deictic reference demonstratives seem to have attracted special attention in linguistics: Green (1995:15), for example, states that 'for many philosophers and linguists, demonstratives lie at the heart of deictic issues', and Hyslop (1993:1) claims that 'the best way of studying the expression of spatial deixis in language is via the system of demonstratives'. And this special interest is very well documented in the literature. Anderson and Keenan (1985), for example, provide the by now classic overview of deixis with an extensive part on demonstratives. Himmelmann (1996) — on the basis of discourse data from only five languages — presents a taxonomy of what he claims to be universal uses of demonstratives in narrative discourse. He summarises the result of his research as follows: 'Demonstratives are used either in establishing a referent in the universe of discourse for the first time (situational and discourse deictic uses) or to single out a certain referent among already established referents (tracking and recognitional use)'. As already mentioned, he claims (Himmelmann 1996:240, 242) that 'all of these four major uses and only these four major uses ... are universally attested in natural languages'. Diessel (1999:1) 'provides the first large-scale analysis of demonstratives from a crosslinguistic and diachronic perspective', defining demonstratives and discussing their morphology, their semantics, their syntax, their pragmatic use and their grammaticalisation.[8] Dixon (2003) presents a typology of parameters of variation associated with nominal, local, adverbial and verbal demonstratives, surveying their basic characteristics, forms, functions and types of reference. And Enfield (2003) and Ozyürek (1998) discuss the use of demonstratives in interaction.

Of the many observations made, and insights gained, in these publications I will mention just a few that are relevant for understanding the systems of demonstratives presented in this volume.

Discussing the pragmatics of demonstratives Diessel (1999) points out that we have to differentiate between exophoric and endophoric uses of demonstratives (see also Burenhult 2003): 'Exophoric demonstratives focus the hearer's attention on entities in the situation surrounding the interlocuters' (Diessel 1999:94). 'The endophoric use is ... subdivided into the *anaphoric, discourse deictic* and *recognitional* uses. Anaphoric and discourse deictic demonstratives refer to elements of the ongoing discourse ... Recognitional demonstratives

---

7 For a more modified version of this hypothesis see Ebert (1985:266ff.): 'In lokalen Sprachen werden Ausdrücke räumlicher Orientierung in der Regel spezifizierter und häufiger verwendet als in großen Sprachgemeinschaften mit einer langen Schrifttradition ... Ich vermute, daß auch in der deutschen Umgangssprache, und besonders in Dialekten, räumliche Orientierung eine sehr viel größere Rolle spielt als in der Hochsprache'. ['Local languages usually use expressions of spatial orientation more specifically and more frequently than big speech communities with a long writing tradition ... I assume that spatial orientation is much more important in colloquial German and especially in dialects than it is in educated standard German']. See also Dixon (2003:106ff., footnote 10). For a rejection of Denny's hypothesis and for a completely different position see Fillmore (1982:40–41).

8 For critical discussions of Diessel's findings and claims see Dixon (2003:106ff., footnotes 2, 4, 5, 8–10, and 12) and Enfield (2003:40–42).

... are used to indicate that the hearer is able to identify the referent based on specific shared knowledge (1999:91).

Himmelmann (1996:243) and Dixon (2003:93ff.) address the question of formal and functional markedness distinctions within demonstrative systems: 'which term from a spatially-determined system will be used in neutral circumstances, if spatial location is not relevant?' (Dixon 2003:93). Contrary to Lyons (1977:647) who claims that *that* is the unmarked term in English, Dixon (2003:93) — on the basis of his exploration of the deictic reference of *this* and *that* — concludes that *this* is the unmarked term in deictic use. However, he concedes that 'the question of markedness is a difficult one' (Dixon 2003:93). Himmelmann (1996:243) even questions 'whether it is possible (and useful) to determine the respective markedness of demonstratives'.

Enfield (2003:108) points out that some demonstrative systems are 'person-oriented'. Diessel (1999:50) characterises these systems as systems where 'the location of the hearer serves as a reference point' for 'the location of the referent' (see also Anderson and Keenan 1985:284). In his analyses of the interactional use of demonstratives in Lao Enfield (2003:108) points out that 'speakers frame their linguistic choices under the assumption of a maxim of recipient design (Sacks & Schegloff 1979)'. He convincingly shows that

> speakers tailor their utterance so that addressees are not required to make reference to information that the speaker knows or assumes they do not have access to. In turn, addressees EXPECT speakers' utterances to be tailored so as not to depend on information that is not assumed by speakers to be already shared with addressees ...
>
> ... addressee location plays a crucial role in the selection of demonstratives, not only due to addressees' part in affecting the status of shared space ..., but also due to their part in determining how speakers' messages are designed (Enfield 2003:109).

Finally, I would like to mention here that some systems also have forms that encode the non-attention of the addressee to the referent. Ozyürek (1998) and Ozyürek and Kita (2001), for example, redefine the Turkish demonstrative *su*, traditionally referred to as encoding medial distance in opposition to proximal *bu* and distal *o*, as such a form. In their analyses it is evident that the referent of *su* is 'something you (the addressee) are not attending to now' (see also Enfield 2003:109).

The last studies mentioned here have clearly shown that 'reference is a collaborative task' (de León 1990:13) — an aspect that so far has been neglected in most studies on verbal reference in general. Despite the huge literature on the topic of deixis and demonstration a closer inspection of the literature (Senft 1997) reveals that we must know much more about this topic to reach a description and analysis of the semantics of space and spatial reference.

Some years ago Ebert (1985) compared the group of researchers dealing with deixis to hunter-gatherers — and I think she is still right. This anthology provides Ebert's hunter-gatherers with some further data and insights into the phenomenon that Enfield (2003:82) so aptly described as 'one of the great puzzles of linguistic science'. The contributions to this book focus on spatial deixis, especially on demonstratives and their spatial deictic use in Oceanic languages. The reason for this focus is the fact that up till now information on deixis, and especially on spatial deixis in these languages, has been rather difficult to obtain. It is scattered over a number of scientific journals and books or hidden in grammars. This anthology presents, as far as I know, the first collection of papers on deixis and demonstratives in the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian languages. The papers in the collection reveal the great variety and the complexity of (spatial) deictic systems in Oceanic

languages, and it is hoped that they stimulate further research in this highly interesting field of linguistics.

Seven papers discuss the topic of this anthology in Oceanic languages that are spread geographically between Papua New Guinea and Samoa. The anthology ends with Malcolm Ross's summarising overview of the presented systems of deixis and demonstratives from the diachronic point of view (moreover, he provides further typological and geographical information on the languages in focus).

Malcolm Ross also opens the discussion of deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages with his paper 'Aspects of deixis in Takia'. Takia is a papuanised Oceanic language of the Bel family. The majority of its speakers live on the oval volcanic island of Karkar in the Madang Province of Papua New Guinea. After a brief description of characteristic features of this rather uncommon Oceanic language the deictic system is presented. As Ross points out, 'Takia has a number of morphologically related sets of deictic morphemes. Each set has three non-interrogative members, distinguished from each other by their stem vowel ... Some sets also have an interrogative member'. Ross first examines the deictic differences among the three sets. The morphemes of two of these series are speaker-oriented spatial/temporal deictics differentiating between locations and times near versus distant from speaker. The morphemes belonging to the third series are used anaphorically; with their pragmatic-definite use they have a rather high functional load and thus occur more often than the morphemes constituting the other two sets of deictics. Ross then describes the morphosyntactic differences between the morphemes constituting this system of deictics. Takia has three different series of demonstrative morphemes that are used both adnominally and pronominally, but fulfil different syntactic functions. One of these sets and two other sets of morphemes are used as locative adverbials. A last set of deictic morphemes constitute manner adverbials. Ross then discusses locative and deictic expressions and directional and positional verbs with respect to functions that are related to spatial deixis. A brief excursus on compass points is followed by a summarising discussion of the data and analyses presented. This discussion points out that Takia speakers expend considerably more of their morphosyntactic resources on discourse deixis than on spatial deixis.

In her paper 'Spatial deictics in Saliba' Anna Margetts describes the system of demonstratives and place adverbs of Saliba in terms of the semantic distinctions involved and the morphosyntactic behaviour of the relevant word classes. Saliba is an Austronesian language of the 'Papuan Tip cluster' group; it is spoken on Saliba Island in the Milne Bay Province of Papua New Guinea. After a brief characterisation of the language Margetts describes its three-way distinction of spatially deictic terms which distinguishes a speaker-based versus an addressee-based proximal form and a distal one. The relation between the two proximal terms is not symmetrical, the speaker-based form is obviously the unmarked member of the pair. The three-way contrast between the Saliba spatial deictic terms is consistent across the four form classes of spatial deictics in Saliba: free demonstratives, clause-final demonstratives, place adverbs, and determiner clitics and demonstrative particles. Discussing the semantics of this three-way distinction in situational use Margetts observes the following: spatial distance and the presence or absence of touching, finger points, head nods or eye gaze are the most relevant criteria for the three-way choice within the demonstrative form classes. However, visibility, discourse status and ownership of the referent object also influence the choice of demonstrative terms. In contrastive use Margetts found that 'a demonstrative's spatially deictic meaning can be neutralised in favor of establishing a contrast'. Margetts also observes and describes certain contexts in which

all three forms may overlap with each other in terms of the spatial domain to which they can refer. The author describes and illustrates comprehensively the morphosyntax and the use and function of the four form classes of spatial deictics in Saliba.

My contribution is entitled 'Aspects of spatial deixis in Kilivila'. This Western Melanesian Oceanic language of the Austronesian family also — like Saliba —belongs to the Papuan Tip cluster group. Kilivila is spoken on the Trobriand Islands in the Milne Bay Province of Papua New Guinea. After a brief description of basic characteristics of the language, I first discuss the system of demonstratives. Kilivila has two basic sets of demonstratives, one that obligatorily requires deictic gestures, and one that does not require such gestures. The forms within these two sets can take over the function of demonstrative pronouns, of demonstratives that are used attributively, and of place adverbs. Both sets constitute a speaker-centred three-term system with respect to distances distinguished. The demonstratives that do not require an accompanying deictic gesture have to infix into their word gestalt a classifier which provides additional information with respect to the quality of the referent and thus helps the addressee to narrow down the search domain for the referent of the respective demonstrative. The use of all these demonstrative forms for spatial deictic reference is illustrated both in 'table-top' space and in space beyond it. Moreover, it is pointed out that speakers can also shift their basic reference point, that they use the distance-based system on the away or sagittal axis as well as on the across or left/right axis and that in the vertical dimension the Kilivila system is organised around the speaker's torso. Besides spatial demonstrative pronouns Kilivila speakers also use a number of other forms to come up with as unequivocal as possible deictic references. Among these forms are locatives and directionals. The use of these forms is illustrated. Moreover it is shown that in spatial deictic reference positionals, motion verbs, local landmarks and other environmental features are often produced to make it easier for the addressee to identify the object the speaker is pointing at. A brief excursus illustrates the use of demonstratives in discourse deixis (for anaphoric reference). The paper ends with a list of open questions with respect to spatial deixis in Kilivila.

Åshild Næss's 'Spatial deixis in Pileni' presents the very first study on this topic. Pileni is a Polynesian Outlier language of the Samoic-Outlier branch. It is spoken on the small coral islands of Pileni, Nifiloli, Matema, Nukapu and Nupani and in a few settlements on the island of Santa Cruz in the eastern Solomon Islands. After a brief characterisation of the language and its linguistic situation Næss describes the geographic environment of the islands where Pileni is spoken. She emphasises that 'the physical space that the speakers live in is small and lacks naturally defined reference points, which may mean that the necessary reference points for the subdivision and structuring of physical and social space are primarily taken from social relations and the immediate speech situation, to which many of the most common spatial-deictic forms refer'. After this important observation Næss first describes the Pileni three-term system of demonstratives. The system refers to the participants of the immediate speech situation. It seems to distinguish a speaker-based versus an addressee-based proximal form and a distal or 'third person' form which refers either to objects away from both speaker and addressee or to objects close to a third person. Interestingly enough, the addressee-based proximal form is obviously the unmarked form of the paradigm. Discourse uses of the demonstrative suggest that the Pileni system of demonstratives may 'be in the process of shifting from speaker-based to distance-based'. The author describes and discusses the uses and functions of demonstratives in noun phrases, in verb phrases, in relative clauses, and in discourse. She then describes the probably unique system of seven directional particles 'which describe the direction,

physical or social/metaphorical, of the action described by the verb they modify'. Three of these particles relate to the participants in the speech situation, three describe vertical direction, and one particle denotes movement away from a point of reference. Besides these extremely frequently used demonstratives and directional particles Pileni has a few other spatial-deictic forms, such as local nouns (which are usually preceded by one of the prepositions). The contribution shows that spatial deixis is an integral part of Pileni grammar: space is a very strongly grammaticalised category in this interesting Polynesian Outlier language.

Nêlêmwa is one of the twenty-eight Kanak languages spoken in the far North of New Caledonia. In her contribution 'Deixis in Nêlêmwa' Isabelle Bril presents a comprehensive overview of deictic, anaphoric and directional markers in this Oceanic language. Apart from a number of lexical items which constitute temporal or locative landmarks, the core system of spatiotemporal reference consists of three deictic and three anaphoric markers and five directionals which may be suffixed to a number of nominal or pronominal roots, to demonstratives, adjectives, presentative pronouns and to locative and temporal adverbs. The deictics constitute a speaker-centred three-term system with respect to distances distinguished. The anaphoric markers distinguish between discursive reference to something previously mentioned, to facts known to both speaker and addressee, and to something unknown or unreferenced. The directionals distinguish centripetal, centrifugal, transverse, upward or downward direction; they may also refer to static location. They are used for topographic reference, for cardinal directions and geographic reference, for deictic, speaker-centred reference, for endophoric deixis and for aspectotemporal reference. All these deictic, anaphoric and directional markers may have spatial, temporal and sometimes also aspectual reference. The author points out that deixis may have exophoric or endophoric reference. Moreover, she also briefly describes the role of body parts and locational nouns, especially the fairly restricted spatial usage of 'left' and 'right'. Bril amply illustrates all functions of all these means for deictic reference — even with an annotated text of Nêlêmwa oral history in an appendix to the paper. In her conclusion she emphasises that redundancy is a very characteristic feature of the system, as various 'markers belonging to different paradigms ... may co-occur in a sentence or paragraph ... to specify spatiotemporal location or direction'. She also points out that the use of the system sometimes also creates 'intricate spatiotemporal reference points which may be difficult to interpret when one is not familiar with the topography of the story or with the social context and hierarchy of the group'.

In her contribution 'Spatial deixis in Iaai' Françoise Ozanne-Rivierre first provides a general introduction to the phenomenon of different spatial deictic systems in various languages of the world, and a brief description of the linguistic and geographical situation of Uvea. She then describes and analyses the organisation of spatial deixis in Iaai, an Oceanic language of the New Caledonian group spoken on Uvea, the northernmost of the Loyalty Islands, a dependency of the Territory of New Caledonia. The rich system of spatial deictic locatives in Iaai distinguishes a speaker-based versus an addressee-based proximal form and a distal one; it distinguishes four locatives referring to verticality and topography ('down and towards the sea, down near speaker, up and inland', and 'beside at the same level'); it has two forms for referring to the geographical environment that, on a large scale (with fixed points), refer to 'sunset, west, west coast' and 'sunrise, east, east coast', and, in a limited setting (with relative points), refer to 'towards the sea, down below' and 'inland, on a high ground'; finally, Iaai has one form for anaphoric reference to items (persons, objects or places) previously mentioned. These deictic locatives can be

used as expansions of independent personal forms, of a presentative, and of a similative predicate; they can also function as determiners and as adjuncts in noun and verb phrases. These forms are often followed by place names, autonomous locatives or by a prepositional noun group that further specify the place referred to. In post-noun or post-verb position, however, they are always combined with prefixes that indicate either a location or a source or goal. Thus the system differentiates also between static, specified and unspecified location and dynamic source and goal. Moreover, the Iaai deictic system also comprises a set of centrifugal and centripetal directional forms expressing the idea of a goal. After this description of the system and its functions the author discusses the spatial and temporal value of certain of these locative deictics (one of the interesting observations here is that Iaai associates the past with the notion of 'down'). Ozanne-Rivierre then looks in some detail at the two forms used in large-scale references to the geographical environment. She finishes her presentation with a discussion of the observed and — at least at first sight — problematic overlap of the 'west-sea-down' and the 'east-land-up' locatives. However, this overlap is easy to account for when the Iaai spatial deictic system is linked with information on the local geography and ecology. Like Bril, Ozanne-Rivierre illustrates her analyses of this interesting spatial deictic system with a traditional Iaai text.

Ulrike Mosel's comprehensive contribution 'Demonstratives in Samoan' investigates the morphosyntax and the semantics of demonstratives from a holistic perspective, trying both to describe all kinds of uses of demonstratives and to explain how the meaning demonstratives have in actual speech situation is transferred to their other functions. Samoan belongs to the Samoic-Outlier group of Nuclear Polynesian. After a short introduction and a brief description of characteristic features of the language Mosel provides us with a definition of demonstratives and a morphological description of the Samoan forms. She then discusses deictic local nouns and deictic verbs, illustrates the syntactic functions of pronominal demonstratives, analyses the morphosyntax of adnominal demonstratives, and discusses the demonstrative in its function of an adverbial modifier. The second part of her paper is devoted to the analysis of the meanings of demonstratives. Samoan has seven demonstratives. In the actual speech situation they differentiate between objects or persons referred to that are:

(a) together with the speaker (here we have two forms that differentiate between formal$_1$ and informal$_2$ speech),
(b) within reach of the speaker,
(c) together with the addressee,
(d) within reach of the addressee,
(e) not too far away but not in reach of speaker and addressee, and
(f) far away from both speaker and addressee.

Four of these demonstratives are used in situational and non-situational deixis ($a_{1/2}$, c, f) — one of them being a default demonstrative which is used wherever the speaker/addressee distinction is irrelevant. The other three demonstratives (b, d, e) occur only in face-to-face interaction and obligatorily require deictic gestures. In anaphoric and cataphoric text deixis and in reference tracking the parameter of speaker/addressee orientation is relevant for the distribution of demonstratives: the speaker-centred demonstrative expresses cataphora, while the addressee-centered demonstrative expresses anaphora. Mosel explains this transfer of meanings from situational to non-situational contexts in terms of 'a metaphor of passing information ... from the speaker to the addressee'. She argues that cataphora

implies that the speaker still has the information he wants to give to the addressee, whereas anaphora refers to information the addressee has already received.

This volume ends with Malcolm Ross's chapter 'Demonstratives, local nouns and directionals in Oceanic languages: a diachronic perspective'. He presents the available reconstructed data on the demonstrative system, on the morphosyntax of local nouns, and on the directional verbs for the ancestor language Proto Oceanic and discusses the changes that have led to the systems of demonstratives, directional particles and relational nouns described in the preceding chapters. Ross's analyses show that the changes that have occurred since Proto Oceanic times are complex, indeed. However, he concludes the following:

(a) the semantic organisation and the constructional organisation of these systems remain relatively stable;

(b) grammaticalisation may result in the rise of new constructions; however, constructions may also be lost because two constructions can merge into one;

(c) changes in form within small paradigms can be radical, but these changes mirror the changes in the social conditions of the speakers of the respective languages.

As editor, I have to concede that, given the vast number of Oceanic languages, this anthology must face possible criticism for arbitrary and eclectic selection of the papers. However, I am convinced that the systems of deixis and demonstratives in the few Oceanic languages presented here illustrate the fascinating complexity of the study of spatial reference in these languages. Some of the studies presented here highlight social aspects of deictic reference — illustrating de León's point already quoted above that 'reference is a collaborative task' (de León 1990:13). It is hoped that this anthology will contribute to a better understanding of this area and provoke further studies in this extremely interesting, though still rather underdeveloped, research topic — studies that hopefully may put more emphasis on such social functions of deictic reference and thus may open up new and more interdisciplinarily oriented directions in the research of deixis and contribute to refine the theory of indexicals.

References

Anderson, Stephen R. and Edward L. Keenan, 1985, Deixis. In Timothy Shopen, ed. *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical categories and the lexicon*, 259–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen, 2001, Deixis. In Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes, eds *International encyclopedia of the social and behavioral sciences*, vol. 5, 3371–3375. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bosshardt, Hans-Georg, ed., 1986, *Perspektiven auf Sprache: interdisziplinäre Beiträge zum Gedenken an Hans Hörmann*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Bühler, Karl, 1934, *Sprachtheorie: die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache.* Jena: Fischer. (Reprinted 1965. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.)

——1990, *Theory of language: the representational function of language*. Translation of Bühler (1934) by Donald Fraser Goodwin. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Burenhult, Niclas, 2003, Attention, accessibility, and the addressee: the case of the Jahai demonstrative '**ton**'. *Pragmatics* 13:363–379.

Clark, Herbert, 1973, Space, time, semantics, and the child. In Timothy E. Moore, ed. *Cognitive development and the acquisition of language*, 27–63. New York: Academic Press.

de León, Lourdes, 1990, *Space games in Tzotzil: creating a context for spatial reference.* Berlin, Nijmegen: Mimeo.

Denny, J. Peter, 1978, Locating the universals in lexical systems for spatial deixis. *Papers from the parasession on the lexicon, Chicago Linguistic Society, April 14–15, 1978*, 71–84. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

——1985, Was ist universal am raumdeiktischen Lexikon? In Harro Schweizer, ed. *Sprache und Raum*, 111–128. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Diessel, Holger, 1999, *Demonstratives: form, function and grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dixon, Robert M.W., 2003, Demonstratives: a cross-linguistic typology. *Studies in Language* 27:61–112.

Ebert, Karen H., 1985, Wo ist 'da' in Papua? *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 4:259–278.

Ehlich, Konrad, 1993, Deixis. In Helmut Glück, ed. *Metzler Lexikon Sprache,* 123–124. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler.

Ehrich, Veronika, 1992, *Hier und jetzt: Studien zur lokalen und temporalen Deixis im Deutschen.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Enfield, Nick J., 2003, Demonstratives in space and interaction: data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79:82–117.

Fillmore, Charles J., 1975, *Santa Cruz lectures on deixis 1971.* Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

——1982, Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. In Robert Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein, eds *Speech, place, and action,* 31–59. Chichester: John Wiley.

Green, Keith, 1995, Deixis: A revaluation of concepts and categories. In Keith Green, ed. *New essays in deixis: discourse, narrative, literature*, 11–25. Amsterdam: Radopi.

Hanks, William F., 1987, Markedness and category interactions in the Malagasy deictic system. *University of Chicago working papers in linguistics*, vol. 3 (January 1987): 109–136.

Heeschen, Volker, 1982, Some systems of spatial deixis in Papuan languages. In Jürgen Weissenborn and Wolfgang Klein, eds *Here and there: cross-linguistic studies on deixis and demonstration*, 81–109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hill, Clifford, 1978, Linguistic representation of spatial and temporal orientation. *Proceedings of the fourth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistic Society*, 524–538. Berkeley: BLS University of California.

——1982, Up/down, front/back, left/right. A contrastive study of Hausa and English. In Weissenborn and Klein, eds 1982:13–43.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P., 1996, Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox, ed. *Studies in anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyslop, Catriona, 1993, Towards a typology of spatial deixis. BA honours thesis. Canberra: The Australian National University.

Levelt, Willem J.M., 1986, Zur sprachlichen Abbildung des Raumes: deiktische und intrinsische Perspektive. In Bosshardt, ed. 1986:87–211.

Levinson, Stephen C., 1983, *Pragmatics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——1997, Deixis. In Peter V. Lamarque, ed. *Concise encyclopedia of philosophy of language,* 214–219. Oxford: Elsevier.

Lyons, John, 1977, *Semantics*, vols 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——1982, Deixis and subjectivity: Loquor, ergo sum? In Robert Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein, eds *Speech, place, and action*, 101–124. Chichester: John Wiley.

Ozyürek, Asli, 1998, An analysis of the basic meaning of Turkish demonstratives in face-to-face conversational interaction. In S. Santi, I. Guaitella, C. Cave and G. Konopczynski, eds *Oralité et Gestualité: communication multimodale, Interaction,* 609–614. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Ozyürek, Asli and Sotaro Kita, 2001, *Interacting with demonstratives: encoding of joint attention as a semantic contrast in Turkish and Japanese demonstrative systems.* Istanbul, Nijmegen: Mimeo.

Sacks, Harvey and Emanuel A. Schegloff, 1979, Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction. In George Psathas, ed. *Everyday language: studies in ethnomethodology*, 15–21. New York: Irvington.

Senft, Gunter, 1997, Introduction. In Senft, ed. 1997:1–38.

Senft, Gunter, ed., 1997, *Referring to space — studies in Austronesian and Papuan languages.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Trask, Robert L., 1999, *Key concepts in language and linguistics.* London: Routledge.

van den Berg, René, 1997, Spatial Deixis in Muna (Sulawesi). In Senft, ed. 1997:197–220.

Weissenborn, Jürgen and Wolfgang Klein, 1982, Introduction. In Weissenborn and Klein, eds 1982:1–12.

Weissenborn, Jürgen and Wolfgang Klein, eds, 1982, *Here and there: cross-linguistic studies on deixis and demonstration.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wunderlich, Dieter, 1986, Raum und die Struktur des Lexikons. In Bosshardt, ed. 1986:212–231.

Senft, G. "Introduction". In Senft, G. editor, *Deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages.*
PL-562:1-14. Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University, 2004. DOI:*10.15144/PL-562.1*