

Studies in Native American Languages IV

Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics

Volume 10, number 2, 1985

<i>The Editors</i>	forward	
<i>James L. Armagost</i>	On Predicting Voiceless in Comanche	1
<i>George A. Broadwell</i>	Internally Headed Relative Clauses in Choctaw	16
<i>Mary Howe</i>	Shifting Deictic Centers in the Hualapai Demonstrative System	25
<i>Richard W. Lungstrum</i>	Velar Palatalizations in Dakota	38
<i>Monica Macauley</i>	On the Semantics of 'Come,' 'Go,' and 'Arrive' in Otomanguan Languages	56
<i>Mary Pepper</i>	Slavey Expressive Terms: Synchronic Evidence for Diachronic Change	85
<i>Paul Proulx</i>	Notes on Yurok Derivation	101
<i>David S. Rood</i>	Definiteness Subcategorized in Discourse: Lakhota <i>kʔy</i>	144
	Cumulative contents of volumes 1-10	162

FOREWORD

It is indeed gratifying to recognize the degree of acceptance the *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* has come to enjoy, and this is especially true for the series of *Studies in Native American Languages*. Even before the call for papers went out in the fall, we had received inquiries from prospective contributors, and the response to the call itself was remarkable in quality as well as diversity.

This year the *KWPL* marks its first decade of existence, and we are publishing two numbers. Number one is devoted to theoretical issues, general linguistics and old-world languages, while number two is the fourth in the *Studies in Native American Languages* series. This number includes articles representing seven different language families from all over North America (Uto-Aztecan, Muskogean, Yuman, Siouan, Otomanguan, Athabaskan and Algic), and a great deal of original scholarship.

We wish to thank the contributors, both those whose papers appear in this volume, and those whose papers we did not include. We also wish to thank the faculty of the Linguistics department of the University of Kansas for their support and encouragement for the *KWPL* throughout the year.

SHIFTING DEICTIC CENTERS
IN THE HUALAPAI DEMONSTRATIVE SYSTEM

Mary Howe

Abstract: The Hualapai demonstrative system is an interesting example of the way speakers of different languages use language to orient themselves in space. Various analyses of this complex six-morpheme system have been suggested. This paper proposes a division of the system into a set of proximals and a set of distals. The other distinctions may be due to a deictic center which shifts from the speaker to other reference points. In addition, some evidence is offered to indicate that there is a medial in the system which is changing to a hearer-centered distal.

Deictic expressions in language serve to locate the speaker and hearer in time and space. Demonstratives are a particularly interesting set of deictic expressions because they can be illustrative of the way in which the speakers of different languages orient themselves in relation to other people and environmental features. As Fillmore (1982:48) observes, languages generally make either a two-way distinction in demonstratives, indicating either proximal (near to the speaker: English 'this') or distal (distant from the speaker: English 'that'), or a three-way distinction, indicating proximal, medial (not as far from the speaker as distal), and distal. Although the deictic center, or reference point, of these expressions is generally the speaker, it may shift to another point (which is frequently the hearer). Also, the demonstratives may be either modified or replaced by some other deictic expression to indicate such features as largeness (or other qualities) of nearby items, visibility, anaphoric reference, location of the hearer, or nearness to some other referent.

The goal of this short paper is to study the way spatial orientation is segmented and described in the

demonstrative system of Hualapai, a member of the Yuman language family spoken in the north-western part of Arizona. The system of demonstratives in Hualapai is particularly interesting in that it uses six different morphemes to indicate varying degrees of spatial relationships, and thus illustrates some distinctions which are not made explicit in English. Fillmore's (1982) analysis of the deictic category of demonstratives in general was very helpful in my consideration of Hualapai demonstratives. The Hualapai system has been studied by Redden (1981), particularly with reference to meaning differences as a result of vowel alternations in the demonstrative stems, and by Langdon (1968) in her reconstruction of the demonstrative system of Proto-Yuman. The interpretations in the Hualapai reference grammar by Watahomigie et al (1982) led me toward some of the conclusions I draw in this paper. It should be noted that I have not done the fieldwork on this language myself so I am relying on the interpretations of other researchers. The conclusions shown here are that the demonstratives in this language are organized into two distance categories which seem to be evolving from three categories, and that the other lexical distinctions are based on a shifting point of reference.

In English the proximal demonstrative pronoun this and the distal that can be modified in a number of ways depending upon the circumstances, but there are no specific lexical items for such circumstances as "that one over there by you" or "that one over by that rock." Hualapai uses a set of six demonstrative pronouns to indicate differing degrees of distance from the speaker, the hearer, the speaker and the hearer together, and other reference points. Three of these pronouns can also be used as demonstrative suffixes; the other three are used as demonstrative adjectives. All of the following examples are from Watahomigie et al (1982). Without elaborate paraphrasing all the demonstratives translate into everyday English as 'this' or 'that.'

(1) Va nya 'wi:chyu.

va		nya	'-wi:-ch-yu
this=one=closest=to=	speaker	I	3/1-own-Subj-be
This one is mine.			

(2) Ya nya 'wi:vchyu da'opkyu.

ya

this=one=close=to=but=away=from=speaker=and=hearer

nya '-wi:vchyu da'op-k-yu

I 3/1-own-Dem-Subj-be 3=Neg-ss-Aux

This one is not mine.

(3) Wa nya 'mila-chyu.

wa

that=one=we=can=point=at=and=specify

nya '-mila-ch-yu

I 1-aunt-Subj-be

That one is my aunt.

(4) Nyuk mwa'!

nyu-k

m-wa'

that=one=right=near=the=hearer-at 2-sit=Imp

Sit over there!

(5) Ha midinyu:da!

ha

mi-dinyu:d-a

that=one=close=to=the=reference 3/2-write-Imp

Write that one!

(6) Thach waksi nyihaḁkwi.

tha-ch

that=one=remote=or=invisible-Subj

waksi nyi-haḁ-k-wi

cow 3/3=Poss-pet-ss-Aux

That one (about whom we are talking) owns cattle.

There is quite a bit of disagreement among researchers as to the exact meanings of the demonstratives. Redden (1981), for example, comments that it took four years of research before he discovered from an informant that the salient point of division was along the lines of relative distance. Table I summarizes three views on the interpretation of the demonstratives.

TABLE I : Interpretations of demonstratives

	Redden	Winter	Watahomigie et al
va	this very close	near by	this one closest to speaker
ya	this, rather close	near by	this one close to (but away from) speaker and hearer
wa	that, rather far away (distant)	there	that one we can point at and specify
ha	that, very far away	anaphoric	that one close to the reference
tha	that, previously mentioned, invisible	there (distant)	that one remote, distant or invisible
nyu	that far away fairly close to the speaker	there by you	that one right near the hearer

Redden's (1981) analysis breaks the demonstratives down according to relative distance. Winter (1966) does not distinguish between va and ya or between wa and tha, glossing them 'near by' and 'there (distant),' respectively. There is also disagreement on whether the pronoun used for anaphoric reference is ha (Winter 1966) or tha (Redden 1966).

Langdon (1968), in proposing a reconstruction of the Proto-Yuman demonstrative system, uses Hualapai as her starting point (with data from Redden 1966 and Winter 1966) because "it shows the most highly differentiated system (1968:63)." Her analysis of the proto-forms uses three semantic components: [+ near], [+ far], and [+ fairly]. The proto-Yuman demonstrative stems (of the set I am considering here which contain the vowel /a/), the semantic components of each, and their reflexes in Hualapai are as shown in Table II.

Table II

Proto-Yuman	Semantic Components	Hualapai
*va	[+ near] 'near'	va
*sa	[+ far] 'far'	tha
*nya	[- near] [- far] 'location unspecified'	nyu
*wa	[+ far] [+ fairly] 'fairly far'	wa
*ya	[+ near] [+ fairly] 'fairly close by'	ya

Langdon also makes a tentative analysis of *x(a) as 'anaphoric' [- far, - near, + fairly] for which the reflex would be ha.

Winter (1966) refers to va, ha, and nyu as "full deictics", apparently because they occur as stems as well as suffixes, but he offers no explanation for the semantic difference between full deictics and those demonstratives that cannot occur as suffixes. This grammatical difference might account for Winter's translation of va, which is a full deictic, and ya, which can be a stem only, both as 'near by,' because each belongs to a different class of morphemes. However, this distinction does not hold in the translation of wa and tha, both of which are stems, as 'there (distant).' The characterization of the sets by Watahomigie et al (1982) as proximal or distal, however, provides a dividing line between the three demonstratives which can be used as both pronouns and suffixes and the three which can be used only as stems, either pronouns or adjectives.

Speakers of most, if not all, languages typically take their own bodies to be the deictic center, the point of reference for locating other people, places, or objects. Thus the distinction between proximal and non-proximal using the speaker as deictic center can be thought of as basic. In the case of Hualapai, there is then a transfer of the deictic center either to the hearer or to some other reference point. If we divide the Hualapai demonstratives into a proximal set consisting of those that are close to a deictic center, regardless of whether it is speaker-, hearer-, or other-centered, and a distal set consisting of those that are removed from a deictic center, the other dimensions of the system become more apparent. (Table III.)

Table III: Distance in relation to shifting center

Relative Distance	<u>Deictic Center</u>			
	speaker	hearer	both speaker and hearer	other reference point
Proximal	va, -v	nyu, -ny		ha, -h
Distal	wa		ya	tha

First of all, we see that those demonstratives which indicate closeness to some center are also those which can be used as suffixes. Second, the proximals are distinguished from each other depending upon whether the referent is close to the speaker (va), close to the hearer (nyu), or close to some other point of reference (ha). Investigation of this third proximal category needs to be pursued further to see what kinds of features might be salient in the spatial orientation of the Hualapai. For speakers of most languages, certain non-human objects seem to have inherent fronts (houses, cars, moving objects - c.f. Kimball 1971), and this affects the way we talk about them (e.g., 'in front of the house' generally means on the side with the main door even when the speaker is not standing on that side). Do the reference points that are used with ha have this feature of having an inherent front? In addition, certain other aspects of the objects in the environment, such as largeness or immobility (of mountains, boulders, or rivers, for example) make a difference in choice of deictic terms, and it would be interesting to discover which of these features the reference points used with ha share.

Third, the distals contrast with each other along different lines than do the proximals. Wa and ya contrast along the lines of specificity and deictic center (speaker in the case of wa and both speaker and hearer in the case of ya). Wa/ya and tha contrast along the dimensions of visibility. This is a very clear point of contrast because while the proximal/distal contrast is relative, the visible/invisible contrast is absolute - something must be either in sight or not in sight.

Among the distals, since tha as remote (pointing out something out of sight) contrasts with both wa and ya, and wa contrasts with ya by pointing out something from the point of view of the speaker, ya might be considered to be a medial. Fillmore (1982) believes that a pivot change from speaker to hearer in languages that have such distinctions may grow out of a medial. Historically the two separable features of the medial using a prototype semantics model are 1) small distance from the speaker and 2) close to the hearer. The fact that ya acts as a medial and uses both speaker and hearer as pivot might lend support to this claim. If ya is shifting to hearer-centered, the system would become

symmetrical, and consequently eliminate the category of speaker-and-hearer-centered, as Table IV illustrates. Among the proximals there appears to be nothing resembling a medial, nyu being a hearer-centered demonstrative. It may be that this has already shifted from being a medial.

Table IV: Medial to hearer-centered shift

Relative Distance	<u>Deictic Center</u>			
	speaker	hearer	both speaker and hearer	other reference point
Proximal	va< -v	nyu, -ny		ha, -h
Distal	wa	<---=-----ya		tha

In some cases, ya continues to function as a medial, particularly in contrast to wa. In expressions where the demonstrative is accompanied by pointing, the words viya 'this very one' and viwa 'that very one' are used.

(7) Viya midinyu:da!

vi-ya mi-dinyu:d-a

SpkrProx-Med/Dist 3/2-write-Imp

Write this (at which I am pointing)!

(8) Viwam magwa:wva!

vi-wa-m ma-gwa:w-v-a

SpkrProx-SpkrDist-with 2-talk-Recip-Imp

Talk with that one (at whom I am pointing)!

There are two interesting points to note with this use: First, the contrast between ya and wa illustrates ya as a medial since it indicates greater closeness to the deictic center, which in this case must be the speaker since it is accompanied by pointing, but does not exclude the hearer. Second, although in English a similar function is performed by expressions using either two proximals ('this one here') or two distals ('that one there'), in Hualapai this is an almost contradictory juxtaposition of a form of the proximal (vi-) with a distal or medial, showing proximity to the speaker coupled with some distance from the hearer.

One other use of demonstratives that would be interesting to examine in relation to this system involves marking of shared vs. unshared knowledge in discourse. In English, the proximal determiner indicates unshared knowledge and the distal determiner indicates shared knowledge. (Both examples in this section are from Fillmore 1982:54.)

(9) I was visiting this friend of mine last night.

(10) That man is an idiot.

Sentence (9) implies that the hearer does not know the person referred to, while in (10) the distal indicates that both speaker and hearer know the person in question. In Japanese, which has a three-way system, the medial is used for unshared knowledge, and the distal, as in English, is used for shared knowledge (Makino 1978:215-216; Fillmore 1982:54). Since Hualapai may be changing from a three-way to a two-way system, it would be interesting to see which demonstrative would be chosen for these expressions.

This elaborate set of demonstratives showing a shift of deictic center may have a parallel in another aspect of Hualapai grammar. The Hualapai locative markers /-k/ 'toward the speaker' and /-m/ 'away from the speaker' mark a similar distinction between speaker-centered and other-than-speaker-centered (Voegelin and Voegelin 1976; Yamamoto 1976). In addition, the switch-reference markers on verbs (/ -k/ for same subject and / -m/ for different subject) carry the same underlying distinction between shifting deictic centers. Yavapai, which is closely related to Hualapai, has the same pair of morphemes with the same functions. According to Kendall (1975) (from Voegelin and Voegelin 1976:84) "so long

as he stays on the same subject or talks about the same subject he [the Yavapai speaker] stays in one 'conceptual location'." Although the demonstratives are a different set of morphemes, it seems logical to conclude that the point of view in terms of spatial orientation and its metaphorical extension would hold true throughout the language.

It seems to me that it is quite difficult to elicit accurate semantic interpretations for deictic terms. When lexical items do not translate directly from one language to another, the difference can often be made clear by paraphrase and further explanation. But when deictic terms are involved, even the most sensitive researchers may not be aware of how deeply embedded in their world views their spatial orientations are. Spatial orientation is so basic, so directly related to the human body, that it may not be perceived as part of culture, and therefore significant differences in world view may be overlooked.

The Hualapai system of demonstratives is certainly not symmetrical, and as with any verbal expression of spatial orientation, will shift depending on the context. However, this analysis offers a possible systematicity for the previously unexplained distinctions in the set of ³ demonstratives. It leaves unanswered many questions. For example, what are the points of reference used with *ha*? Are they the same as the reference points which become the center of such expressions as 'in front of?' How does the location of such divisive environmental features as rivers, creeks and fences affect the choice of demonstrative? And does the system remain the same (but perhaps on a smaller scale) if the speaker and hearer are inside a building rather than outside? This analysis of the demonstrative system of Hualapai also opens the way for further research on the question of demonstrative use in text-reference to further examine the close relationship between text-reference (which is not technically deictic because it refers only to the linguistic context) and deixis.

NOTES

1. I have used the Hualapai orthography throughout. The symbols which require explanation are as follows: ch = [č], ny = [ɲ], d = [t] (unaspirated lenis dental stop). k represents the aspirated velar stop except when used by convention to represent the locative, directional, and same subject morpheme, in which case it is an unaspirated lenis velar stop.

2. This resembles the way anaphoric reference is used and almost certainly affects the choice of demonstrative. If a piece of discourse precedes the demonstrative, it is therefore shared knowledge:

(a) That's what I said, and I meant it!

But if a piece of discourse is about to follow and is introduced through cataphoric reference, it is obviously only known to the speaker and is thus unshared knowledge:

(b) This is what she meant: she doesn't want to go with you.

It seems likely that the demonstrative used for shared knowledge would be the same as that used for anaphora and the one used for unshared knowledge would be the same as that used for cataphora. This is in fact the case in English and Japanese. However, because of the complexities of this system, I have been unable to discover a clear pattern of use in text reference. I expected to find that a distal was used for anaphoric reference, and a proximal was used for cataphoric reference. Instead, my preliminary findings are the reverse: ha and nyu are used anaphorically and ya is used cataphorically. I intend to continue consideration of this matter. It seems to me that the differences must be due to other factors in the system related to the shifting deictic center.

3. I have omitted discussion of Redden's (1981) contrasts between vowel alternations in demonstratives because, although they change the meaning in terms of specificity, intensity, and visibility, the deictic center remains the same.

REFERENCES

- Fillmore, C.J. 1982. Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. Speech, Place, and Action: Studies in Deixis and Related Topics, ed. by R.J. Jarvella and W. Klein. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd. 31-55.
- Kendall, M.B. 1975. The /-k/, /-m/ problem in Yavapai syntax. International Journal of American Linguistics 41. 1-9.
- Kimball, J. 1971. The grammar of facing. Unpublished paper.
- Langdon, M. 1968. The Proto-Yuman demonstrative system. Folia Linguistica 2. 61-81.
- Makino, S. 1978. Kotoba to Kukan (Language and Space). Tokyo: Tokyo Daigaku Shuppan-Kai.
- Redden, J.E. 1966. Walapai II: morphology. International Journal of American Linguistics 32. 141-163.
- Redden, J.E. 1981. Relative distance and relative specificity in Walapai demonstratives. Proceedings of the 1981 Hokan languages workshop and Penutian languages conference (Occasional Papers on Linguistics 10), ed. by J.E. Redden. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University. 11-14.
- Voegelin, C.F. and F.M. Voegelin. 1976. Some recent (and not so recent) attempts to interpret the semantics of native languages of North America. American Indian Languages and American Linguistics, ed. by W. Chafe. Lisse: The Peter De Ridder Press. 75-98.
- Watahomigie, L.J., J. Bender, and A.Y. Yamamoto. 1982. Hualapai Reference Grammar. Los Angeles: American Indian Studies Center, UCLA.
- Watahomigie, L.J., and A.Y. Yamamoto. 1984. Grammatical devices and narrative routines in Hualapai texts. Paper presented at the 23rd SSILA Meeting at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Denver, CO, Nov. 18, 1984.

Winter, W. 1966. Yuman languages II: Wolf's son - a Walapai text. International Journal of American Linguistics 32. 17-40.

Yamamoto, A. Y. 1976. Note on the Interpretation of /-m/ and /-k/ in Walapai. Proceedings of the First Yuman Languages Workshop, ed. by J.E. Redden.. Carbondale, IL: University Museum, Southern Illinois University. 149-152.