

DEMONSTRATIVES IN A BEDOUIN ARABIC DIALECT OF WESTERN SUDAN

Stefano Manfredi

► **To cite this version:**

Stefano Manfredi. DEMONSTRATIVES IN A BEDOUIN ARABIC DIALECT OF WESTERN SUDAN. Folia Orientalia, Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Oddział w Krakowie, 2014. halshs-01681143

HAL Id: halshs-01681143

<https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-01681143>

Submitted on 11 Jan 2018

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Stefano Manfredi

Università degli Studi di Napoli 'L'Orientale'

DEMONSTRATIVES IN A BEDOUIN ARABIC DIALECT OF WESTERN SUDAN

Abstract: This article aims at describing the forms, the distribution and the functions of demonstratives in Kordofanian Baggara Arabic, an Arabic dialect spoken by semi-nomadic cattle herders living in the Southern Kordofan State of the Republic of Sudan. Based on an oral corpus gathered on field, the study analyses in typological perspective the morphosyntactic and the pragmatic features of demonstrative pronouns and determiners as well as of sentential and locational demonstratives.

Keywords: Sudanic Arabic, demonstratives, reference, grammaticalization

1. Introduction

Demonstratives function to coordinate the interlocutors' joint focus of attention, which is one of the most basic functions of human communication (Diessel 2006: 463). Being one of the few closed word classes universally present in language, demonstratives have been largely described and compared in discourse-pragmatic, functional and typological perspectives. Dixon (2003: 61-62) defines a demonstrative as 'any item, other than 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which can have pointing or (deictic) reference.' Diessel (1999a), for his part, proposes three criteria for defining the categorical status of demonstratives. First, demonstratives are pointing expressions serving syntactic functions. Second, they serve certain pragmatic functions by organizing information flow in a conversation, and by focusing the hearer's attention on objects in the speech situation. Third, demonstratives encode a meaning of spatial distance. Diessel also remarks the necessity to differentiate the use of demonstratives in a specific syntactic context (i.e. their distribution) from their categorical status (i.e. their distribution and specific forms). In this perspective, demonstratives may occur in four syntactic contexts: pronominal, adnominal, adverbial and identificational. If these syntactic functions are formally distinguished, then demonstratives belong

to four different grammatical categories: pronouns, determiners, adverbs and identifiers. Some languages, alike the Arabic variety that I am going to describe in this paper, use demonstratives of the same grammatical category in more than one syntactic context.

At the semantic level, demonstratives are deictically contrastive. This means that they are ‘pointing words’ whose primary function is to indicate relative spatial or temporal distance of a referent from a deictic centre. The deictic centre, which is also called the ‘origo’, is roughly equivalent to the speaker’s location at the time of the utterance (Diessel 2011). There is usually a proximal demonstrative denoting closeness to the deictic centre and a distal demonstrative denoting some relative distance from it. The distinction may be more elaborated in languages that exhibit more than two deictic terms. Apart from spatial and temporal distance, demonstratives play an important role in the organization of information flow by keeping track of prior discourse participants and activating shared information. The communicative importance of demonstrative is reflected in their grammaticalization into a wide number of grammatical markers such as definite articles, relative pronouns, complementizers, sentence connectives, copulas, focus markers and other grammatical markers (Diessel 1999b).

As far as the study of demonstratives in Arabic dialects is concerned, Fisher (1959) still represents the most important comparative study. Besides, there is a series of synchronic and diachronic studies dealing with specific aspects of demonstratives in both eastern (Doss 1979; Woidich 1992) and western (Caubet 1992; Khalfaoui 2007) Arabic dialects. This article aims at describing the forms, the distribution and the functions of demonstratives in Kordofanian Baggara Arabic (hereafter KBA), an Arabic dialect spoken by semi-nomadic cattle herders living in the Southern Kordofan State of the Republic of Sudan (Manfredi *forth.*). After a brief survey of the main isoglosses characterizing KBA (§ 2), the study describes the morphosyntactic and the pragmatic features of demonstrative pronouns and determiners (§ 3). The following sections are dedicated to the morphosyntactic analysis of deictic presentatives (i.e. sentential demonstrative) (§ 4-5) and locational demonstrative adverbs (§ 6). The study finally summarizes the main typological features of demonstratives in KBA (§ 7).

2. Dialect and Data

KBA is representative of the Sudanic Arabic dialect type. That being so, it displays a number of pan-Sudanic features such as the phonological reflexes /g/ and /d/ for the etymological *q and *ḏ, the presence of the phonological segment *c* [tʃ], the absence of CCC sequences, the presence of a preformative *a-* in imperatives, and the use of auxiliary *gā'id* for expressing a progressive aspect (Owens 1993b). Within the Sudanic context, KBA can well be considered a western Sudanic dialect. This internal classification finds a reason in several

isoglosses linking KBA to the Arabic dialects of Chad and Nigeria as, for instance, the presence of non-etymological consonants *ny* [ɲ] and *ng* [ŋ], the presence of backness harmony, the alternation *-e/-a* in feminine marking on nouns, the presence of the morpheme *al-* for the derivation of reciprocal verbs. Besides, there are certain mixed features that give evidence of a prolonged contact with eastern Sudanic dialects as in the case of the concurrence between *hān* and *hūl* for expressing an analytic possession (Manfredi 2012). As a further matter, KBA presents typical Bedouin features such as the reflex /q/ for the etymological *ǧ, the form =*a* for the 3SG.M bound pronoun and the presence of feminine plural as a morphological category in verbs and pronouns.

The following study is based on a natural speech analysis of an oral corpus gathered on field (December 2008 - February 2009) and it does not include any elicited data. The selected corpus consists of 2 hours (13400 words) of spontaneous and semi-spontaneous texts recorded with 7 Baggara speakers (5 men, 2 women) in Korom (25 km east of Kadugli, the capital city of Southern Kordofan).

3. Pronominal and Adnominal demonstratives

3.1. The Semantics and Morphosyntax of Demonstrative Pronouns and Determiners

In KBA, demonstrative pronouns mark a two-way deictic contrast (i.e. proximal vs. distal)¹ and they present a maximally contrastive paradigm inflected for number (i.e. singular, plural) and gender (i.e. masculine, feminine). In line with the majority of Sudanic dialects (Owens 1993b: 168), but different from other Bedouin dialects of the region (Reichmuth 1983: 122), KBA presents a single morphological set of demonstrative pronouns lacking of the Old Arabic morpheme **hā*, which is instead used as an invariable deictic presentative (see § 5). Proximal demonstrative pronouns are unmarked, whereas their distal counterparts end in *-(a)k*. In addition, a distal emphatic deictic term may be optionally expressed by the ending *-(ā)ka*.

¹ Typologically speaking, the two-way deictic distinction is the most common distance contrast in the world's languages, and in modern Arabic dialects. On a sample of 324 languages represented in the World Atlas of Language Structure, 127 languages (54% of the total) have a two-way deictic contrast for demonstrative pronouns (Diessel 2011). As far as Arabic dialects are concerned, there are very few cases of three-way deictic contrast (Vincente 2006: 322). These are the Jiblah dialect in Yemen (with the forms *hāḍkáh. hāḍkih. hāḍkúh*, Fischer and Jastrow 1980:116), the dialect of Beḥsāni in Iraq (with the forms *hākāh, hāykāh, hāwkāh*, Fischer and Jastrow 1980:151), and the dialect of Daragōzū in Turkey (with the forms *ukka, ukkī, ukkō*, Jastrow 1973:41).

Table 1. Demonstrative pronouns and determiners

	<i>PROXIMAL</i>	<i>DISTAL</i>	<i>DISTAL EMPHATIC</i>
SG.M	<i>da</i>	<i>dāk</i>	<i>dāka</i>
SG.F	<i>di</i>	<i>dīk</i>	<i>dīka</i>
PL.M	<i>dōl</i>	<i>dōlak</i>	<i>dōlāka</i>
PL.F	<i>dēl</i>	<i>dēlak</i>	<i>dēlāka</i>

Pronominal and adnominal demonstratives in KBA have the same stem, but they are formally distinguished by their syntax, thus they belong to different grammatical categories. Pronominal demonstratives in subject position precede nominal and verbal predicates. On the contrary, adnominal demonstratives always follow a nominal head minimally made up of a definite NP.² Pronominal demonstratives are always stressed therefore they are independent words. Adnominal demonstratives may sometimes cliticize to a preceding NP, but they are never bound to a specific word class. Therefore, they are not considered true clitics and they are always transcribed as independent words.

- *Pronominal demonstratives*

Proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns can represent the head of both NPs and VPs as in examples (1-3).³ Pronominal demonstratives control agreement on nouns and verbs.

1. *di* *balad* *abbahāt=i //*
 DEM.PROX.SG.F country father\PL= 1SG
 ‘This is the country of my paternal ancestors.’
2. *dīk* *bitt* ‘*amm=i //*
 DEM.DIST.SG.M daughter paternal_uncle=1SG
 ‘That is my paternal cousin.’

² This syntactic distinction between pronominal and adnominal demonstrative is a common feature of Egyptian and Sudanic dialects (Woidich 1992; Owens 1993b). According to Doss (1979:351), the post-nominal position of demonstrative determiners is a residue of a previous stage in the evolution of Egyptian dialects toward the Cairene koine, which contrasted with the more common pre-nominal position.

³ For the purposes this article, examples display a prosodic segmentation. Segmentation of the discourse flow into intonation units is made by detecting their boundaries. The major perceptual and acoustic cues for boundary recognition are the following: (1) final lengthening; (2) initial rush (anacrusis); (3) pitch reset; (4) pause. Following a well-established tradition in the prosodic analysis of oral corpora (Cresti and Moneglia 2005; Mettouchi and als. forth.), I distinguish between units with minor (i.e. non-terminal) break (signalled by a single slash /) and units with major (i.e. terminal) breaks (signalled by a double slash //).

When it is used adnominally, the proximal singular demonstrative pronoun *da* can also modify the locational demonstrative adverb *hini* ‘here’ for emphasizing the reference to a place incorporating the deictic centre (see § 6.).

7. *ana* / *wild-o=ni* *hini* *da* //
 1SG give_born-3PL.M=1SG here DEM.PROX.SG.M
 ‘As for me, I was born right here.’

In the same manner, the proximal singular *da* can modify the modal demonstrative adverb *mitil* ‘like’. In this case, it is used deictically with accompanying gestures to demonstrate the way something is done. The reference to the modal adverb may be further emphasized by the reiteration of the adnominal demonstrative as showed in example (8).

8. *yōm al=’irse* / *bi=na-l’ab-u* *mitil da da* //
 day DEF=marriage IND=1PL-play-PL like DEM.PROX.SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.M
 ‘The wedding day, we dance just like this.’

The singular masculine proximal demonstrative *da* may also modify adverbs of time expressing different temporal references: contemporaneity (*towwa* ‘now’, example 9), immediate past (*mbāriḥ* ‘yesterday’, example 10) and immediate future (*mbākir* ‘tomorrow’, example 11).

9. *ar=rawāwga* *raja’-o* *towwa da* //
 DEF=scout\PL come_back-3PL.M now DEM.PROX.SG.M
 ‘The scouts came back right now.’

10. *wiṣil-ta* *korom mbāriḥ da* //
 arrive-1SG Korom yesterday DEM.PROX.SG.M
 ‘I arrived in Korom yesterday.’

11. *mbākir da* / *itte lāzim ta-ji=na* //
 tomorrow DEM.PROX.SG.M 2SG.M must 2SG.M -come=1PL
 ‘Tomorrow, you must come to our place.’

On the contrary, the singular masculine distal demonstrative *dāk* can follow adverbs of time for signalling a temporal distance between the narrated event and the time of narration as in the following example.

12. *wokit* *dāk /* *aniḥna* *má=fī=na //*
 time DEM.DIST.SG.M 1PL NEG=EXS=1PL
 ‘At that time, we were not there.’

As a further matter, it is not rare to find plural proximal demonstratives following a singular head. In these cases, the plural demonstratives do not imply a deictic reference nor they modify the preceding noun; rather they form a collective (plural) nominal head incorporating the lexically expressed subject. This construction is particularly productive with proper nouns and kinship terms.

13. *abū=y* *dōl /* *b=a-ḥart-u //*
 father=1SG DEM.PROX.PL.M IND =3-till-PL.M
 ‘As for my father’s group, they till.’

14. *ana* *mašē-t* *lē=farīg* *otmān* *dōl //*
 1SG go-1SG to=camp Othman DEM.PROX.PL.M
 ‘I went to the Othman’s family camp.’

Concerning the distal emphatic demonstratives ending in *-(ā)ka*, they introduce remoteness in space and time and they generally point to referents out-of-sight. Differently from proximal and distal forms, distal emphatic demonstratives are relatively rare and they only function as deictic adnominal determiners after nouns (example 15) and adverbs of time (example 16). This syntactic restriction can be explained by the low degree of grammaticalization of these demonstrative forms, which, consequently, cannot be described on an equal footing with proximal and distal demonstrative pronouns and determiners.

15. *al=’iyāl* *at=talfān-īn* *dōlāka //*
 DEF =children DEF =stupid=PL.M DEM.DIST.emph.PL.M
 ‘Those (far) stupid children.’

16. *wokit* *dāka /* *an=nās* *šīe //*
 time DEM.DIST.emph.SG.M DEF=people little_bit
 ‘At that (far) time, there were few people.’

Finally, it should be stressed that in a minority of cases proximal and distal demonstratives may also constitute the nominal predicate of an identificational clause. More in particular, a demonstrative can only be the attribute of a pronominal head. This construction may be in opposition with presentational clauses in which a demonstrative pronoun has an independent personal pronoun as its attribute (see § 4, ex. 28).

17. *hu* *da* //
 3SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.M
 ‘He is the one.’ (‘he is this’)

The categorical status of demonstrative pronouns and determiners can be represented as follows.

Table 2. Functions and distribution of demonstrative pronouns and determiners

	<i>FORMS</i>	<i>SYNTAX</i>
<i>Pronoun</i>	PROX, DIST	DEM (NP or VP)
<i>Determiner</i>	PROX, DIST, DIST.emph. NP.def DEM (NP or VP) ADV DEM	

3.2. The Pragmatics of Demonstrative Pronouns and Determiners

As pointed out above, demonstratives primary indicate relative spatial or temporal distance of a referent from a deictic centre. However, they may also serve a variety of other pragmatic functions. The pragmatic functions of demonstratives have been analysed by Fillmore (1997), Himmelmann (1997), and Diessel (1999a, 1999b) who generally agree on distinguishing two basic pragmatic functions: the ‘exophoric’ function, which is enacted by demonstratives for referring to non-linguistic entities in the speech situation, and the ‘endophoric’ function, which is instead enacted by demonstratives referring to elements of the ongoing discourse. Diessel (1999a: 93) further divides the endophoric function into the ‘anaphoric’, ‘discourse deictic’ and ‘recognitional’ uses. If anaphoric demonstratives are co-referential with a prior NP, discourse deictic demonstratives link the clause in which they are embedded to the proposition to which they refer. Recognitional demonstratives, for their part, do not refer to elements of the surrounding discourse; rather they are used to indicate that the hearer is able to identify the referent on the basis of a shared knowledge. As I will show, demonstrative pronouns and determiners in KBA can be alternatively linked to the expression of these four pragmatic values.

- *Exophoric use*

Exophoric demonstratives are pragmatically anchored in the speech situation and they always indicate a deictic contrast on a distance scale. Fillmore (1997: 63) distinguishes between two exophoric uses of demonstratives: the gestural and the symbolic use. The gestural use requires a pointing gesture in order to identify a given referent, whereas the symbolic use involves knowledge

about the communicative situation. Example (18) illustrates the exophoric gestural use of an adnominal demonstrative.

18. *al=bagar-a* *aṃṃ=ḍanab* *aṭ=tawīl* *dīka //*
 DEF=cows-SING mother=tail DEF=long DEM.DIST.emph.SG.F
 ‘That (far) cow with a long tail.’

The adnominal demonstrative in example (19), on the contrary, does not require a pointing gesture since its use is determined by the shared knowledge about a larger situational context. Different from the symbolic use, gestural use can only be expressed by a proximal demonstrative.

19. *al=balad* *di* *xarbān* *xalās //*
 DEF=country DEM.PROX.SG.F ruined definitively
 ‘This country is completely ruined.’

- *Anaphoric use*

Anaphoric demonstratives serve as a language-internal function for pointing to a NP in the surrounding discourse. Anaphoric demonstratives are often co-referential with non-topical antecedents (Diessel 1999a: 96). Consider the following example.

20. *eyy* *zōl* *b=i-ḥājjir* *ḥusān=a //* *da*
 every fellow IND=3SG.M-prepare horse=3SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.M
aj=juwād //
 DEF=stallion
 ‘Everyone prepare his own horse. This is the stallion.’

In (20), the proximal demonstrative pronoun *da* does not refer to the subject of the preceding sentence (i.e. *eyy zōl* ‘everyone’); rather it is co-referential with its non-topical object (i.e. ‘his horse’). In point of fact, *da* indicates a focus shift (non-focused object > focused subject) in the second sentence, which is also intonationally marked by a major prosodic boundary. Anaphoric demonstrative pronouns can be also coreferential with topicalized NP. In particular, KBA developed a special identificational construction based upon topicalization.

21. *da* *da /* *da* *l=fāris* *fōg=hum //*
 DEM.PROX.SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.M DEF=champion on=3PL.M
 ‘This one, this is the champion among them.’

22. *di* *di* / *di* *bitt=i* *ana* //
- DEM.PROX.SG.F DEM.PROX.SG.F DEM.PROX.SG.F girl=1SG 1SG
- ‘This one, this is my daughter.’

In examples (21-22), the topic (i.e. the referent that the proposition is about) is represented by a clefted NP formed by a sequence of two exophoric proximal demonstrative pronouns and it is prosodically enclosed by a minor prosodic boundary. In the following equative clause, the proximal demonstrative in subject position is coreferential with the topicalized NP and it represents the identificational core of the sentence.

As a further matter, the anaphoric use of adnominal demonstratives and their interaction with other tracking devices (such as the definite article *al=*) can be affected by the referential status of the NP they refer to. In point of fact, KBA marks a syntactic distinction between given and new referents. Generally speaking, when a referent is introduced for the first time into the discourse, it is new (unidentifiable) and it is then coded as an indefinite NP. After its introduction, a referent is pragmatically treated as given (identifiable) and it is then joined with some device for marking its identifiable status. In KBA, a pragmatically given referent is marked by a default singular masculine proximal demonstrative *da* in. Consider the following extract of conversation.

23. SP1a *al=banāt* *biji* *b=i-jib-an* *šāyle* *mitil* *da* //
- DEF=girlPL AUX IND=3-bring-PL.F sack.F like DEM.PROX.SG.M
- ‘Then the girls bring a *shayle* (big) like this.’

- SP2 *šāyle* *da* / *di* *šin=i* //
- sack.F DEM.PROX.SG.M DEM.PROX.SG.F what= 3SG.F
- ‘This *shayle*, what is this?’

- SP1b *aš=šāyle* // *di* *š=šuwāl* //
- DEF=sack.F DEM.PROX.SG.F DEF=big_sack
- ‘The *shayle*? This is a big sack.’

In (23. SP1a) the speaker introduces the (morphologically feminine) referent *šāyle* ‘sack’ which is pragmatically new and unanchored from to the speech situation. It is thus undefined and undetermined. By now, the referent is given and textually accessible. Consequently, when the interlocutor reintroduces it in (23. SP2), it is determined by a default singular masculine proximal demonstrative *da*. Still, it is not defined by the article *al=*. This syntactic

- *Discourse deictic and recognitional use*

Adnominal demonstratives also occur as discourse deictics. Differently from anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictics do not refer to a preceding NP; rather they focus the hearer's attention on aspects of meaning, expressed by a clause, a sentence, a paragraph, or an entire story (Diessel 1999a: 101). In KBA the use of demonstratives as discourse deictics is related to the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses. In this regard, Comrie (1989: 138-139) argued that restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses are radically different in pragmatic terms, in particular in that the restrictive relative clause uses presupposed information to identify the referent of a noun phrase, while the non-restrictive relative is a way of presenting new information on the basis of the assumption that the referent can already be identified. Despite of the fact that formal distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses is found sporadically across languages, KBA⁴ marks a syntactic distinction. Restrictive relative clauses are unmarked and they are often used in sentential attributive constructions. In this case the relative pronoun *al* follows a definite NP and precedes an adjective. Restrictive relative clauses restrict the domain of the noun in terms of specific identification.

25. *axwān=i* *al* *kubār //*
 brother\PL=1SG REL big\PL
 'My elder brothers' ('My brothers who are elder')

Non-restrictive relative clauses, for their parts, are always marked by an adnominal proximal demonstrative that agrees with the modified NP. The information provided in the relative clause is most likely to be mentioned in the immediately preceding discourse.

26. *aniḥna* *loggorí //* *aniḥna* *ṣoborí //* *aniḥna* *tillew //*
 1PL Loggorí 1PL Soborí 1PL Tillew
má=fi *farig //* *bēn* *aniḥna /* *wa* *n=nās* *al* *warrē-t=ak*
 NEG=EXS difference between 1PL and DEF=people REL show-1SG=2SG.M
kalām=hum *dōl //*
 discourse=3PL.M DEM.PROX.PL.M
 'We are Loggorí, we are Soborí, we are Tillew. There's no difference between us and the people that I talked to you about.'

⁴ The same syntactic distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clause is found in Sudanic Arabic-based pidgins and creoles (see Manfredi and Tosco forth. for Juba Arabic and Wellens 2005 for Ugandan Ki-Nubi).

In example (26), the whole non-restrictive relative clause *n=nās al warrē-t=ak kalām=hum dōl* ‘the people that I talked you about’ functions as discourse deictic device for focussing the attention of the hearer on the previously mentioned participants (i.e. the *loggori*, *šobori*, and *tillew* tribes). The final proximal demonstrative does not only connect the information to a textually accessible referent, but it also functions as boundary marker of the non-restrictive relative clause. This is because the referent does not persist in the following discourse. In typological terms, it is interesting to note there is no prosodic difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses since they are both enclosed by a major prosodic boundary.

Non-restrictive relative clauses marked by proximal demonstratives also function as recognitional devices for referring to linguistic expression that are not uttered in the same context as the demonstrative. Consider the following example.

27. *al=hijjey-āt at=talāte al gul-ti=hin lē=na dēl //*
 DEF=riddle-PL.F DEF=three REL say-2SG.F=3PL.F to=1PL DEM. PROX.PL.F
guṣṣ(i)=hin lē=na hini //
 tell.IMP=3PL.F to=1PL here
 ‘The three riddles that you told us (before). Tell them to us now.’

Here, the non-restrictive clause *al=hijjey-āt at=talāte al gul-ti=hin lē=na dēl* ‘The three riddles that you told us’ refers to something that has been told in the past and that is not textually accessible. Though, the referent is considered by the speaker to be shared knowledge. And thus it is determined by the proximal demonstrative *dēl*. In morphological terms, it is interesting to note that the loss of deixis of demonstratives in discourse deictic and recognitional constructions, does not imply a restriction of its gender and number agreement as in the case of anaphoric demonstratives marking pragmatically given referents (see above).

4. Deictic presentatives (sentential demonstratives)

According to Grenoble & Riley (1996: 820), deictic presentatives are ‘canonical deictics in the sense that they are used to point to some object in the extra-linguistic (real word) context and introduce it into the discourse’. This means that, differently from demonstrative pronouns, deictic presentatives are exclusively exophoric. The French *voici* / *voilà* are often cited as examples of deictic presentatives which function only gesturally. Fillmore (1982: 47) calls such presentatives ‘sentential demonstratives’. Diessel (1999: 79), for his part, remarks the necessity to distinguish between ‘sentential demonstratives’ and ‘demonstrative identifiers’ arguing that, even if they are both used to

introduce new discourse topics, demonstrative identifiers are embedded in a specific grammatical construction (i.e. a copular or non-verbal clause), while sentential demonstratives are syntactically more independent. In KBA, the demonstratives in copular clauses have the same morphological and syntactic features as pronominal demonstratives in other contexts and hence they have to be considered demonstrative pronouns.

28. *da hu šāl=a //*
 DEM.PROX.SG.M 3SG.M take_away=3SG.M
 ‘This is he who took it away’

Conversely, presentational clauses in which a proximal demonstrative pronoun in subject position is followed by a 3rd person independent pronoun provided the historical source for the grammaticalization of an innovative set of deictic presentatives (e.g. **da hu* ‘this is he’ > *dawú* PRES.3SG.M; **dōlāk hum* ‘those are they’ > *dōlākuma*).⁵ Alike demonstrative pronouns, deictic presentatives distinguish two degrees of deixis (without any emphatic form) and they are inflected for gender and number.

Table 4. Deictic presentatives

	<i>PROXIMAL</i>	<i>DISTAL</i>
SG.M	<i>dawú</i>	<i>dāko</i>
SG.F	<i>diyé</i>	<i>dīke</i>
PL.M	<i>dolaṃṃo</i>	<i>dōlākuma</i>
PL.F	<i>delamṃa</i>	<i>dēlākina</i>

From a syntactic point of view, deictic presentatives constitute a complete predicate therefore they are typically self-standing. In prosodic terms, when deictic presentatives are used gesturally, they are always isolated and enclosed by a major prosodic boundary as showed in examples 29-30.

29. *dawú //* *ligī-t=a //*
 PRES.PROX.SG.M find-1SG=3SG.M
 ‘Here it is. I found it.’

⁵ In a comparative perspective, it is interesting to note that, differently from KBA, Nigerian Arabic developed a set of deictic presentatives built on proximal demonstrative pronouns with the addition of *-wa* M and *-ya* for the singular and on distal demonstrative pronouns with the addition of the 3rd personal pronouns *humma* M and *hinna* F for the plural (Owens 1993a: 45).

30. *dāke* // *māma* *j-at* //
 PRES.DIST.SG.F mummy come-3SG.F
 ‘There she is. Mummy came’

Nonetheless, deictic presentatives might also represent the pronominal subject of sentences that are functionally equivalent to copular clauses. In this case, deictic presentatives directly precede a definite copula complement with which they agree and the whole presentative clause is delimited by a major prosodic boundary as in 31-32.

31. *dixé* *baḡar:t=i* //
 PRES.PROX.SG.F *ḡow:F=1SG*
 ‘Here my *ḡow* is.’

32. *dāko* *‘ali* //
 PRES.DIST.SG.M Ali
 ‘There Ali is.’

It is not rare that the foregrounding of the copula complement causes the deictic presentative to be right-dislocated and then to occur at the end of the intonation unit. Examples 33-34 show that the change in the word order does not imply any modification in the prosodic segmentation since there is no prosodic boundary between the deictic presentative and the preceding complement.

33. *ni-dalli* *hini* // *al=barrāk* *dāko* //
 1PL-descend here DEF=thunder PRES.DIST.SG.M
 ‘Let’s camp here. The storm, there it is’

34. *al=moḡor-a* *dāke* //
 DEF=rain-SING PRES.DIST.SG.F
 ‘The rain, there it is.’

Furthermore, deictic presentatives may also represent the pronominal subject of verbal clauses. Also in this case, they immediately precede the predicate with which they agree and the whole verbal clause covers a single intonation unit enclosed by a major prosodic boundary.

35. *towwa* *dolaḡmo* *woḡl-o* //
 now PRES.PROX.PL.M arrive-3PL.M
 ‘Now here they are arrived’

Apart from their deictic and pronominal functions, deictic presentatives (i.e. sentential demonstratives) play also an important role in the organization of the discourse flow. In particular, the proximal singular masculine deictic presentative *dawú* is widely used as sentence connective. According to Diessel (1999: 125), sentence connectives are frequently formed by a pronominal demonstrative and some other element (i.e. adverb or adposition) that indicates the semantic relation between conjoined sentences. In line with the above, in KBA, when the deictic presentative *dawú* is used as a sentence connective, it is always preceded by the conjunction *wa* ‘and’. In a sequence of two conjoined sentences, the grammaticalized construction *wa dawú* occurs at the beginning of the second sentence summarizing the information expressed by the preceding one. At the same time, it provides the thematic background for the following sentence. Examples 36-38 show that, being thematically associated with two sentences, *wa dawú* creates an overt link between two sentences. In semantic terms, this link corresponds to a temporal-consecutive meaning much like the French *voilà que* ‘and then, immediately after’. Prosodically speaking, the two conjoined sentences correspond to two independent intonation units whose interdependence is signalled by a minor prosodic boundary.

36. *katal-ná / wa dawú ji-na hini //*
 kill-1PL\3SG.M and PRES.PROX.SG.M come-1PL here
 ‘We killed it and then we came here’
37. *injamḡ-na šīe / wa dawú sīr-na //*
 rest-1PL little_bit and PRES.PROX.SG.M move_for_transhumance-1PL
 ‘We rested a little bit and we immediately moved for the transhumance.’
38. *aṛ=ṛawā‘iye gām-o b=i-lkallam-o ambēnāt=hum /*
 DEF=shepherd\PL get_up-3PL.M IND=3-speak-PL between=3PL.M
wa dawú rawwah-o amḡ=sirdibbe //
 and PRES.PROX.SG.M move-3PL.M Umm Sirdibbe
 ‘The shepherds started to speak and then they immediately went to Umm Sirdibbe.’

Table 5. Functions and distribution of deictic presentatives

	<i>FORMS</i>	<i>SYNTAX / PROSODY</i>
<i>Deictic presentative</i>	PROX, DIST	PRES //
<i>Pronominal</i>	PROX, DIST	PRES NP.def or VP // NP.def PRES //
<i>Sentence connective</i>	PROX.SG.M	... / <i>wa</i> PRES ... //

5. The presentative particle *ha*

KBA also possess a deictic presentative particle stemmed from the Old Arabic deictic morpheme **hā*. A morpheme *hā* / *ha* plus personal pronoun (independent or bound) is a very common strategy for expressing a proximal presentative in Old Arabic as well as in modern Arabic dialects (Bloch 1991: 74-80). As far as KBA is concerned, the morpheme *ha* occurs in presentative constructions functionally equivalent to ditransitive clauses with two arguments: a recipient-like argument and a theme-like argument. The recipient-like argument is expressed by means of 2nd person stressed bound pronouns⁶ cliticized to the invariable particle *ha*. The theme-like argument follows. Examples 39-41 show that the whole presentative construction cover a single intonation enclosed by a major prosodic boundary.

39. *ha=ká* *birš=ak //*
 PRES=2SG.M mat=2SG.M
 ‘Here’s to you your mat.’
40. *ha=kí* *l=gurān //* *a-mš-i* *a-ħlib-i* *l=bagar-a //*
 PRES=2SG.F DEF=hawser IMP-go-F IMP-milk-F DEF=cows-SING
 ‘Here’s to you the hawser. Go and milk the cow.’
41. *gāl /* *ha=kú* *l=girš //* *wa* *fāt //*
 say.3SG.M PRES=2PL.M DEF=money and pass.3SG.M
 ‘He said: here’s to you the money. And he left.’

⁶ Stressed bound pronouns are phonologically distinguished from primary bound pronouns (e.g. =*ka*/=*ak* vs =*ká*/=*ák* 2SG.M; =*ki* vs =*kí* 2SG.F; =*ku* vs =*kú* 2PL.M; =*kin* vs =*kín* 2PL.F) and they play very different syntactic and semantic roles (Manfredi forth.). In particular, 2nd person stressed bound pronouns introduce subject and subjectoids arguments such as the subject of the cohortative of motion verbs (e.g. *a-rāh=kí* IMP-go=2SG.F ‘let’s go’ (me and you)) or the experiencer introduced by the interrogative particle *māl* (e.g. *māl=ák* what’s_up_with=2SG.M ‘what’s up with you?’). The same stressed pronominal forms are found in the bedouin dialect of the Shukriyya in eastern Sudan (Reichmuth 1983).

Alike the sentential demonstrative *dawú*, the particle *ha* underwent a process of grammaticalization from an exophoric particle used to orient the hearer in the outside world to a sentence connective for creating an overt link between two sentences. Though, differently from *dawú*, the particle *ha* does not require any other element for indicating the relation between the conjoined sentences. Furthermore, examples 42-43 show that, when it is used as a sentence connective, the particle *ha* is prosodically enclosed by a minor prosody boundary between two intonation units corresponding to the conjoined sentences. In semantic terms, *ha* is not linked to a temporal sequence of actions but it rather signals a cause-and-effect relation between two events.

42. *gūm-an //* *ha /* *bi=na-gūm //*
 get_up-IMP.2PL.F PRES IND=1PL-get_up
 ‘(He says): get up! So, we get up.’
43. *dāko* *al=fīl /* *da* *darb=a //*
 IDF.DIST.SG.M DEF=elephant DEM.PROX.SG.M path=3SG.M
ha / *bi=na-lgud* *darb=a //*
 PRES IND=1PL-track path=3SG.M
 ‘There the elephant is, this is its path. So, we track its path.’

Lastly, it is interesting to note that the reduplication of the presentative *ha* as sentence connective gave rise to an innovative discourse marker *hàhá*.⁷

44. *walād* *nūba* *wa* *nūba* *kull=hum /* *sawa //*
 son\PL Nuba and Nuba all=3PL.M together
hàhá / *eyy* *jinis* *biji* *b=u-xušš //*
 PRES every kind AUX IND=3SG.M-get_in
 ‘The Awlad Nuba (Baggara tribe) and all the Nuba, together. So, every kind (of people) start to get in (the wrestling circle).’

Table 6. Function and distribution of the presentative particle *ha*

<i>FUNCTIONS</i>	<i>SYNTAX / PROSODY</i>
<i>Deictic presentative</i>	<i>ha=RECPT theme //</i>
<i>Sentence connective</i>	<i>... // ha / ... //</i>

⁷ The LH tonal pattern of the discourse marker *hàhá* is in phonological opposition with the HL tonal pattern of the negative device *hàhà* (Manfredi forth.).

6. Demonstrative Adverbs

The notion of demonstrative adverb was introduced by Fillmore (1982: 47) for referring to locational deictics such as *here* and *there*. Diessel (1999: 74) and Dixon (2003 : 62) suggest that no known language lacks of at least two spatially contrasting adverbial demonstratives. Syntactically, they are basically used as modifiers of verbs therefore they are considered adverbs. However, in KBA demonstrative adverbs can sometimes modify nominal heads. Different than demonstrative pronouns and sentential demonstratives, locational demonstrative adverbs distinguish three degree of deixis: proximal, medial and distal.

Table 7. Demonstrative adverbs

<i>PROXIMAL</i>	<i>MEDIAL</i>	<i>DISTAL</i>
<i>hini</i>	<i>hināk</i>	<i>qādi</i>

hini ‘here’ in example 45 is used to refer to an area including the deictic centre, while *hināk* in example 46 ‘there’ refers to a relatively close area from the deictic centre. *qādi* ‘over there’ in example 47, for its part, introduces remoteness in space. When they modify a verb, demonstrative adverbs are always sentence final.

45. *a-g’od* *hini* //
 IMP-sit here
 ‘Sit here.’
46. *za’ra-tu* *hināk* //
 cultivate-2PL.M there
 ‘Did you cultivate there?’
47. *hāla* *l=’awīn* *maš-an* *i-zg-an* *qādi* //
 now DEF=women go-3PL.F 3-water-PL.F over_there
 ‘The women just went to water (the cattle) over there.’

hināk and *qādi* may be deictically opposed like in the following example.

48. *má=tu-xuṭṭ=-u* *hinák* / *a-mš-u* *qādi* //
 NEG=2-put-PL there IMP=go-PL over_there
 ‘Don’t put forth there, go further.’

All the previous examples show locational demonstrative adverbs used as verb modifiers. However, they also occur as deictics for indicating the location of a given event. In this case, they are syntactically free and they can be used both exophorically for referring to locations in the surrounding situation (example 49) and anaphorically for mentioning a location already cited in the discourse (example 50).

49. *hini / aniḥna bi=n-gūl ke //*
 here 1PL IND=1PL-say like_this
 ‘Here, we use to say like this.’

50. *xaṭṭē-na xašm al=wādi / wa min hināk mbākir*
 put-1PL mouth DEF=seasonal_river and from there tomorrow
sīr-na //
 move_for_transhumance-1PL
 ‘We put forth at the beginning of the seasonal river, and the day after we moved from there.’

As a further matter, the demonstrative proximal adverb *hini* ‘here’ can occur in an adnominal position after a defined NP. When used adnominally, the demonstrative adverb does not modify the preceding NP; rather it emphasizes the pragmatic availability of the referent expressed by the defined noun. More in particular, the whole NP is established as the major participant by means of topicalization. Examples 51-52 show two instances of *hini* marking a topicalized NP. In the first case, coreferentiality in the comment is marked by the anaphoric bound pronoun =*hin* =3PL.F. In the second one, the topicalized subject is recalled by the 3rd plural masculine pronominal affix *-o* on the verb of the comment.

51. *uttu / al=bār hinē=ku hini / lōn=hin kikkēf //*
 2PL.M DEF=cows POSS.F=2PL.M here colour=3PL.F how
 ‘As for you, your cows here, what colour are they?’

52. *aṣ=šubyan hini / j-o kutār //*
 DEF=boy\PL here come-3PL.M much\PL
 ‘These guys here, they came in bulk.’

Table 8. Functions and distribution of demonstrative adverbs

<i>FUNCTIONS</i>	<i>FORMS</i>	<i>SYNTAX / PROSODY</i>
<i>adverbial</i>	PROX, MED, DIST	VP ADV //
<i>deictic</i>	PROX, MED, DIST	free
<i>adnominal</i>	PROX	NP.def ADV / comment //

7. Envoy

In this article I tried to analyse the forms, the semantics and the functions of demonstratives in KBA. Broadly speaking, in KBA we can individuate four categories of demonstratives: demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative determiners, deictic presentatives (i.e. sentential demonstratives), and demonstrative adverbs.

Table 9. Demonstratives in KBA

	<i>SYNTAX</i>	<i>PRAGMATICS</i>
<i>Demonstrative Pronouns</i>	pronominal	exophoric, anaphoric
<i>Demonstrative Determiners</i>	adnominal	exophoric, anaphoric, discourse deictic, recognitional
<i>Deictic Presentative (Sentential Demonstrative)</i>	presentative, pronominal, sentence connective	exophoric
<i>Presentative particle ha</i>	presentative, sentence connective	exophoric
<i>Demonstrative Adverbs</i>	adverbial, adnominal	exophoric, anaphoric

Demonstrative pronouns and determiners present the same stem, but they are formally distinguished by syntax (i.e. DEM NP/VP vs. NP.def DEM). KBA does not present identificational demonstratives since the demonstratives in copular clauses have the same features as pronominal demonstratives. Demonstrative pronouns are mainly used exophorically, though they may also be coreferential with a previous NP. Demonstrative determiners, for their part, gave rise to the grammaticalization of specific anaphoric constructions for marking the distinction between given/new referents. In this regard, Himmelmann (1996: 229) points out that the use of anaphoric demonstratives after the first mention of a new discourse participant is especially common in languages that do not

have a definite article. Against this assumption, KBA possesses a definite article marking highly referential and pragmatically active participants. Furthermore, demonstrative determiners represented the source of the grammaticalization of non-restrictive relative clauses used both as discourse deictic and recognitional device. Deictic presentatives (i.e. sentential demonstratives) developed on the basis of identificational constructions (see ex. 28) and the presentative particle *ha* are exclusively exophoric. The important communicative function of these deictic items is reflected in their grammaticalization into sentence connectives. The grammaticalization that interested both demonstrative determiners and deictic presentatives represent a process involving the whole construction, not only the demonstrative item. In the grammaticalized construction, the demonstrative retains its original syntactic features. This confirms that pathway along which the demonstratives grammaticalized is determined by the syntactic context in which they originally appear. In KBA, the lack of phonological changes indicates a low stage of grammaticalization of demonstratives. However, when demonstratives are used as grammatical markers, they are deictically non-contrastive (i.e. they are always proximal) and they are restricted to a specific syntactic and prosodic context. Diessel (1999b: 35) suggests that in a two-term deictic system, the distal form is more likely to be grammaticalized. On the contrary, in KBA the default form for grammatical markers is proximal singular masculine. Lastly, concerning the semantics of demonstratives, KBA presents a distance-oriented system in which the deictic centre is basically the same for all demonstratives (i.e. the speaker). In this context, a striking feature of KBA is the coexistence of three different deictic oppositions: a two-way opposition for demonstrative pronouns, a two-way opposition plus one emphatic form for demonstrative determiners, and a three-way deictic opposition for adverbial demonstratives.

References

- Bloch, Ariel. (1991). *Studies in Arabic Syntax and Semantics*. (Second edition). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Caubet, Dominique. (1992). Deixis, aspect et modalité: les particules *hā-* et *rā-* en arabe marocain. In Mary-Annick Morel and Laurent Danon-Boileau (eds.), *La deixis*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 139–149.
- Comrie, Bernard. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology*. 2nd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Cresti, Emanuela and Massimo Moneglia 2005. *C-ORAL-ROM: Integrated Reference Corpora for Spoken Romance Languages*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger (1999a). *Demonstratives: form, functions and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/New York: Benjamins.
- _____. (1999b). The morphosyntax of demonstratives in synchrony and diachrony. In *Linguistic Typology*, no. 9: 1-49.

- _____. (2006) Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. In *Cognitive Linguistics*, Vol. 17 (4): 463-489
- _____. (2011). Distance contrasts in demonstratives. In Matthew Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The Word Atlas of Language Structure Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library, chapter 41. Available online at <http://wals.info/chapter/41>. Accessed on 2013-09-13.
- Dixon, Robert M.W. (2003). Demonstratives: a cross linguistic typology. In *Studies in Language*, vol. 27, no. 1: 61-112.
- Doss, Madiha (1979). The position of the demonstrative *da, di* in Egyptian Arabic: a diachronic inquiry. In *Annales Islamologiques* XV: 349-357.
- Fillmore, Charles J. (1982). Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis. In Robert Jarvella and Wolfgang Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place and Action*. Chichester: Wiley, 31-59.
- Fisher, Wolfdietrich (1959). *Die Demonstrativen Bildungen der neuarabischen*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fischer, Wolfdietrich and Otto Jastrow. (1980). *Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Grenoble, Lenore A. and Matthew Riley. 1996. The role of deictics in discourse coherence: French *voici/voilà* and Russian *vot/von*. In *Journal of Pragmatics* 26: 819-838.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus (1997). *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Jastrow, Otto. (1973). *Darazü eine arabische Mundart der Kozluk-Sason-Gruppe (Südostanatolien)*, Nuremberg: H. Carl.
- Khalfaoui, Amel (2007). A cognitive approach to analyzing demonstratives in Tunisian Arabic. In M. A. Mughazy (ed.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XX*. Amsterdam/New York: Benjamins. 169-186
- Manfredi, Stefano (2012). Dialect mixing and dialect levelling in Kordofanian Baggara Arabic (western Sudan). In A. Barontini, C. Pereira, A. Vicente and K. Ziamari (eds.), *Dynamiques langagières en Arabophonies: variations, contacts, migrations et créations artistique. Hommage offert à Dominique Caubet par ses élèves et collègues*. Zaragoza/Paris: Colección "Estudios de Dialectología Árabe", 141-162.
- _____. (forth.). *Kordofanian Baggara Arabic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Manfredi, Stefano and Mauro Tosco (forth.). The morphosyntax and prosody of topic and focus in Juba Arabic. In S. Manfredi and M. Tosco (eds.) *Arabic-based pidgins and creoles: comparative, descriptive and socio-historical issues*. Special issue no. 5 of *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages*.
- Mettouchi, Amina, Martine Vanhove and Dominique Caubet (eds.) (forth.). *Corpus-based studies of lesser-described Languages: the CorpAfroAs Corpus of spoken AfroAsiatic languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Owens, Jonathan (1993a). *A grammar of Nigerian Arabic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- _____. (1993b). *Nigerian Arabic in a comparative perspective*. In *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 14: 85-175.
- Reichmuth, Stefan (1983). *Der arabische Dialekt der Sukriyya im Ostsudan*, Zürich: Georg Olms.

Vicente, Ángeles (2006). Demonstratives. In K. Versteegh et al. (eds.), *Encyclopaedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, Vol.1. Leiden: Brill, 320-323.

Wellens, Ineke (2005). *The Nubi Language of Uganda: An Arabic Creole in Africa*. Leiden: Brill.

Woidich, Manfred (1992). Vorangestellte Demonstrativa im Kairenischen. *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15: 195–219.

List of glosses, abbreviations and symbols

ACT	Active	PRES	Deictic presentative
ADV	Adverb	PROX	Proximal
AUX	Auxiliary verb	PTCP	Participle
DEF	Definite article	RECPT	Recipient
DEM	Demonstrative pronoun	REL	Relative pronoun
DIST	Distal	RC	Relative clause
DIST.emph	Distal emphatic	SG	Singular
EMPH	Emphatic reflexive pronoun	SING	Singulative
EXS	Existential copula	VOC	Vocative
IDF	Demonstrative identifier	VP	Verb phrase
IND	Indicative	1, 2, 3	First, second, third person
IMP	Imperative	-	Affix boundary
NEG	Negative operator	=	Clitic boundary
NP	Noun phrase	\	Ablaut
NP.def	Defined noun phrase	/	Minor prosodic boundary
PL	Plural	//	Major prosodic boundary
POSS	Possessive		