

## RESOLVING AMBIGUITY OF DEMONSTRATIVE USE IN KAMAS

**Gerson Klumpp**

*University of Tartu*

**Abstract.** The purpose of the present paper is to establish pragmatic criteria which help in parsing syntactically ambiguous instances of a sequence of demonstrative pronoun and noun (D\_N) in the Kamas text corpus. The paper also gives an account of the Kamas demonstrative system as encountered in the grammatical, lexical and text records.

**Keywords:** Kamas, demonstratives, discourse pragmatics

**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2015.6.2.09>

### 1. Introduction

This article addresses a philological problem of the Kamas pre-shift text corpus,<sup>1</sup> namely parsing the sequence of a demonstrative pronoun and a noun (D\_N) in a number of ambiguous instances. Such a sequence may, in principle, be interpreted as one single argument {D+N} or as two arguments {D}\_{N}. In the first case the demonstrative pronoun *dĩ* would function adnominally, in the second case pronominally; cf. (1a, b) for examples.

(1) a. {*dĩ bũze*} *baltu i-bi*.

DEM man axe take-PST

‘This man took an axe.’ (9.3, KW 96)

---

1 This small corpus consists of twelve narratives of different length plus some representatives of “minor genres” (one song, two prayers, 30 riddles) recorded by Kai Donner in 1912 and 1914, edited by Aulis J. Joki in 1944 (KW). Some of the texts come in two versions, a written version and a phonograph recording (see Klumpp 2013b). Examples from the texts are quoted in phonological transcription, and follow the version in Donner’s manuscripts with reference to the relevant page in KW (except for text M where the manuscript is missing). The present approach does not consider the larger but syntactically defective *post-shift* corpus of Kamas, recorded by Ago Künnap in the 1960s and 1970s, partly published by Künnap, and digitally accessible at <http://www.murre.ut.ee/arhiiv/>.

- b. *küres pa nu-ga. {dī-m} {köčün güd'ər} tīl-lü'-bi.*  
 cross wood stand-PRS DEM-ACC K.-G. dig-MOM-PST

‘A cross stood there. Köčün Gūd'ər dug this out.’ (8.82–83, KW 95)

The readings of the demonstrative NPs in (1a, b) are non-ambiguous due to their syntactic surroundings or morphological form. In (1a) the sequence D\_N is followed by a nominal argument (*baltu* ‘axe’), and the predicate is a two-place verb (*i-* ‘take’), in consequence of which the sequence *dī büže* may be parsed as one argument only (‘this man’), otherwise there would be too many arguments in the sentence. By contrast, in (1b) the demonstrative must be parsed pronominally because it is inflected for accusative case, and adnominal demonstratives do not agree (see below). The proper noun is not object-marked and must be interpreted as the subject of the two-place verbal predicate (*tīl-* ‘dig out’). However, in a number of instances, correct parsing doesn’t become obvious from the form of the pronoun or the sentence context. This is the case, e.g., in (2) where, in principle, two readings may apply to the sequence D\_N.

- (2) *dī ma'-də šü-bi*  
 DEM tent-LAT enter-PST

- (i) adnominal DEM:  $\{\emptyset\}_1 \{dī ma'də\}_2$  ‘{He}<sub>1</sub> entered {this tent}<sub>2</sub>.’  
 (ii) pronominal DEM:  $\{dī\}_1 \{ma'də\}_2$  ‘{This one}<sub>1</sub> entered {a/the tent}<sub>2</sub>.’

(6.58, KW 93)

Ambiguity in examples like (2) is due to the two functions which the Kamas demonstrative pronoun *dī* ‘this (one)’ fulfils: in adnominal function it appears pre-nominally where it does not agree with its head noun in case, number and person; cf. (1a) as well as (3) below. In pronominal function, however, the demonstrative is inflected for the respective categories; cf. (1b) and (4) below. In addition, Kamas allows for zero anaphora: the subject pronouns *he* resp. *they* in the translations of (2i) and (5) below, as well as the object pronoun *him* in (5), correspond to zero expressions in the Kamas text. Thus, a demonstrative in its base form as in (2) may be a non-agreeing adnominal pronoun which forms, together with its head, a demonstrative NP in whatever syntactic function, e.g., a lative-marked goal adverbial as in (2-i), or a subject argument pronoun as in (2-ii).

- (3) *dī ni-zeŋ-dən śar-bi-n-dən essen uda-bə saǰ*  
 DEM boy-PL-3PL play-PTC-LOC-3PL child.PL.GEN hand-ACC3SG off  
*nie'-lə-dən*  
 tear-FUT-3PL:OC

‘In playing, these sons of them will tear off (other) children’s hands.’  
 (6.3, KW 91)

- (4) *tūjə dī-zeŋ-bə em ku-’*  
 already DEM-PL-1SG NEG.FUT1SG see-CON

‘I won’t see these of mine (i.e. my lakes) anymore.’ (L.9, KW 87)

- (5) *parəldə-lu'-bi-i'*  
 surround-MOM-PST-3PL

‘They surrounded him’ (2.53, KW 89)

The purpose of the present paper is to set up pragmatic criteria which help in parsing syntactically ambiguous instances of D\_N as in (2). Note that the consideration of givenness on the basis of context is not sufficient: ambiguity in cases like (2i, ii) does, after all, also result from the fact that according to Kamas grammar, the expressions in question (zero, D, D+N, N) may all refer to given entities; cf. (6) below for an example where a bare lexical noun (*šalguj* ‘blade of grass’) first refers to a new and then to a given entity. Thus, if the context of a syntactically ambiguous case of D\_N reveals only that the possible referents are given, this does not yet provide a sufficient base for parsing. A more detailed analysis of the motivations for the different types of pronominal reference is therefore necessary. In other words, what would be the motivation to encode a given referent as D+N instead of, for example, N; and what is the motivation to encode it as D, and not as zero?

- (6) *šalguj bāldə-bi-i'[,] köbrügəm-bi. kōs bej-lāndə-bi šalguj*  
 blade break-PST-3PL be a bridge-PST coal cross-DUR-PST blade  
*amo-lu'bdə-bi.*  
 burn-MOM-PST

‘They plucked a blade of grass which served as a bridge (over a brook). While the coal was crossing over the blade burned through.’ (1.3–4, KW 88)

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 briefly summarizes the system of Kamas demonstratives and specifies the place of the pronoun *dī* as well as its stressed variant *dī́* within that system. Section 3 introduces the necessary pragmatic contrasts and defines the motivations for the different encodings of anaphoric expressions. In Section 4 the introductory example (2) will be successfully parsed: as it turns out, it conforms to a reference pattern in which newly introduced referents are referred to by a demonstrative lexical NP (D+N) after their introduction into the discourse; Section 4 will also discuss other motivations of encoding by adnominal demonstrative anaphora. The following Section 5 assembles some relevant cases of pronominal demonstrative anaphora, in the light of which the discussion of more syntactically ambiguous cases is continued. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the results. It goes without saying that not all problems connected to demonstrative expressions in the Kamas text corpus can be addressed in the present paper.

## 2. Kamas demonstratives

### 2.1. The distinction of demonstrative stems

There are four demonstrative pronouns in Kamas, all of which are also bases of local (and partly other) adverbs – cf. Table 1. Swedish and Russian glosses in Table 1 come from the manuscript by Castrén (1847), who gives the most detailed description. In the following, we discuss this data in order to achieve a classification of the Kamas demonstrative system, and especially to determine the place of *dī* within this system.

As may be observed from Table 1, *dī* is considered a demonstrative and a third person pronoun. In the latter function it is glossed by Swedish *han*, as well as by the Russian masculine он (the Kamas pronoun is, of course, gender neutral). In its demonstrative function it is glossed as Swedish *den* ‘this (one)’, followed in parentheses by the peculiar comment ‘unknown, indefinite’. In comparison with the other three stems, one may notice that this is the only glossing which does not operate in terms of proximity/distality, a parameter relevant for all the other stems: *dü* ‘this here (near)’ is proximal, whereas *šö* ‘this there (far away)’, and *idə* ‘this there (not very far away)’ are distal, with *šö* – according to Castrén – being more distal than *idə*. In the column of locative adverbs, *dügəŋ* ‘here (Russ. здесь)’ and *šögəŋ* ‘over there

(Russ. *этам*)’ confirm proximity for *dü* as well as distality for *šö*. The adverb based on *dī* is glossed ‘there (Russ. *там*)’, which may be interpreted as being located between the other two on the proximity scale, or as outside the proximity scale, referring to a location not specified for proximity; this latter interpretation would correspond to the meaning of the pronoun in question. Finally, *idəgən* is glossed as Swedish *därså* ‘about there’, bringing up again a notion of unspecified – invisible? – location, but rather distal than proximal. Thus, on the basis of the grammatical records, one may assume that the four demonstrative pronouns include a three-member system differing in terms of proximity, with one pronoun – our *dī* – standing apart.

**Table 1.** Kamas demonstratives and their locative forms according to Castrén (1847)<sup>2</sup>

	demonstrative pronoun	demonstrative adverb, e.g. locative	
1	<i>dü</i> ‘den här (nära); <i>эТОТ</i> ’	<i>dü-gən</i>	‘здесь’
2	<i>dī</i> 1. ‘den (obekanta, obestämdt)’ 2. ‘han; он’	<i>dī-gən</i>	‘там’
3	<i>šö</i> ‘den där (långt borta), den där-borta; <i>ТОТ</i> ’	<i>šö-gən</i>	‘därborta; <i>этам</i> ’
4	<i>idə</i> ‘den där (ett stycke ifrån, ej sär-deles långt borta); <i>эВОН</i> ’	<i>idə-gən</i>	‘därså’

In the text sources, a very clear contrast in terms of proximity is documented between exophorically<sup>3</sup> used *dü* and *šö* in (7). In this metaphorical riddle question the flower of the food plant *Lilium martagon* is conceptualized as the visible earring of a person whose body is otherwise hidden in the ground. The visible sphere is referred to by proximal *dü t’o*<sup>4</sup> ‘this sphere’, the invisible by distal *šü t’o* ‘that sphere’. In another riddle in (8), letters are metaphorically conceptualized as splinters

2 Castrén also lists the following dialectal variants: *dö(-)~dü(-)*, *šü(-)~šö(-)*, and *jedə(-)~idə(-)*.

3 *Exophoric* means the pronoun in question does not refer to a textual antecedent but to a referent present in the speech situation (see, e.g., Diessel 1999).

4 There is no independently attested lexeme *t’o* ‘sphere’ in Kamas, and at present it cannot be excluded that the morpheme in question is derivational. However, for the purpose of the present illustration the exact nature of the syllable following the pronominal stems in question is of minor importance.

falling down from some wood chopping activity in the other world. The expression *šü t'o* ‘that sphere’ here, again, refers to a non-visible sphere, which is contrasted with a proximal sphere, now referred to by the lative adverbial of the demonstrative *dü, döbər* ‘hither’.

- (7) *boš-tə šü t'o-gən, kugoj-də dü t'o-gən*  
 body-3SG DEM sphere-LOC earring-3SG DEM sphere-LOC  
 ‘Her body is in that sphere, her earring is in this sphere.’ (R.3, KW 85)
- (8) *šü t'o-gən, pa paj-lia-i', ta'bdə döbər sa'mə-la'bə*  
 DEM sphere-LOC wood chop-PRS-3PL splinter here fall-DUR  
 ‘In the other world<sup>5</sup> they chop wood, a splinter comes falling.’ (R.16, KW 86)

Proceeding from (7) one may look for other instances of distal *šö* (dial. *šü*) and proximal *dü* (dial. *dö*) in the narratives. The first one appears twice, both occurrences in direct speech as in (9) where, in principle, it may be accompanied by a pointing gesture; for the other record see (12) below. Judging from the exophoric use of the pronoun in (9), one may conclude that this pronoun’s deixis is neither speaker, nor hearer-oriented, but somewhere outside the spheres of the interlocutors. This type of deixis would be in accordance with the highest degree of distality claimed for this pronominal stem by Castrén (see above, Table 1). The demonstrative *dü* does not appear elsewhere in the text corpus, but a short example sentence of its lative adverbial from the lexical recordings may confirm the proximal meaning, cf. (10).

- (9) *šide šö-bə mĩ-liə-m.*  
 two DEM-ACC3SG give-FUT-1SG  
 ‘I’ll give you these two.’ (Speaker refers to his daughters present at the moment of speech.) (8.112, KW 96)
- (10) *u'bdə-'* *döbər!*  
 get.up-IMP2SG hither  
 ‘Climb up here!’ (KW 13a)

5 Donner translates the expression *šü t'o* ‘that sphere’ as ‘in the sky’ (‘taivaassa’); the regular word for ‘sky’ in Kamas is *num*.

The two-syllabic distal demonstrative *idə* occurs twice in the text corpus, both occurrences in one text, one adnominal and one pronominal, both meaning approximately ‘that other (one)’, cf. (11a, b). In (11a), the man referred to by *idə kuza* is the main protagonist and an antagonist of the protagonist who had left him in order to gather people. (11b) appears in the last sentence of the tale; the trickster protagonist is to be banned from the community now; he shall be tied to a raft and committed to the river. However, while the community is engaged in building the raft, he manages to trick somebody else into his miserable position, and the community acts on this other person instead of him. In the manuscript, the pronoun *idəm* is inserted here as if the narrator had added it later, pointing out or stressing the confusion. These text examples confirm distality for *idə*; however, the question of what the exact difference would be between the two distal pronouns *idə* and *šö* remains open.

- (11) a. *kam-bi il o'bdə-zit-tə. il o'bdo-bi.*  
 go-PST people gather-INF-LAT people gather (itr.)-PST  
*šo-bi idə kuza-nə.*  
 come-PST DEM man-LAT

‘He went to gather people. The people gathered. They came to that man.’ (11.22, KW 99)

- b. *i-bi-i' idə-m so-gənə sar-bi-i', bü-nə*  
 take-PST-3PL DEM-ACC raft-LOC tie-PST-3PL river-LAT  
*ö'-le' mĩ-bi.*  
 let-CV give-PST

‘They took that one, tied him onto the raft and committed him to the river.’ (11.48, KW 99)

Finally, for third person pronoun and demonstrative *dĩ*, it has already been assumed above on the basis of Castrén’s data that its place within the Kamas demonstrative system is outside the proximity/distality scale; its peculiar glossing ‘unknown, indefinite’ could possibly be interpreted as indefinite with regard to its proximity/distality value, since as a demonstrative it certainly does not express indefiniteness of a referent. Despite its frequency, there are no instances of exophoric use in the text corpus. All these properties point to an anaphoric pronoun,

i.e. a demonstrative referring to textual antecedents as, e.g., in (1b) above. This can be illustrated by (12), a record from a piece of direct speech within a narrative where the locative adverb *dīgəṇ* ‘there’ refers to a place pointed out immediately before with the help of exophorically used distal *šū*. From this example, it becomes clear that *dī* refers to textual antecedents and does not establish a location in terms of proximity. Table 2 summarizes the findings so far.

- (12) *šū sagər māja-gəṇ, dī-gəṇ amna.*  
 DEM black mountain-LOC DEM-LOC live.PRS  
 ‘On that black mountain, there she lives.’ (M.19, KW 197)

**Table 2.** The system of Kamas demonstrative stems

exophoric		endophoric (anaphoric) <sup>6</sup>	
proximal	<i>dū</i>		<i>dī</i>
distal	<i>šö</i>	<i>idə</i>	

## 2.2. Stressed *dī*

The system of four demonstratives as reported by Castrén has two stems with an initial dental plosive and a non-low front vowel: *dī* vs. *dū*. Strangely, in Donner’s Kamas materials, *dū* as in (7) above seems to have gone unnoticed when arranging the grammar, at least it is not listed among the demonstratives (cf. KW 144–145). Instead, different phonetic realizations of *dī* are presented as two different pronouns: proximal *də, də, d<sup>ə</sup>* ‘dieser hier’ vs. distal *di, dī, dī* ‘jener’ (KW 144–145). However, this distinction is not based on solid ground. First, the same grammar’s section on personal pronouns presents both

6 The anaphora function of *dī* is the only endophoric use directly attested in the corpus (as for the terminology, cf. Diessel 1999: 93). However, of the other two endophoric uses – discourse deictic and recognitional use – the first one is attested indirectly in a sentence-connecting adverbial: the frequent connective adverbial *dīgattə* ‘then’ is analyzed as the ablative 3rd person sing. of our demonstrative *dī* in its discourse deictic function; it means literally “from his/her this” where ‘this’ refers to the possessor’s – i.e. a topic actant’s – situation, action or spoken text. Cf. also the grammaticalization cline of endophoric demonstratives by Diessel (1999: 113). For the recognitional – or anamnestic (Himmelmänn 1997: 61) – use no direct or indirect attestations were found.

vowel types under one entry: *di*, *dī*, *d<sub>l</sub>*, *d<sub>ə</sub>*, *d<sub>ə</sub>*, *tə* ‘Personalpronomen der 3. Sing.’ (KW 143). Second, although the lexical part of KW does in fact distinguish two entries, their meanings do not correspond to those of the grammar: *d<sub>ə</sub>*, *d<sup>ə</sup>* ‘der, er’ vs. *d<sub>l</sub>*, *d<sub>j</sub>* ‘er’ (KW 13).<sup>7</sup> And third, neither do the text occurrences reflect this claimed distinction. Here, the vowel of the demonstrative in question varies greatly: from long [ī], full [i] and [e], overshoot [i̇] and reduced [i̇], over various front vocalic nuances of schwa [ə, ə̇, ə̇, ə̇] down to zero (apocope), cf. the account in Table 3 (the hyphen in epenthesis means that the variant in question is also attested with a following suffix of case or number; occasional initial *t-* instead of *d-* is ignored here.)

**Table 3.** Donner’s notations of (assumed) stressed *dī* and unstressed *dī̇* in Kamas texts

notations	<i>dī</i>	<i>dī(-)</i>	<i>d<sup>i</sup></i>	<i>d<sub>l</sub>(-)</i>	<i>d<sup>l</sup></i>	<i>d<sub>ə</sub>(-)</i>	<i>d<sup>ə</sup></i>	<i>de(-)</i>	<i>d<sub>ə</sub>(-)</i>	<i>d<sup>ə</sup>(-)</i>	<i>d<sub>-</sub></i>
instances	3	14	1	24	1	14	1	6	9	18	2
interpretation	stressed <i>dī</i>		unstressed <i>dī̇</i>								

The most frequent notations according to Table 3, *d<sub>l</sub>(-)* and *d<sup>ə</sup>(-)*, would actually correspond to the proximity distinction claimed in Donner and Joki’s grammar (KW 144–145). However, trying to achieve different readings in terms of proximity for these occurrences is impossible. In addition, it seems from the very outset unlikely that a minimal difference in overshoot vowel quality such as, e.g., [i̇] vs. [ə̇] would be a phonemic distinction of two pronominal stems. Instead, an explanation in terms of stress seems more adequate: stress on the pronoun achieves full vocalic [i], which can appear even as long [ī] since Kamas has positional vowel lengthening in open syllables. All other records are variants of overshoot /i/ (cf. Klumpp 2002, 35–36). The sound written by upside down or elevated <i> as well as the schwa and the fronted schwa [ə̇] are common phonetic realizations of /i/; obviously, the same holds for [e]. (It must be noted that four of the six instances of *de(-)* appear in Donner’s first recordings from 1912, in which his transcription of Kamas was not yet as experienced as in his later recordings from 1914).

<sup>7</sup> Confusingly, KW contains two more mistakes: KW 13 *d<sub>ə</sub>* ‘was?’ for which there is no evidence in the manuscripts, and KW 145 *d<sub>ə</sub>m* ‘dieser hier’ which results from an error in the manuscript of tale 6 (cf. Joki’s commentary no. 50, KW 111).

Assuming a stressed variant of the demonstrative in question seems appropriate also for semantic reasons, namely in contexts of contrast as, e.g., in (13). The contrast which holds here is one between the mentioned woman who enjoys the advantage of having a hunter in the house, and another female protagonist who has to survive exclusively on roots because there is no hunter in her house.

- (13) (The son of a woman becomes a successful hunter.)

*dí* [tī]<sup>8</sup> *nükke uja sil am-na' i-bi.*

DEM woman meat fat eat-CV be-PST

‘THIS woman was eating meat and fat.’ (M.10, KW 197)

Summarizing, it can be stated that Kamas has a demonstrative pronoun *dī*, with a stressed variant *dí*, which functions as a pronominal as well as an adnominal anaphoric expression. In opposition to three other Kamas demonstrative stems, it is neutral in terms of proximity. The stressed variant appears in contrastive contexts, especially where a contrast holds between two referents expressed with the same lexical expression (e.g., this woman [vs. that woman], cf. (13)). However, stress on the pronoun does not necessarily mark contrast, as it may also be taken as prosodic independence where the pronoun constitutes an argument expression; this, however, is not regularly so, otherwise the present article would be without substance; but see (35d) in Section 5 below for a pertinent case.

The distinction between pronominal demonstrative and 3rd person pronouns made by grammarians (Castrén, Donner, Joki) is completely ignored here. In our opinion such a distinction is not reflected in the actual use of the pronoun. Kamas, like its Turkic neighbours – cf., e.g., Xakas *ol* ‘он; тот’ (Baskakov & Inkižekova-Grekul 1953: 416, Anderson 1998: 19–20) –, is a language which has no distinct 3rd person pronoun. Finally, one more clarification seems relevant here: the relative frequency of adnominal *dī* in the Kamas narratives may raise the question of whether it is some kind of definite article. The answer to this question is clearly no. Following Himmelmann’s (1997: 42) criterion that a definite article has to indicate not only pragmatic but also semantic definiteness as, e.g., Eng. *the* in the expression *in the meantime*, it can be simply stated that such a function cannot be

8 The forms in brackets are quotes in Donner’s narrow transcription according to the manuscript; cf. also KW 93.

detected for the demonstrative in question. Semantic definiteness, if at all, would be marked by a possessive suffix in Kamas.

### 3. Anaphoric encoding

Three contrasts apply to anaphoric referential expressions with the Kamas demonstrative *dĩ* (D, and D+N). First, compared to zero anaphora, pronominal reference is a choice for a higher encoding effort from which one may assume that the referent in question is less *salient* than one which may be referred to by zero anaphora – see (14a). Second, the choice of pronominal over lexical expression is due to *topicality*. By “lexical expression” we mean one which allows for a givenness reading, whether it contains a givenness feature<sup>9</sup> or not. A topical referent may be referred to by an (unstressed) pronoun, *or* by a lexical expression (cf. Gundel et al. 1993: 275, 294), but not vice versa: a referent which is not the topic of a sentence may not be referred to by an unstressed pronoun (to say nothing of zero anaphora) – see (14b). Finally, a third contrast concerns lexical expressions only: a bare lexical noun in Kamas may be interpreted as referring to a *given* referent in a specific context, but, of course, it is also a default expression for a newly introduced referent. A lexical expression with a givenness feature (a possessive suffix or an adnominal demonstrative) is an explicit expression of a given referent – see (14c). The contrasts in (14a–c) allow for determining the function of different encodings more precisely: encoding a referent with a demonstrative lexical NP means to explicitly express the givenness of the referent in question. Further, replacing the lexical expression with a pronoun means to explicitly express the referent’s topicality. And finally, dropping a referential expression is a sign of the immediate salience of the topical referent in question.

---

9 Cf. the definition by Krifka (2007: 37): “A feature X of an expression *a* is a Givenness feature if X indicates whether the denotation of *a* is present in the Common Ground or not, and/or indicates the degree to which it is present in the immediate Common Ground.” A givenness feature may be deaccentuation or an element making an expression definite. In Kamas, that could be a demonstrative pronoun or a possessive suffix.

- (14) a. *Salience contrast*:  
zero anaphora > pronominal reference
- b. *Topicality contrast*:  
pronominal reference > lexical reference
- c. *Givenness contrast*:  
lexical reference by demonstrative NP > lexical reference by bare noun

#### 4. Adnominal demonstrative anaphora

With the referential taxonomy in (14) in mind, one may return to the ambiguous case in (2) – repeated here as (15) –, and assign the lowest possible referential statuses to the argument expressions in question as in Table 4. Then the context of (15) is addressed with the following two questions: (i) is the subject referent salient or (only) topical? And (ii) is the goal referent given or new? The context of (15) is provided in (16).

- (15) *dĩ ma'-də šü-bi*  
DEM tent-LAT enter-PST
- (i) adnominal DEM:  $\{\emptyset\}_1 \{dĩ ma'də\}_2$  ‘{He}<sub>1</sub> entered {this tent}<sub>2</sub>.’
- (ii) argument DEM:  $\{dĩ\}_1 \{ma'də\}_2$  ‘{This one}<sub>1</sub> entered {a/the tent}<sub>2</sub>.’
- (6.58, KW 93)

**Table 4.** Assignment of possible referential statuses to the arguments of (15i, ii)

	argument 1 (subject)	argument 2 (goal)
(i) adnominal reading lowest referential status	$\emptyset$ salient	<i>dĩ ma'də</i> given <sup>10</sup>
(ii) argument reading lowest referential status	<i>dĩ</i> topical	<i>ma'də</i> new

<sup>10</sup> The status *given* for a referent encoded as D+N means anaphorical givenness here. Of course, the exophoric use of demonstratives would also involve situational givenness (cf. Diessel 1999: 94).

- (16) *mīllū'-bi[.] ma'-gən-də šo-bi[.] ohi' ma' nu-ga[.]*  
 go.INCH-PST tent-LAT-3SG come-PST single tent stand-PRS  
*jada-t kak tūjə naga [.] dī ma'-də šū-bi. surar-ia-t: ...*  
 village-3SG already isn't DEM tent-LAT enter-PST ask-PRS-3SG.OC  
 'He departed, came home. A single tent is standing there, his village  
 does not exist anymore. He enters this tent. He asks: ...' (6.55–59, KW  
 93)

As for the subject argument in (16), one may observe that the referent is a protagonist in a topic chain, i.e. it is encoded as a zero subject expression over a series of predications (here the first two verbal predicates 'departed' and 'came home'). The following two predications interrupt the topic chain for a background description of the place the protagonist has arrived in. However, although he is not the subject, the referent stays active as the implicit discoverer of the single tent, and as the referent of the possessive suffix in the expression 'his village'. In addition, there is no concurring protagonist when it comes to entering the tent, i.e. we may assign the referent salience, and expect zero anaphora for the encoding of the protagonist in the crucial sentence (15), and, in consequence, parse the demonstrative adnominally. Corroborating this parsing decision is the fact that the referent of the goal argument (the tent) had been introduced in the preceding background description, it is given, thus encoding it by anaphoric D+N is felicitous. As a result, the correct parsing for (15) is the adnominal one in (15i) '{He}<sub>1</sub> entered {this tent}<sub>2</sub>'.

Adnominal parsing of D\_N in (15/16) may be confirmed by a couple of similar instances where parsing is not ambiguous for syntactic reasons as in (17)–(20) below. A clearly adnominal demonstrative appears in *dī ma'gən* 'in this tent' in (17); the predicate is a one-place verb, and pronominal parsing of the demonstrative would yield a surplus argument. The same holds for *dī nūkken* 'this woman (gen.)' in (18). Less straightforwardly adnominally parsed is D\_N in (19) because there is a two-place predicate and the demonstrative may, in principle, be parsed pronominally. However, pronominal parsing would involve marked word order VS instead of neutral SV, for which there is no motivation. Finally, in (20) an object marking rule helps in parsing the string *dī kuza*. In principle, the sentence could mean 'he invites a man' (with *kuza* as an unmarked indefinite object), but the context reveals that the object of the invitation is a protagonist referred to by zero anaphora. An adnominal reading, in which *kuza* would refer to this

main protagonist, is excluded since the definite object ‘this man’ would require object marking (i.e. accusative *kuza-m*); the correct reading can only be a subject demonstrative nominative NP referring to the newly introduced other man.

- (17) *urgo sagər mǎja-gən ku-bi: ma’ nu-ga. dǐ ma’-gən šü*  
 big black mountain-LOC see-PST tent stand-PRS DEM tent-LOC fire  
*nei-le’bə, bor mazəro-gə’ u’-la’bə*  
 burn-DUR.PRS smoke smoke-hole-ABL rise-DUR.PRS

‘On the big black mountain he saw there was a tent. In this tent a fire is burning, smoke is rising from the smoke hole.’ (M.36–37, KW 197)

- (18) *kambi[,] o’b nükke-gən üzə-bi. dǐ nükke-n ni-t i-bi.*  
 go.PST one woman-LOC fall-PST DEM woman-GEN boy-3SG be-PST  
 ‘She went on and ended up at a woman’s place. This woman had a son.’  
 (10.29–30, KW 98)

- (19) *tǎga-n kunzə mǐnə-ländə-bi[,] šamnak bäl-da to’bdo-bi[,]*  
 river-GEN along pass-DUR-PST spoon break-PTC pop up-PST  
*i-bi dǐ šamnām...*  
 take-PST DEM spoon.ACC

‘She strolled along the river and came across a piece of a spoon. She took this spoon...’ (1.8–10, KW 88)

- (20) *o’b nükke-t baška tibi-zi’ amno-bi. dǐ kuza*  
 one wife-3SG other husband-INS live-PST DEM man  
*kǎštə-lia-t.*  
 invite-PRS-3SG.OC

‘One of his wives lived with another man. This man invites him.’  
 (7.3–4, KW 93)

In all these examples, D+N refers to a referent introduced immediately before. Apparently, this is a frequent pattern which may involve all kinds of syntactic functions like goal/location in (15/16) and (17), possessor in (18), direct object in (19), and subject in (20). This pattern is well known in typological literature on demonstrative anaphora, e.g., Diessel (1999: 97–98) cites several relevant cases.

Equipped with the foregoing, one may apply the parsing {D\_N} also to (21), a parallel example to (15) but with different word order, as well as to other syntactically ambiguous cases. The excerpt in (22) displays two of them: the first one, ‘with this blood’, is an exact parallel, i.e. the demonstrative lexical NP appears immediately after the introduction of the referent blood. The second case is a little different in that the referent bladebone had been introduced a bit earlier. However, its introduction may be still considered close enough to fit the pattern. The example is also a parallel to (15i) in that the subject is a continued topic protagonist with no relevant interruptions (the interruption by *kemdə* ‘his blood’ is not relevant because the referent is a body part of the topic referent who is referred to by a possessive suffix), i.e. pronominal reference for the subject is not expected. Finally, one more example for which the pragmatic criterion of plot integration of a newly introduced referent serves as a parsing criterion is (23).

(21) *kandə-ga. ma' nu-ga. šü-bi {dī ma'-də}.*

go-PRS tent stand-PRS enter-PST DEM tent-LAT

‘He goes. A tent is standing (there). He entered this tent.’ (8.43–45, KW 94)

(22) Excerpt from tale no. 8 (8.16–20, KW 94)

a. *ni'də u'bdə-bi[,] t'alaš šüškü i-bi.*

outside stand.up-PST bare bladebone take-PST

‘He got up to go outside where he found a blank bladebone.’

b. *püje-bə talə-j to'bdə-bi, kem-də maŋ-nu'-bi[.]*

nose-ACC3SG smash-CV hit-PST blood-3SG flow-MOM-PST

‘He smashed his own nose, his blood started running.’

c. *{dī kem-zi'} šüškü-m bar t'o'bdə-bi.*

DEM blood-INS bladebone-ACC all smear-PST

‘With this blood he coated the bladebone all over.’

d. *šü-bi ma'-də[,] {dī šüškü-m} aspa'-də pa'dlo-bi.*

enter-PST tent-LAT DEM bladebone-ACC cauldron-LAT put.in-PST

‘He entered the tent and (in place of meat) put this bladebone into the cauldron.’

- (23) *ku-bi-ndə      talai-n-də      to'-əndə      jada      nu-ga.*  
 see-PTC-LOC3SG    sea-GEN-3SG    shore-LOC3SG    village    stand-PRS  
 {*dī    jada-nə*}    *ei    tu-ga      üzə-bi,      šü    embi,*  
 DEM    village-LAT    not    come-CV    descend-PST    fire    put.PST  
*šüimə-bə      öt'ter-bi.*  
 mare-ACC3SG    hobble-PST

'As he sees, there's a village on the sea shore. Before he arrived at this village, he dismounted, made a fire, and hobbled his mare.' (2.20–21, KW 89)

Plot integration of a newly introduced referent is not the only motivation for encoding by D+N. Three more shall be mentioned here: the first one is *reactivation*, i.e. a once topical referent is not active in the discourse and has to be reactivated by a full lexical expression with a givenness feature (cf., e.g., Chafe 1987: 25–36). A typical instance is (24): the protagonist referent encoded as *dī kuza* 'this man' in 11.13 had been mentioned last as a subject expression in 11.3 (see also example 29 below). Inbetween, i.e. in 11.4–12, he observes a scene performed by two other protagonists. In 11.13 he becomes an acting plot participant again, and is encoded by D+N. The second of the motivations to be added here is *discourse level transition*, e.g., the transition from direct speech to plot (narration flow) in (25). Note that the referent encoded by *d'esseŋ* (*dī esseŋ* 'the children') is, in principle, salient as the addressee of the preceding two sentences of direct speech. Still, after the direct speech level has ended the children are encoded by D+N. Finally, *contrastive topic* expressions as in (26) are one more motivation for encoding a referent by D+N.

- (24) *dī    jadaj-la'    šo-bi.    [...] dī    kuza    par-lu'-bi      ma'-gən-də.*  
 DEM    visit-CV    come-PST      DEM    man    return-MOM-PST    tent-LAT-3SG  
 'He came visiting. [...] This man returned home.' (11.3, 13, KW 99)

- (25) "*esseŋ,    urgāba      šonə-ga[.]    uja    pa'-ka'!*"    *d\_esseŋ*  
 child.PL    grandfather    come-PRS    meat    cook-IMP2PL    DEM\_child.PL  
*ü'mə-bi-i'    ija-gən-dən      nōrbə-bi:*  
 run-PST-3PL    mother-LAT-3PL    say-PST

"'Children, grandfather is coming. Cook meat!'" The children ran and told their mother: ...' (1.13–15, KW 88)

- (26) *kambi-i', šo-bi-i'. dī ko'bdo ine-n old'a*  
 go.PST-3PL arrive-PST-3PL DEM girl horse-GEN clothing  
*ku-lia, a dī ni ne-n old'a ku-lia.*  
 look-PRS but DEM boy woman-GEN clothing look-PRS

‘They (the boy and the girl) left and arrived (at the warehouse). The girl inspected horse gear, and the boy inspected women’s dresses.’  
 (10.36–37, KW 98)

One may be inclined to apply the parsing pattern {D N} of newly introduced referents also to the following example (27b) in which the demonstrative precedes a non-finite verb form, and, in consequence, may read (literally) “in this being terrified”. On the basis of the Kamas corpus it is hardly possible to rule out this parsing, despite the fact that it would be the only attested case of a so called case-masdar noun appearing with an adnominal demonstrative. However, comparing this sentence with a parallel text passage from a phonograph recording (cf. Klumpp 2013b), one may reject the adnominal parsing; cf. (28). Here, the demonstrative appears in front of a converb where it cannot have an attributive reading (see Klumpp 2002: 112–133), but can only be parsed as an argument expression. It seems therefore reasonable to apply the argument parsing also to (27b). For the motivations for pronominal reference as in (27) and (28), see the following Section 5.

- (27) Excerpt from text no. 8 (8.96–98, KW 95)

a. *i-ge kaŋga! nere'-lə-le'.*  
 not-IMP2PL go.IMP2PL frighten-FUT-2PL  
 ‘Don’t go! You will frighten her.’

b. *dī nerö-bi-ndə bospos-tə-bə t'ägar-l-də.*  
 DEM be.frightened-PTC-LOC3SG self-3SG-ACC3SG stab-FUT-3SG.OC

- (i) { $\emptyset$ } {*dī nerö-bi-ndə*}: ‘She in this being terrified will stab herself.’  
 (ii) {*dī*} {*nerö-bi-ndə*}: ‘In being terrified she’ll stab herself.’

- (28) *i-ge kaŋga, i-ge kaŋga, dī nerö-le'*  
 not-IMP2PL go.IMP2PL not-IMP2PL go.IMP2PL DEM be.terrified-CV  
*bospos-tə t'ägar-lə-[t].*  
 self-3SG stab-FUT-3SG.OC

‘Don’t go, don’t go! Being frightened she will stab herself.’ (SU032 0.39–43)

Proceeding from the patterns introduced in this section, the following section discusses some more syntactically ambiguous instances of D\_N with different pragmatic constellations. Like in (27b), and differently from the other examples so far, argument readings of D now become central.

## 5. Pronominal demonstrative anaphora

Before proceeding with the discussion of ambiguous readings of D\_N, some typical instances of demonstrative pronominal anaphora are presented. In Section 3 it was stated that pronominal reference is to be expected in encoding a referent which is topical, but not salient (see 14a–c above). Lack of salience may be due to subject switch as in (29) below, where a zero anaphora subject would be infelicitously interpreted as the continued subject of the preceding sentence.

- (29) *dĩ kuza amnə-bi batpolə-n aŋ-gən-də. dĩ büštö-zi'*  
 DEM man sit-PST cellar-GEN door-LAT-3SG DEM awl-INS  
*köten-gən-də mü'-lü'-bi, dĩ kar-i ne'-lü'-bi.*  
 butt-LAT-3SG prick-MOM-PST DEM open-CV pull-MOM-PST

‘The man<sub>x</sub> sat down on the trap-door of the cellar (where the other protagonist<sub>y</sub> is hiding). He<sub>y</sub> pricked him with an awl in his<sub>x</sub> butt. He<sub>x</sub> pulled (the door) open.’ (11.27–29, KW 99)

Lack of salience also exists after a discourse level transition as in (30). The first two sentences of (30) consist of an introduction of protagonists: a woman, a man, and their friend. The third sentence starts the plot. A zero subject expression would probably be tolerated if it referred to a main protagonist, but not to the friend; (30) is very similar to the pattern of demonstrative anaphora with newly introduced referents in Section 4, except that the anaphoric expression now consists simply of the demonstrative pronoun without a lexical expression.

- (30) *nükke büže-zi' amno-bi. najdə-dən i-bi. dĩ jadaj-la' šo-bi.*  
 woman man-INS live-PST friend-3PL be-PST DEM visit-CV come-PST  
 ‘Once there was a married couple. They had a friend. He came visiting.’ (11.1–3, KW 99)

Pronominal reference over zero anaphora may be motivated not only for discourse pragmatic reasons, but also for syntactic reasons: zero expression is appropriate only for subjects and objects (cf. (5) in the introduction); any other syntactic role of a referent in question requires its overt expression in order to encode it with the necessary case suffix.<sup>11</sup> This is illustrated with a lative form of the pronoun in (31) where the question about salience of the referent in question is of secondary importance. It is simply the syntactic role of goal which requires overt expression. Concerning parsing, these forms are never ambiguous because they are inflected, and inflection does not apply to adnominal demonstratives (see introduction).

- (31) *kūli-n      ńekkə-zey-də-zi'    amor-ia.    kūli-n      ńekkə-zey-də*  
 raven-GEN    cub-PL-3SG-INS    eat-PRS    raven-GEN    cub-PL-3SG  
*dĩ-nə      tũššə-lām-bi.*  
 DEM-LAT    learn-DUR-PST  
 'He eats together with the raven's nestlings. The raven's nestlings  
 became accustomed to him.' (7.17–18, KW 93)

(32c) is, again, a syntactically ambiguous example.<sup>12</sup> The parsing favoured here is pronominal, i.e. (32c-ii). This decision is based on the assumption that zero anaphora for the subject referent (the wife) would be infelicitous after the discourse level transition from direct speech in (32b) to plot continuation in (32c). The fact that the wife is referred to by minimal material only points to the topicality of this referent. But in the presence of the main protagonist of the tale, zero anaphora is not expected. (The main protagonist may be referred to by zero even as a switched subject, as in (32b).) As already in the preceding examples, the English translation for the D argument in (32c) is rather the personal pronoun, not the demonstrative.

11 To some degree, for a topical referent, such a requirement may be avoided in applying passive or dative shift as, e.g., in Mansi (cf. Skribnik 2000, Virtanen 2015). But for Kamas, such techniques are not available.

12 We consider the string *dĩ\_inəbə* DEM \_bow.ACC3SG ambiguous though it contains two features which may point to an argument reading of the demonstrative here: (i) in case of an adnominal reading we might expect apocope as with *esseŋ* in (25) above; and (ii) there are no secure instances of adnominal *dĩ* with a possessive suffixed noun. However, neither of these features is robust enough to exclude an argument reading *a priori*.

(32) Excerpt from tale no. 7 (7.21–24, KW 94)

a. *t'aktə nükke-t bñj-le' šo-bi.*  
 old woman-3SG get.water-CV come-PST

‘His old wife came (to the river) in order to fetch water.’

b. *nörbə-lia: –inə-m, mö-m tet-tə!*  
 tell-PRS bow-1SG arrow-1SG bring-IMP2SG:OC

‘He told her: –Bring my bow and arrow!’

c. *dĩ inə-bə teppi.*  
 DEM bow-ACC3SG bring.PST

(i) {Ø} {*dĩ inəbə*}: ‘{She} brought {this bow of his}.’

(ii) {*dĩ*} {*inəbə*} ‘{She/this one} brought {his bow}.’

The following example (33) – a narrative within a narrative – contains, again, a constellation of two topical participants. The first one, the people (of the village), are mentioned without a proper introduction in (33b). The other one (the daughter) is introduced in a possessive predication in (33c). The ambiguous string appears in (33d): *dĩ iləm*. Again, the adnominal reading is considered infelicitous for a pragmatic argument based on discourse level transition: the transition from background description to plot continuation after the introduction of the referent daughter in (33c) would motivate even demonstrative lexical reference (D+N) as in the examples presented in Section 4 above. In consequence, the most explicit encoding parsable is chosen here, namely D (cf. the parallel in (30) above). Corroborating this decision is that bare lexical expression for the other referent of (33d) (the people) is felicitous as well. Accusative marking on direct object expressions favours a givenness reading; it is not uncommon for a given, or even a topical referent, to be encoded as a bare lexical expression (plus accusative case); cf. (34) for a parallel. In sum, for (33d) pronominal parsing {D}\_N appears justified.

(33) Excerpt from tale no. 6 (6.62–65, KW 93)

a. *šide ñi-be' i-bi.*  
 two boy-1PL be-PST

‘We had two sons.’

b. *il so-nə sar-bize ö'-le' mĩ-bi bü-nə.*  
 people raft-LAT tie-CV:ANT let-CV give-PST river-LAT  
 'People tied them onto a raft and committed them to the river.'

c. *dĩ-zen pi'nēn-də ko'bdo-ba' i-bi.*  
 DEM-PL.GEN after.LOC-3SG girl-1PL be-PST  
 'After them we had a daughter.'

d. *dĩ il-əm bar kut-la' kum-bi.*  
 DEM people-ACC all kill-CV lead off-PST

(i) {Ø} {*dĩ iləm*}: 'She killed all these people.'

(ii) {*dĩ*} {*iləm*} 'This one killed all the people.'

(34) *šo-bi esseŋ-gən-dən[,] i-bi essem[,] ma'-gən-də*  
 come-PST child.PL-LAT-3PL take-PST child.PL.ACC tent-LAT-3SG  
*kun-na' kambi.*  
 lead-CV go.PST  
 'He came to their children, took the children, and led them to his home.' (6.48, KW 92)

(35) presents two more syntactically ambiguous instances of D\_N. It is an excerpt from the same tale as (34). In addition to the aforementioned daughter, the other topical protagonist is her brother with whom this excerpt starts. In (35a) he is encoded as D+N, motivated by the beginning of a new episode. In (35b, c) he is encoded as a zero anaphora subject. In (35d) then, he switches into an object role which, obviously, motivates material encoding. The question is how much: N, or D+N? Again, as in (35d), the noun is object marked, which favours a definite reading of 'boy' here. Further, considering the fact that the subject referent of (35d) (the sister) is not salient at this particular moment, zero anaphora would hardly be a felicitous encoding. On the other hand, she is definitely topical, since she is the object of her brother's search. Thus, pronominal reference as a simple indicator of subject switch (cf. the parallels in (29) and (32) above) is the favoured parsing in (35d). This decision is corroborated by assumed stress on the pronoun, resp. its prosodic independence, inferred from the full vowel in the narrow transcription (cf. Section 2.2 above). In the last sentence (35e), the refer-

ential status of the sister is clearly salient, now a continued subject in a topic chain, and, consequently, one may expect zero anaphora. For the boy, who is, in principle, also salient, we expect material encoding, in order for the lative suffix to be attached. The question is, why is he referred to by D+N, and not simply by D? At present, we have no appropriate answer, however, in the sense of Gundel et al. (1993, 275, 294) we may accept an encoding which is more explicit as minimally demanded. Perhaps the dramatic situation favours some extra effort here. The parsing decision for (35e) is thus adnominal D+N.

(35) Excerpt from tale no. 6 (6.68–72, KW 93)

a. *dī nī ine-bə šī-bi[,] pē-le' kalla' tūr-bi.*  
 DEM boy horse-ACC3SG mount-PST search-CV go.CV disappear-PST  
 'The boy mounted his horse, went searching (for his sister).'

b. *kambi urgo kara'-də[.]*  
 go.PST big steppe-LAT  
 'He went to the big steppe.'

c. *dī-gən tunoldə-la' mille'-bi.*  
 DEM-LOC gallop-CV go.DUR-PST  
 'There he was galloping around.'

d. *dī [dī] nī-m ku-biza tunoldə-la' šo-bi.*  
 DEM boy-ACC see-CV:ANT gallop-CV come-PST

(i) {Ø} {*dī nīm*}: 'When {she} saw {this boy} she came galloping.'

(ii) {*dī*} {*nīm*}: 'When {this one} saw {the boy} she came galloping.'

e. *sū'mə-le' naŋ-bi dī [dī] nī-nə.*  
 jump-CV cling-PST DEM boy-LAT

(i) {Ø} {*dī nīnə*}: '{She} jumped and clung to {this boy}.'

(ii) {*dī*} {*nīnə*}: '{This one} clung to {the boy}.'

## 6. Summary

The syntactically ambiguous instances of the sequence *D\_N* – i.e. the base form of the demonstrative pronoun *dī*, or its stressed variant *dī́*, preceding a noun – for which a parsing solution was offered are (15/16), (21), (22c–d), (23), and (35e), each with adnominal parsing {D+N}, and (27b), (31c), (32d), and (34d) with pronominal parsing {D}\_{N}. The decisions are based on discourse pragmatic criteria. For the referents in question their referential status has been discussed, distinguishing thereby salience, topicality, and givenness, and correlating the statuses with possible encodings (see Section 3). Further, discourse level transitions, also clearly contribute to the motivations for a specific encoding: after a transition from background transcription or direct speech to plot continuation, the motivation for material encoding (lexical and/or pronominal) is higher. Other motivating factors are subject switch, contrastivity contexts, or semantic case marking. The discussion follows the tradition of many works operating with the notion of referential status as, e.g., Prince (1981), Ariel (1990), Gundel et al. (1993), but does not necessarily assume a homogenous hierarchy, but rather three different contrasts (the salience contrast, the topicality contrast, and the givenness contrast, see 14a–c) because the transitions from topicality to salience, or from givenness to topicality, are not entirely clear to us. As for the purpose of this paper which addresses the topic from a philological point of view, having specific reading problems in mind, this solution seems satisfying for the time being. As a preliminary work for the discussion in Section 4, and 5, the status of the anaphoric demonstrative among the four demonstrative stems of Kamas has been determined in Section 2: it is an anaphoric device, not used exophorically. In addition, it was necessary to distinguish a stressed, or prosodically independent, variant.

It has to be stressed that the results of this paper do not achieve a complete new understanding of the discussed Kamas text records. In most instances, the German translation in KW reveals a correct parsing, or it does not even make much of a difference whether an NP is translated as, e.g., ‘the boy’ or ‘this boy’. However, seeing as the Kamas text corpus provides some more problems involving (possible) occurrences of the demonstrative *dī́/dī* which need to be solved in the future, this paper aimed at providing a necessary foundation.

As an example for an undecided case, one more example shall be presented: one after the other, three sisters disguise themselves

as boys in order to replace their father at work. The two elder sisters had returned home with their mission uncompleted, now the youngest daughter prepares for leaving. Preparations involve hair-cutting and putting on a men's gown as in (36a). This sentence refers to the preparations of the eldest daughter, earlier in the text. In the case of the second daughter, the narrator skipped these preparations. Coming now to the third daughter, the narrator starts with the dressing part in (36b). In (36c) the hair cutting is mentioned too, containing the string *dī\_e'bdəbə* 'DEM \_ hair.ACC3SG'. From the perspective of the subject referent, pronominal reference is not expected since in (36c) the girl is a continued subject in a topic chain for which zero expression would be appropriate, and therefore the reading in (36c-i) with an adnominal demonstrative is favoured. This parsing could be justified by assuming that the narrator forgot to mention the hair cutting first, then added it after (36b), and devoted some extra effort to the encoding of the hair (cf., however, footnote 12 for the uncertainty concerning instances of adnominal demonstrative with possessive marked nouns). Speculations like this show how much the parsing of syntactically ambiguous sequences of demonstrative pronoun and noun depend on pragmatic criteria.

(36) Excerpt from text no. 10 (KW 97–98)

- a. *e'bdə-bə saj bǎppi[,] tibi-j old'a šer-bi.*  
 hair-ACC3SG off cut.PST man-ADJ gown dress-PST

'She cut off her hair and put a men's dress on.' (10.7, KW 97)

- b. *tibi-j old'a šer-bi.*  
 man-ADJ gown dress-PST

'She put a men's dress on.' (10.23, KW 98)

- c. *dī e'bdə-bə saj bǎppi.*  
 DEM hair-ACC3SG off cut.PST

(i) {Ø} {*dī e'bdəbə*}: ? 'She cut off this hair of hers.'

(ii) {*dī*} {*e'bdəbə*}: ? 'She cut off her hair.'

## Acknowledgements

This paper is an extended version of Klumpp (2013a). The research was supported by the European Social Fund's Doctoral Studies and Internationalisation Programme *DoRa*. Special thanks go to Renate Pajusalu, an anonymous reviewer, and David Ogren.

## Address:

Gerson Klumpp  
 Institute of Estonian and General Linguistics  
 University of Tartu  
 Jakobi 2  
 51014 Tartu  
 Estonia  
 E-mail: klumpp@ut.ee

## Abbreviations

In the glossings appear the following abbreviations not included in Leipzig glossing rules: ANT – anterior converb, CON – connegative stem, CV – converb, INCH – inchoative aktionsart, LAT – lative case, MOM – momentaneous aktionsart, OC – object conjugation (object agreement marker), PTC – participle.

## References

- Anderson, Gregory D. S. (1998) *Xakas*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Ariel, Mira (1990) *Assessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Baskakov, Nikolaj A. and Anastasija I. Inkižekova-Grekul (1953) *Xakassko-russkij slovar'*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Castrén, Matthias A. (1847) *Manuscripta Castréniana XIX. Samoiedica 13: Kamass-Samoiedica*. Helsinki: National Library of Finland.
- Chafe, Wallace (1987) "Cognitive constraints on information flow". In Russel S. Tomlin, ed. *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, 21–51. (Typological Studies in Language, 11.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- CM = Castrén 1847.
- Diessel, Holger (1999) *Demonstratives: form, function, and grammaticalization*. (Typological Studies in Language, 42.) Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg, and Ron Zacharski (1993) "Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse". *Language* 69, 264–307.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus (1997) *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase. Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. (Linguistische Arbeiten, 362.) Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Joki, Aulis J. (1944) *Kai Donners Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik*. (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae, 8.) Helsinki.
- Klumpp, Gerson (2002) *Konverbkonstruktionen im Kamassischen*. (Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 58.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Klumpp, Gerson (2013a) "On demonstrative anaphora in Kamas". In Èva Fancsaly and Gábor B. Székely, red. *Obi-ugor és szamójéd kutatások, Magyar őstörténet. Hajdú Péter és Schmidt Èva emlékkonferencia 2012*, 123–143. Pécs: Pécsi Tudományegyetem.
- Klumpp, Gerson (2013b) "On Kai Donner's phonograph records of Kamas". *Finnisch-Ugrische Mitteilungen* 37, 45–59.
- Krifka, Manfred (2007) "Basic notions on information structure". In Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow, and Manfred Krifka, eds. *The notions of information structure*, 13–55. (ISIS, 6.) Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.
- KW = Joki 1944
- Prince, Ellen F. (1981) "Toward a taxonomy of given-new information". In Peter Cole, ed. *Radical pragmatics*, 223–256. New York: Academic Press.
- Skrjabin, Elena (2000) "Pragmatic structuring in Northern Mansi". In Tõnu Seilenthal, ed. *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-ugristarum Pars VI: Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica III*, 222–239. Tartu.
- Virtanen, Susanna (2015) *Transitivity in Eastern Mansi: an Information-structural approach*. Academic dissertation. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.

**Kokkuvõte. Gerson Klumpp: Lahendus kamassi keele demonstratiivide mitmetitõlgendatavuse kõrvaldamiseks.** Artikli eesmärgiks on esitada pragmaatilised kriteeriumid kamassi keele tekstikorpuses leiduvate süntaktiliselt mitmetitõlgendatavate demonstratiivpronoomeni ja substantiivi järjendite (D\_N) analüüsimiseks. Lisaks annab artikkel ülevaate kamassi keele demonstratiivide süsteemist sellisena nagu see esineb grammatilistes, leksikaalsetes ja tekstilistes allikates.

**Märksõnad:** kamassi keel, demonstratiivid, diskursuspragmaatika