

## Chapter 3

# Attention focus and information packaging in Vera'a demonstratives

Stefan Schnell

Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language & University of Melbourne

I investigate endophoric uses of demonstratives in the Oceanic language Vera'a (North Vanuatu) in relation to their exophoric use, drawing on different types of linguistic data, in particular conversations during the building of a house and narrative texts. I find that Vera'a demonstratives mark a three-way distinction of speaker-oriented (excluding the addressee) versus addressee-oriented (including the speaker) versus distal (excluding both speaker and addressee). Seeking to determine the core meaning of the three demonstratives that would square with both their exophoric and their endophoric use, I develop the hypothesis that considerations of joint attention focus rather than localisation are its central aspect: speaker-oriented forms are used to *draw* the addressee's attention to an entity, addressee-oriented forms to *maintain* attention to an entity, and distal forms to *delay* attention to an entity. The joint attention meaning of demonstratives in endophoric use yields effects in the domain of information packaging: speaker-oriented forms are used to introduce new information; addressee-oriented forms in specific syntactic contexts yield effects akin to topic and focus; distal forms are used to keep track of background information. Hence, attention focus is the invariable core meaning of Vera'a demonstratives that accounts for all senses in different contexts of use.

## 1 Introduction

The role of demonstratives in discourse has been the focus of a growing body of corpus-based research, starting with Himmelmann (1996). Recent work has been undertaken for the Australian language Dalabon by Cutfield (2012) and the Oceanic language Logea by Dawuda (2009). The central question concerning the endophoric (inner-textual) usage of demonstratives is its relationship to their exophoric (deictic) usage. One line of thought sees discourse essentially as a metaphorical extension of space (Diessel (1999) and Bühler (1999[1934]: 121)), with spatial distance being equivalent to anaphoric (antecedent) distance, and referent activation. An example of this is Terrill (2001), who examines the function of two demonstratives, *foia* and *oia*, in discourse from Lavukaleve: she finds



that the use of these two forms in endophoric use mirrors their function to mark distance distinctions (proximal versus distal) in situational use, so that spatial distance in the physical environment corresponds to antecedent distance within discourse, for instance how many clauses lie between an anaphor and its antecedent within a given text. Other authors stress the speaker/addressee orientation of demonstratives, but still see them merely as anchor points for marking spatial relations between speaker, referent, and addressee. This view is reflected in Margetts (2004). Yet other authors also focus on the speaker/addressee orientation of demonstratives, but see the use of demonstratives as a reflection of communicative interaction that can override ‘objectively’ determined spatial circumstances (see Enfield 2003 on Lao). In this line of thought, Mosel (2004) shows that Samoan speaker-oriented demonstratives are often used to introduce new information into discourse, whereas speaker-plus-addressee-oriented demonstratives are used for given referents, reflecting the knowledge state of speaker and addressee during discourse production/comprehension rather than their location in space relative to each other or to the entity referred to. This paper lends further support to this latter view, and it links the significance of knowledge states of interlocutors to that of joint attention. On this view, demonstratives can be characterised as linguistic devices that serve to “coordinate the interlocutors’ joint focus of attention” (Diessel 2006: 481).

In this paper I present findings from a study of the use of demonstratives in the Oceanic language Vera'a. I argue that Vera'a demonstratives do not have spatial-localising but attention-focussing meaning. Typical for an Oceanic language from Melanesia, Vera'a has a rich inventory of interrelated demonstrative forms that can be divided into three functionally defined sets of forms: 1. speaker-oriented (DEM.SPKR), 2. addressee-oriented (DEM.ADDR), and 3. neither speaker- nor addressee-oriented (distal) (DEM.DIST). In instances of exophoric reference, these forms do not merely serve the localisation of an entity in terms of their distance relative to either speaker, addressee, or both. Rather, it is the awareness state of participants in the communicative situation that is crucial for their exophoric use, serving to coordinate the attention focus of speaker and addressee (Diessel 2006). Thus, addressee-oriented forms are used where speaker and hearer share awareness of a referent and attend to it, even when the referent is located in the speaker's *here-space*. Conversely, speaker-oriented forms can be used where a referent is at a large distance from both speaker and addressee if the speaker believes the addressee to not be aware of or not attending to a referent they want them to attend to. Distal forms are used to refer to something that speaker is not focussing their attention on.

Crucially, the same considerations of attention focus account for the endophoric use of demonstratives in narrative texts (Diessel 2006: 476): here, speaker-oriented forms are restricted to two cases of *Deixis am Phantasma* (Bühler 1999[1934]: 121–140), a subtype of situational use in Himmelmann (1996: 222) (see §3.3 for a more detailed characterisation): 1. announcements of a narrative that is about to be produced by the speaker, and 2. cases of direct speech, where the narrated situation is rendered in analogy to the physical context of the actual speech situation. These uses are classified as exophoric here. In endophoric use, the choice between addressee-oriented and distal forms is sensitive to referential distance; however, the use of addressee-oriented forms can yield

information-packaging effects in specific discourse contexts, often corroborated with other structural properties, for instance left-dislocation and emphatic particles. I argue here that these information-packaging effects do not constitute an extended meaning of demonstratives, but follow straightforwardly from their attention-focussing meaning: speaker-oriented forms are used cataphorically to draw the addressee's attention to the narrative that is about to ensue, whereas addressee-oriented forms are used anaphorically, but serve to reinforce joint attention to already shared and activated information. This latter function then contributes to information-packaging effects, which are essentially a matter of pragmatic inference and the semantics of given syntactic and discourse contexts. Addressee-oriented forms are thus not simply used to mark the activation of a referent, and other forms of reference – typically pronouns – are used for activated referents. Distal forms, on the other hand, are used to re-activate a referent.

The paper unfolds as follows: §2 provides a brief overview of the Vera'a language and its speakers, and the corpus data underlying this study. In §3, I first define the class of demonstratives in Vera'a, and related demonstrative adverbs derived from them, and describe their syntactic distribution. I then turn to the description of exophoric uses, followed by endophoric uses. In §4, I discuss the findings with regard to spatial and attention-focus accounts of demonstratives. In §5, I conclude the paper, and provide an outlook on future research.

## 2 Language data and methodological notes

Vera'a (ISO 639-3: vra) is an Austronesian language of the Oceanic subgroup spoken by 500 people on the island of Vanua Lava, the largest of the Banks group of islands in North Vanuatu. It belongs to what Kalyan & François (to appear) call the 'Vanuatu linkage'. Vera'a is spoken in close vicinity to Vurës (Malau 2016) and Mwotlap (François 2001), and adult speakers are usually fluent in the former, and often at least understand the latter. All speakers of Vera'a above the age of approx. 3 years speak Bislama, the English-lexified contact language that has the status of Vanuatu's 'national language'. Nonetheless, Vera'a is not severely endangered and it is very vital: most children grow up (until the age of about 3) monolingually with Vera'a, which is used virtually in all domains of everyday communication, except for some church services. Immigrants into the Vera'a community usually acquire Vera'a, but may continue to use their first language with their children in their homes (this concerns mainly women from neighbouring communities who marry into the Vera'a community) (cf. François 2012). The language is endangered only due to the small size of the community, so that a language shift, for instance to Vurës, could potentially occur within a short time frame if the positive attitude towards the language should falter in the future.

This study draws on different types of text data in the Vera'a language documentation that I have been compiling since December 2006 in close collaboration with speakers of the language ([http://dobes.mpi.nl/projects/vures\\_veraa/](http://dobes.mpi.nl/projects/vures_veraa/)). The documentation encompasses recordings of a wide range of communicative events, ranging from narratives – produced mainly for the sake of being documented – to public speeches and (very few) ca-

sual conversations, which represent the most naturally occurring communicative events. Particularly relevant for this study are a set of video recordings documenting the construction of a larger house (approx. 4 hours), audio recordings of plant (150 descriptions, 30sec average recording length) and fish (254 descriptions, 1.5min average length) descriptions, and a collection of narrative texts (65 narratives of different lengths), most of which were only audio-recorded. Video recordings exist for a handful of narratives, and I will point to specific visual clues where relevant in the discussion to follow. Note, however, that for the purposes of this study, neither gestures nor prosodic structures were taken into account systematically, and a systematic and sound analysis of these two aspects of language use will have to be left for future work on the language. The time-aligned annotation of the audio signal in all recordings was segmented into pause units.

A smaller set of 10 narratives from different male and female speakers of different ages – some traditional legends and myths, some more similar to (moral) fables in the European tradition – contain rich morphosyntactic annotations that serve as the basis for some quantitative examination into the use of demonstratives in Vera'a. The texts show some variation in length, ranging from 178 to 929 clause units. Table 1 gives an overview.

Table 1: GRAID-annotated corpus of Vera'a narrative texts

Text ID	Speaker initials	age group	text type	no. of clause units
ANV	AN	18–25	narrative	208
AS.1	AS	35–50	narrative	224
GABG	GA	35–50	narrative	178
GAQG	GA	35–50	narrative	232
HHAK	HH	18–25	narrative	446
ISAM	IS	50+	narrative	248
ISWM	IS	50+	narrative	608
JJQ	JJ	50+	narrative	929
MVBW	MV	25–35	narrative	314
PALA	PH	35–50	narrative	402
Totals				3789

All of these ten narratives are part of the Vera'a corpus Schnell (2016) within the Multi-CAST collection (Haig & Schnell 2016; <https://lac.uni-koeln.de/de/multicast/>). Like all other text corpora in Multi-CAST, the Vera'a texts have been annotated according to the GRAID conventions (Haig & Schnell 2014), reading 'Grammatical Relations and Animacy in Discourse'. This annotation scheme has been designed specifically for purposes of research into referentiality, argument structure and discourse structure, as pioneered by Wallace Chafe and Talmy Givón, and associates. Essentially, GRAID annotations cou-

ple glosses for form (zero, pronoun, full NP) with those for syntactic functions (s, a, p, etc.), as well as information on person and animacy. The Vera'a corpus also contains annotation of phrasal sub-constituents, merely indicated by symbols for “word to the right of NP head” (<rn>) and “word to the left of NP head” (<ln>), and likewise for constituent words in complex verbal predicates. Also, adjuncts and other clause-level constituents, like adverbs and particles, have been annotated as <other>.

In the study of demonstratives reported here, GRAID annotations were used systematically together with morphemic glossing: since both layers of annotation are *symbolically associated* (and the respective type has been used for the GRAID tier relative to the morphemic glossing tier in ELAN), all demonstrative forms can be searched with respect to their syntactic function, either as an argument, a clause-level adjunct/particle, or an NP-level satellite constituent. Thus, using ELAN's layered search function, one can easily determine figures for and all instances of say DEM.ADDR forms occurring on NP level by searching for <dem.addr> on the morphemic glossing tier and <rn> on the GRAID tier. It was thus possible to determine a total of 759 instances of demonstrative forms in use in this corpus, comprising 528 basic demonstratives and 231 demonstrative adverbs. Since GRAID triggers basic features of referring expressions, we can also compare quantitatively the use of demonstratives in relation to NPs without demonstratives and other forms, in particular zero and pronoun. This latter investigation is, however, beyond the scope of this paper, and is planned to be undertaken in the future.

In this paper, I generally draw on the wider Vera'a documentation, discussing different types of data in turn. It will thus be clear during the discussion from which type of data a specific example has been drawn. The Vera'a Multi-CAST corpus serves merely to establish a quantitative picture of syntactic distributions of different demonstrative forms in narrative texts.

### 3 Demonstratives in Vera'a

In this section, I first define demonstratives in Vera'a following Himmelmann (1996) and describe the inventory of basic demonstratives and derived demonstrative adverbs in §3.1, and their syntactic distribution in §3.2. I then turn to their exophoric and endophoric uses in §3.3 and §3.4 respectively. My use of these two terms is adopted from Halliday & Hasan (1976: 33) in the following way: exophora is a direct relationship between a linguistic expression and an extra-linguistic entity; this is essentially the same as deixis. Endophoric relations can be defined in analogy to the definition of anaphora, as stated by Huang (2000: 1):

[An anaphora; added by Stefan Schnell] is a relation between two linguistic elements, wherein the interpretation of one (called an anaphor) is in some way determined by the interpretation of the other (called an antecedent) [...].

I use endophoric here as a hyperonym to both anaphora and cataphora, where the latter defines a relationship of “carrying forward” rather than backward. Like Huang (2000)

for anaphora, I understand endophoric relations as essentially quite vague and general, relying to a large degree on pragmatic inference. Thus, in determining whether a referring expression is exophoric or endophoric (for instance a definite full noun phrase), interlocutors will seek different clues as to whether they require to consider the discourse context of the same text, or whether they should resort directly to the physical surroundings of the speech situation in order to establish its reference. Although some form types are more common than others in one of the two types of relation, referential form classes are generally not specified for their type of reference. For instance, a personal pronoun in Vera'a can be endophoric or exophoric, regardless of the fact that the former use is possibly more common than the latter. Likewise, demonstratives are not *per se* exophoric.

Exophoric uses of demonstratives are attested in two different communicative contexts and related recordings, namely in non-narrative contexts (house building videos, observations) and in or immediately connected to narratives. In the latter context, they come in two different types: 1. the introduction of a narrative, and 2. instances of *Deixis am Phantasma*, in the sense of Bühler 1999[1934]: 131:

*[...] wenn ein Erzähler den Hörer [...] ins Reich der konstruktiven Phantasie führt und ihn dort mit denselben Zeigwörtern traktiert, damit er sehe und höre, was es dort zu sehen und zu hören [...] gibt. Nicht mit dem äusseren Auge, Ohr usw., sondern mit dem, was man [...] das "innere" oder "geistige" Auge und Ohr zu nennen pflegt. [...]* when the narrator leads the hearer [...] into the realm of constructive imagination and treats him to the same deictic words as before so that he may see and hear what can be seen and heard there [...]. Not with the external eye, ear, and so on, but with what is [...] called the "mind's" eye or ear [...] (English translation by Donald Goodwin and Achim Fraser Eschbach)

Although we may expect this special kind of deictic reference within direct speech to work somewhat differently from deixis within the actual speech act frame, I take the similarities eluded to by Bühler sufficient to treat them basically alike here (but I will point out to the reader what type is represented by any given example). Before turning to the exophoric and endophoric uses of demonstratives, I shall provide a definition of these forms together with their inventory in Vera'a, and outline their syntactic distribution.

### 3.1 Definition and inventory of demonstrative forms

Vera'a distinguishes three basic forms of demonstrative, marking a three-way opposition between speaker-oriented (DEM.SPKR), addressee-oriented (DEM.ADDR), and distal (DEM.DIST). What is labelled here 'addressee-oriented' is understood as essentially encompassing the sphere of both speaker and addressee, as will become clear below. The three forms fall under the definition put forward by Himmelmann (1996: 210), albeit with one qualification. According to Himmelmann, demonstratives have the following necessary criteria:

- (1) Demonstratives are linguistic expressions that
1. are in a paradigmatic relationship to elements that serve to locate a referent on a distance scale, i.e. proximal, distal, etc.
  2. cannot be used with reference to entities that are uniquely identifiable in a culture (or the world), or in so-called associative anaphora, e.g. where an anaphor is a part of the whole expressed by the antecedent

As for criterion 1, in situational use DEM.SPKR forms can be used to identify a referent that is located close to the speaker, whereas DEM.ADDR forms can be used where it is further away from the speaker, possibly between addressee and speaker. The form DEM.DIST can be used for referents even further away from the speaker, possibly at a large distance from both speaker and addressee. Examples in §3.3 will illustrate these points. While these uses concern the extension of demonstratives, their intentional definition in Vera'a does not draw precisely on the distance parameter, as will become clear in the sections to follow. Moreover, it seems that the Vera'a facts provide some illustrative evidence that the exophoric-situational use is not necessarily basic to the meaning of demonstratives, as assumed in earlier work by Diessel 1999: 93. Instead, my findings support the view that the meaning of demonstratives is general with respect to exophoric and endophoric uses (cf. Himmelmann 1996: 242), and is indeed grounded in considerations of interlocutor interaction and 'attention focus', as found by Enfield (2003) for Lao (cf. also Diessel 2006). Table 2 summarises the inventory of basic and adverbial demonstrative forms. Forms of DEM.SPKR and DEM.ADDR alter between a 'plain' form and a form prefixed with *a-*. The latter is quite likely to represent a crystallised combination of the specific locative article *a* and a demonstrative. The formal distinction is relevant insofar as they correlate with constraints on syntactic distribution: for instance only the prefixed but not the plain forms of basic demonstratives can occur adnominally. Where a form is prefixed, this is indicated by .A in the gloss, for instance DEM.SPKR.A for the prefixed speaker-oriented base form.

Table 2: Inventory of Vera'a demonstrative forms

	DEM.ADDR		DEM.SPKR		DEM.DIST
	PLAIN	A-FORM	PLAIN	A-FORM	
BASIC	nē	anē	gēn(ē)	agēn(ē)	ē
MANNER	senē	asenē	segēn(ē)	asegēn(ē)	
TEMPORAL	va'anē		va'agēn		
LOCATIVE	('e)kēnē		('e)kēgēn		

Table 2 also lists demonstrative adverbs in addition to basic demonstratives. These are derived from the base forms as follows: manner adverbs are derived by adding a prefix *se-* whose exact meaning and origin are unclear at this stage. Temporal adverbs essentially

consist of an adverb *va'a* ‘already’ plus the base form. Locational adverbs are combinations of the noun *'ekē* ‘place’ and a basic demonstrative. All three types of adverb can be used adnominally and occupy the same phrase-final slot as base forms (compare example (3)):

- (2) *n= gie si =n gengen si =n sava senē di =m wōlwōl*  
 ART= kava or =ART food or =ART what MAN.DEM.ADDR 3SG =TAM1 RED:buy  
*ma mē no. (0.6)*  
 hither DAT 1SG  
 ‘[He gave me money for the work.] Also kava, food, or such things, he bought for me.’  
 MVRP.080

I will be dealing mainly with the use of base form demonstratives in this chapter. However, I will occasionally outline particular usage properties of DEM.SPKR and DEM.ADDR by reference to adverbs where particularly illustrative examples show that the findings presented here apply to the wider demonstrative system.

As for Himmelmann’s second criterion, the forms in Table 2 are indeed incompatible with the first usage context, but a single example is attested that is similar to the binding (associative) anaphora example mentioned by Himmelmann (1996: 210):

- (3) *qōñ vōwal e ruwa mē =n gunu-ruō duru =m 'ōgo 'ōgo vaa-van*  
 night one PERS HUM:DL DAT =ART spouse-3DL 3DL =TAM1 stay stay RED-go  
*=n reñe anē ne wotoqtoqo.*  
 =ART woman DEM.ADDR.A AOR:3SG pregnant  
 ‘One day, (there was) a couple. They stayed and stayed (and after some time) that woman got pregnant.’  
 ANV.001–003

In this example, the speaker first introduces the couple, and two clauses later refers to one in the couple, the woman, using an adnominal DEM.ADDR. This usage would disqualify the forms in question as demonstratives according to Himmelmann’s second criterion. Thus, if we take this particular use of a DEM.ADDR form as evidence against its status as a demonstrative we will probably have to conclude that the language does not possess demonstratives at all, given the clear paradigmatic relation of the form with DEM.SPKR and DEM.DIST forms. This would in my view not be a plausible analysis, given the universality of demonstratives (and hence their expectedness in Vera’a) and the otherwise clear indications that the forms in question function like demonstratives in other languages.

There are two possibilities to account for this ‘abnormal’ use of a demonstrative: firstly, we might be dealing simply with a production mistake, given that it is the only example in the entire corpus. Though this is somewhat speculative, it is not impossible that speakers occasionally ‘miscalculate’ the identifiability of referents, believing that there is an eligible antecedent expression in the discourse context, although there isn’t (Ariel 1990: 72). The second possibility is that Himmelmann’s criterion is too narrow, and that Vera’a treats associative anaphora differently from other languages. Which of these two possibilities is more appropriate remains an open question at this point, and is left for future



investigations of more, and possibly more varied, discourse data to determine whether such uses are more common with some speakers or in some contexts than our current data suggests.

### 3.2 Syntactic distribution of demonstrative forms

For base form demonstratives, three syntactic positions and respective functions are attested: NP-internal modifier (adnominal use), argument on clause level (pronominal use), and clause-level adverbs and particles. Table 3 provides figures for the frequencies of uses of DEM.ADDR, DEM.SPKR, and DEM.DIST in all three syntactic contexts, with the restriction that DEM.DIST cannot be used pronominally.

Table 3: Frequencies of basic demonstratives in 10 Vera'a narratives

DEM.ADDR			DEM.SPKR			DEM.DIST		Totals		
ADN	PRO	other	ADN	PRO	other	ADN	other	ADN	PRO	other
255	20	127	21	4	10	74	17	350	24	154

All three forms can be used adnominally, as modifiers in the noun phrase, as shown by the following examples (4) and (5):

- (4) *ne 'ēn e ruwa māl̄māla ē =s sag 'i e ruwa*  
 AOR:3SG see PERS HUM:DL girl DEM.DIST =SIM sit DEL PERS HUM:DL  
*māl̄māla anē so*  
 girl DEM.SPKR.A QUOT  
 '[...] and then (he) spotted those two girls (who were) sitting (there), and the two girls said: ...' 1.PALA.059–060
- (5) *no =k kaka =n nel̄no vu' agēnē*  
 1SG AOR:1SG story =ART voice spirit DEM.SPKR.A  
 'I am going to tell this (the following) story: ...' ISWM.001

The functions of these different forms in adnominal use will be discussed in §3.3 and §3.4. Pronominal use is restricted to DEM.ADDR and DEM.SPKR forms. While DEM.ADDR demonstratives occur as subjects (ex 6) and predicates (ex 7) in non-verbal clauses, all pronominal uses of DEM.SPKR are instances of subjects in non-verbal clauses (ex 8):

- (6) *nē =n tēktēk mu-n e Qo'.*  
 DEM.ADDR =ART RED:speech POSS.GEN-CS PERS Q.  
 'This was Qo's speech [what Qo' said].' JJQ.306

- (7) *bul wova'al ē di sa nē*  
 bunch pawpaw DEM.DIST 3SG EMPH DEM.ADDR  
 'That bunch of pawpaw (over there), it is exactly that [which we had in mind]'  
 GABG.075
- (8) *kamaduō gēn.*  
 IDL.EX DEM.SPKR  
 'This (is) us.' 2.PALA.125
- Pronominal uses of demonstratives are very rare, in particular where DEM.SPKR forms are involved. These cases are in fact restricted to contexts of *Deixis am Phantasma* in narrative texts, to be discussed in §3.3. This corroborates the findings from the sample presented in Himmelmann (1996: 215) for texts from different languages.
- Similar to other Oceanic languages (Mosel (2004) on Samoan; Margetts (2004) on Saliba; François (2001) on Mwotlap), basic demonstratives in Vera'a can occur on clause level in clause-final position, for example:
- (9) *e raga anē =k tek so =n tōo me ma' nē*  
 PERS HUM:PL DEM.SPKR.A =AOR:NSG say QUOT =ART fowl FUT dead DEM.ADDR  
 'And they said: "These chickens will die!"' ANV.037
- (10) *dir'ōl =k ōnōn 'i anē*  
 3TL =AOR RED:lie DEL DEM.SPKR.A  
 'They lay down [and shortly after that ...]' MVBW.109
- (11) *e Qo' ne sag rēn sag kēkē ē*  
 PERS Q. AOR:3SG sit stuck up above DEM.DIST  
 'But Qo' is trapped up (in the tree), have you forgotten?' JJQ.151
- (12) *kamam mi'ir sa gēnē lē =n wio.*  
 IPL.EX.TAM1 sleep EMPH DEM.SPKR LOC =ART bamboo  
 'Let's sleep right here, in the bamboo.' JJQ.354

In examples (9) and (10), DEM.ADDR forms occur in clause-final position. In (9), it functions as an assertive particle that serves to underscore the speaker's conviction about the truth of a proposition. In (10), it fulfils a clause-combining function, details of which will be discussed in §3.4. The same function is carried out by DEM.DIST in this position (ex 11). Basic DEM.SPKR forms always function as locative adverbs when occurring on clause level (ex 12).

Demonstrative adverbs are used mainly adverbially on clause level (category 'other' in Table 4). However, they do occur – in rare instances – as modifiers in the noun phrase. Table 4 lists the relevant figures for frequencies of use.

I confine myself here to presentation of a single example of a locative adverb in adnominal function (see also example (2) above):

Table 4: Distribution and frequency of demonstrative adverbs in 10 narratives

	DEM.ADDR		DEM.SPKR		TOTALS	
	ADN	other	ADN	other	ADN	other
MANNER	2	57	3	24	5	81
TEMPORAL	1	61	0	5	1	66
LOCATIVE	4	57	1	16	5	73
TOTALS	7	175	4	45	11	220

- (13) *'erē 'ama' 'ekēnē*      *dir =ēm van se-serge ma.*  
 PL devil LOC.DEM.ADDR 3PL =TAM1 go RED-together hither

'The spirits (of) here, they came together here.'

ISWM.281–282

In the following subsections, I will focus on the use of basic demonstratives, and only occasionally turn to the use of demonstrative adverbs.

Before we turn our attention to the different uses of demonstratives, it should be noted that adnominal demonstratives are the only NP-level element that directly influences the referential interpretations of NPs. Pre-head articles are merely phrase markers whose only function is the marking of the type of phrase, and the subtype of NP (common versus personal). NPs with adnominal demonstratives are definite, and have an identifiable referent. We will see below that this is merely an entailment of demonstratives, and not their core meaning. NPs without demonstratives are likewise regularly used in contexts where their referent is identifiable, but they are also compatible with discourse-new reference. As for pronominal uses of demonstratives, these may be relatively rare in the corpus because third person pronouns are regularly used for anaphoric and – to a lesser degree – deictic reference to identifiable entities. As indicated above, this paper will be confined to the development of a first hypothesis concerning the use and meaning of Vera'a demonstratives. A systematic corpus study of the use of demonstratives in competition with other types of referring expressions will be left for future work on the language.

### 3.3 Exophoric use of Vera'a demonstratives

The exophoric functions of demonstratives are often seen as basic, for instance in Diessel (1999). While it is the exophoric use of demonstratives that defines the class as a whole in Himmelmann's (1996) definition, it is questionable whether spatial considerations are part of the core meaning of demonstratives. Himmelmann himself doubts this, as do studies like Enfield (2003), as well as later work by Diessel (2006). My findings concerning the use of demonstratives in Vera'a lend further support to the view that the basic function of demonstratives is in interlocutor interaction and attention focussing.

The purpose of this section is to provide an outline of exophoric uses of the three demonstratives in Vera'a. I will here draw on two types of data, namely the house building video and observation where speakers point to entities and locations in the physical environment of the recording. Secondly, I will illustrate the same patterns of demonstrative use in instances of *Deixis am Phantasma* in the direct speech of characters pointing to entities within the narrated reality. The last type of exophoric use to be discussed here is in a narrative's frame, in particular where a narrative is announced just prior to its narration, and where it is wrapped up after the last events have been reported.

It should be noted here that at this stage, no more systematic investigation of situational uses of demonstratives – like the studies by Enfield (2003) on Lao and Margetts (2004) on Saliba – has been carried out for Vera'a as yet. This is, however, not strictly necessary for understanding their use in narrative discourse, as will become clear below. The basic distinctions of speaker orientation, addressee orientation, and distal interpretation is relatively clear from the few examples in the video recordings (the house-building recording and a subset of narratives), and is the only one relevant for their use in narrative discourse. We will see in some examples here that even in exophoric use, information-related categories are more relevant than spatial considerations.

Vera'a demonstratives are participant-oriented, which does not so much draw on distance relative to the speaker, but on considerations as to whether the addressee (or the speaker) can be regarded as sharing some *here-space* with the referent. In this system, DEM.SPKR forms are strictly associated with the speaker, as can be seen from the following two examples where the DEM.SPKR form contributes the location of an object near the speaker, but outside of the immediate perception of the addressee:

- (14) *woqe'enge agēnē* 'erē mom kal 'i [...] HouseBuilding10\_FQ.005  
 wood DEM.SPKR.A PL put up DEL  
 'This wood here [in speaker's hand], put (it) up, I have just cut (it).'
- (15) *n gasel luwo mu-m gēn* observed  
 ART knife big POSS.GEN-2SG DEM.SPKR  
 'Your bush knife is here [where I am]!'

Example (14) is taken from a house building recording. In this situation the speaker is holding a piece of wood in his hand and is about to pass it up to someone standing on the scaffold, so that it becomes a strut in the house's rafter. In uttering (14), he brings this new piece of roof structure to the other person's attention. Examples like (15) can be observed daily in the Vera'a community. Here, the speaker is sitting in a sleeping house and shouts out to the addressee, who is searching for his knife outside and inside the kitchen house. One crucial aspect concerning the use of DEM.SPKR is that it seems to entail the speaker's assumption that the addressee is not attending to the entity in question (and is possibly not familiar with it). This is illustrated by the following examples of direct speech involving situational use within narratives. Here, the speaker is drawing the addressee's attention to something that is not only clearly not in their *here-space*, but is also presented in such a way that the addressee is not aware of it:

### 3 Attention focus and information packaging in Vera'a demonstratives

- (16) *ruwa =n nō-k ēn bē agēnē n= bē nō-k*  
 HUM:DL =ART POSS.DOM-1SG ART water DEM.SPKR.A ART= water POSS.DOM-1SG  
*anē ga mana nē.*  
 DEM.SPKR.A STAT power DEM.ADDR  
 ‘Hey you two, I have some water here. This water of mine has magic powers.’ AS.  
 1.100–101

- (17) *n qō gēnē wo =n mañra gēnē no me gis gidē =k van.*  
 ART pig DEM.SPKR and =ART money DEM.SPKR 1SG FUT hold 1PL.IN =AOR go  
 ‘I have a pig here, and some money here. I’ll take it and then let’s go.’  
 ISWM.219

In both examples, the referent is presented as new to the addressee. Once attention has been established in (16), the speaker uses the DEM.ADDR form in the following clause which further elaborates on the referent. The data examined thus far lend themselves to the following hypothesis: DEM.SPKR forms are used where an entity is only in the *here-space* of the speaker, excluding that of the addressee, and where the addressee is not yet attending to that entity.

By contrast, DEM.ADDR forms are used where the referent is not exclusively in the speaker’s *here-space*, for instance where addressee also has perceptual access to it or where it is in the addressee’s *here-space*. The following two examples illustrate this:

- (18) *o kēnē nē ga tēlēglēg.*  
 INTERJ LOC.DEM.ADDR DEM.ADDR STAT askew  
 ‘No, there, that one is (still) uneven [not horizontal].’  
 HouseBuilding04\_PB.008

- (19) [...] *le rieg ēn nāra gasel anē* [...] [...]  
 take out ART mouth knife DEM.SPKR.A  
 ‘Remove that (blade of that) knife!’  
 HouseBuilding09\_JJ.009

Again, both examples stem from the house building video recordings. In (18), the speaker is first looking at the measuring string between two posts on the other side of the house’s plane. The string is used to check whether both posts have the same height, and here the speaker states that it is not horizontal yet. The adjustment of the string is the main thing that is happening at this stage, and the speaker can assume everybody to be attending to it. In (19), the speaker – standing outside the scaffold – is referring to the knife lying in the middle of the house’s plane, surrounded by other builders. One of these in fact then approaches the knife, apparently following the request. Everybody in this scene can be regarded as being aware of the knife lying there. We can assume that the use of a DEM.SPKR form would have triggered the addressees’ turning their heads towards the speaker, the *here-space* exclusive to the speaker.

Equivalent examples can be found in direct speech within narrative texts where both characters, the speaker and the addressee, are rendered as being aware of an entity and attending to it:

- (20) *nē* =*n ēn men nē*  
 DEM.ADDR =ART ART bird DEM.ADDR  
 ‘[discussion among characters after hearing some noise out in the bush] “That [what we are hearing here] is a bird, believe me!” (There is a bird singing.)’  
 MVBW.061
- (21) *o bul wēwē wova'al ne vōwal sarēnē ga mine ne'ē sa*  
 INTERJ friend fruit pawpaw NUM one up.there STAT ripe DEM.ADDR EMPH  
*gidu me gen nē*  
 IDL.IN FUT eat DEM.ADDR  
 ‘Oh friend, that one ripe pawpaw fruit up there, that’s the one we will eat, I tell you.’  
 GABG.051–052

The second example also illustrates the omnipresent potential ambiguity between exophoric-situational and endophoric-tracking use: as will become clear below, DEM.ADDR forms are also the ones used for given-activated referents – i.e. those referents already attended to by both speaker and addressee – and DEM.ADDR forms could here be understood as referring to the entity both characters attend to in the depicted physical environment, or the referent in the depicted discourse of direct speech. Example (16) illustrates a similar ambiguity in the second clause, where the magic water just presented to the two is taken up again in the second clause.

The following examples of direct speech illustrate the same functional aspect of DEM.ADDR forms, this time used adnominally:

- (22) *dir =m gal no ma no =m rem a =n woqe'enge anē.*  
 3PL =TAM1 lie 1SG hither 1SG =TAM1 climb LOC.SP =ART tree DEM.SPKR.A  
 ‘They tricked me into coming here, and I climbed up this tree.’ JJQ.182–183
- (23) *'ei bulsal nik ē dada sēvēē lē =n bē nanara anē*  
 INTERJ friend 2SG AOR:2SG RED:do how LOC =ART trunk tree.sp DEM.SPKR.A  
 ‘Hey, friend, what are you doing on this Nanara trunk here?’ GAQG.034

Summarising the observations concerning the use of DEM.ADDR, the following can be stated: 1. the entity in question is not clearly located in the speaker’s *here-space* and is not clearly excluded from that of the addressee, and 2. both speaker and addressee attend to it, or are at least aware of it.

Comparing the use of DEM.SPKR and DEM.ADDR forms, we can conclude that the former are used where the entity is excluded from the addressee’s *here-space* and is being brought to the addressee’s attention just at the time of utterance, and the latter is used where the converse situation holds, i.e. where an entity is not excluded from the addressee’s *here-space* and both speaker and addressee are already attending to it at the beginning of the utterance. This hypothesis would be falsified, for instance, by examples where a DEM.ADDR form is used for an entity clearly in the *here-space* of the speaker but not the addressee – for instance where both are separated by a wall or so, as in example (15) above – or where a DEM.SPKR form is used when clearly both speaker and addressee

were already attending to the entity at the beginning of the utterance. Such examples have not been identified in the data.

The decisive factor in the use of these two forms is the inclusion versus exclusion of the addressee, rather than the speaker's *here-space*. This is illustrated by the following example where the referent of the NP 'head post' is in the speaker's *here-space*, but not excluded from that of the addressee. The speaker here appeals to the fact that the addressee – in this case myself behind/next to the camera – is attending to the post, pointing the camera at it and him:

- (24) *di ne 'i-'iris e raga a sag kēkē a =n wōlwōlo*  
 3SG AOR:3SG RED-EVEN PERS HUM:PL LOC.SP up above LOC.SP =ART CROSS  
*ē nē =n wōqa'ag qi'i nē no =s 'ar'ar*  
 DEM.DIST DEM.ADDR =ART post head DEM.ADDR 1SG =SIM RED:carve  
*anē.*  
 DEM.ADDR.A

'So that it is becoming even with the others up there on that cross (beam). This is the head post, you know, that one I am cutting.' HouseBuilding08\_JJ.002–003

This shows that DEM.ADDR forms are used where the addressee is assumed to be aware of or attending to the entity in question, for instance looking straight at it as in this example. The DEM.SPKR forms are, on the other hand, restricted to uses where only the speaker has perceptual access to or is aware of the entity in question, as was illustrated by example (15) above. The relevant functional aspect of DEM.SPKR forms, distinguishing them from DEM.ADDR forms, is that they are exclusive to the speaker's access.

The hypothesis that DEM.SPKR forms are associated with a strictly speaker-delimited *here-space* receives further support from the observation that DEM.SPKR forms cannot be used as expansions of the speaker's *here-space* to include that of the addressee, or a wider spatial dimension. For such contexts – where English would use *here* – DEM.ADDR forms are used. In the following example, taken from an account of local history recounting the resettlement of Vera'a speakers at the location of the contemporary village, the speaker refers to the village of Vera'a, where the recording is taking place:

- (25) *lē =n masōgi dir =ēm mul kal ma kēnē*  
 LOC =ART time 3PL =TAM1 move up hither LOC.DEM.ADDR  
 'When they came up here [to today's Vera'a village, where the recording takes place]...' BSVH.066

The same is illustrated by the following examples from direct speech within narratives: in (26) and (27), the speaker refers to the house where he, his associates and the addressee are.

- (26) *kamam ē mi-mi'ir ros a vie kamam mi'ir wal*  
 1PL.EX NEG.GEN1 RED-sleep NEG.GEN2 LOC.SP where 1PL.EX:TAM1 sleep INTENS  
*sa kēnē*  
 EMPH LOC.DEM.ADDR

'We didn't sleep anywhere (else), we slept right here!'

JJQ.396

- (27) *kamam ne gitag ēn mō-mam [...] kamam ga mi'ir wal sa*  
 1PL.EX ?? not.exist ART POSS.HOUSE-1PL.EX 1PL.EX STAT sleep INTENS EMPH  
*lē =n nimē anē*  
 LOC =ART house DEM.SPKR.A  
 ‘We don’t have another house that we could move to. We slept in this house right here!’  
 JJQ.425

The respective DEM.SPKR forms of locative adverbs are used only where the addressee is clearly not included in the speaker’s *here-space*, as in the following example of direct speech where a character is inviting a group of people from far down the coast to stay at his place:

- (28) *van ma gēdē me 'og kēgēn.*  
 go hither 1PL.IN FUT stay LOC.DEM.SPKR  
 ‘(You guys) come here, and we will stay here together.’  
 JJQ.273

That attention focus is the driving force behind the choice between DEM.ADDR and DEM.SPKR forms is further supported by examples where DEM.SPKR forms are used with referents that are clearly situated at an enormous distance from the position of the speaker. The crucial point is that it is *not in the addressee’s here-space*. Moreover, it seems that the speaker in this example intends to draw the addressee’s attention to something new, or something the speaker would assume the addressee not to be aware of at a given point. The most blatant example illustrating this point comes from another instance of direct speech in a narrative: in (29), a boy asks his father about a light that is far away in the bush (and the video shows the narrator pointing into the distance when depicting the boy’s gesture, while looking to the other side to address his father), using the DEM.SPKR form:

- (29) *lē =n qōñ ne vōwal Wowōt ne vesir e 'ama-gi so mam*  
 LOC =ART night NUM one pers.name AOR:3SG ask PERS father-3SG QUOT dad  
*ba =n bur agēnē =n sava*  
 but =ART light DEM.SPKR.A =ART what  
 ‘Then one day, Wowot would ask his father: “Dad, but this light here [pointing gesture], what is that?”’  
 ISWM.075–076

The explanation for the use of a DEM.SPKR form in line with our hypothesis is that here the speaker has the light in mind and now wants to direct his father’s attention to it so he can ask him about it. Similarly in the following example, the group of people – already featured in examples (26) – (28) – is looking for a place to sleep to hide from the evil spirit who had invited them to stay with him. The group has been sleeping in different parts of the house, hiding from the spirit who wants to kill them. In example (30), one member of the group gives them away to the spirit by telling him the actual place they spent the night in:



- (30) *kamam mi'ir sa gēnē lē =n wio*  
 1PL.EX sleep EMPH DEM.SPKR LOC =ART bamboo  
 ["Where did you sleep?" And then Tagarqonqon said:] "We slept right here, in  
 the bamboos [We slept in the (bamboo) struts.]" JJQ.354

This example contrasts with examples (26) and (27) – taken from the same context. Here the speaker draws the addressee's attention to something new, rather than the house, that the addressee is familiar with, aware of and shares his *here-space* with. Specifically, the speaker here points to a more specific place within the house that – given the context – the addressee was not aware of. Finally, an example from the house building video illustrates the same idea. In (31), the speaker – standing next to the camera and commenting on what is happening in the frame – points to different spots where the side posts of the house are going to be located, thereby drawing the attention of the addressee – me in this case, behind the camera – to these different locations:

- (31) *rōv'ē 'i so =n 'aval-gi a kēl sar gēnē dir =ēk mom*  
 close DEL CPL =ART side-3SG LOC.SP back bushwards DEM.SPKR 3PL =AOR put  
*qē =n 'erē qa'aga (0.4) wo dir =ēk qē'ēg kēl ēn 'aval-gi*  
 finish =ART PL post and 3PL =AOR begin back ART side-3SG  
*agēnē. (0.3)*  
 DEM.SPKR.A

'It's almost like that side further bushwards, they have put all the posts, and then they will start on this side over here.' HouseBuilding05\_IS.008–009

Here, the speaker first points away from the two of us towards the bushwards side of the plane of the house, using a DEM.SPKR form, and then turn to the other side, again using a DEM.SPKR form. This consecutive pointing to new locations and referents seems similar to the listing use of proximal demonstratives in Samoan (Mosel 2004), and is compatible with the idea that such forms are used to draw the addressee's attention to the next, new point in the series.

Finally, DEM.DIST forms are used where an entity is not associated with the speaker or addressee, and is not to become the focus of attention. Example (25) above illustrates this: the speaker uses a DEM.ADDR form when referring to the post he is cutting, assuming that the addressee is also attending to it. But in the immediately preceding clause, he refers to the cross beam of the house's scaffold that is outside of what speaker and addressee will then be attending to, and relevant only as background. The DEM.DIST form is used here. DEM.DIST forms are also used where the speaker cannot fully attend to the referent in question because it is outside their perception. This is the case in (32), where Cat is asking Rat about the pawpaw that only Rat has access to:

- (32) *o bul rōv-rōv'ē nik e kur kirmō =n gako wova'al ē*  
 INTERJ friend RED-close 2SG 2SG:AOR gnaw break =ART stalk pawpaw DEM.DIST  
 'Hey friend, will you almost have gnawed through that pawpaw stalk?'  
 GABG.083

I conclude that the DEM.ADDR and the DEM.SPKR forms are both used where the speaker seeks joint attention focus with the addressee; DEM.DIST forms, on the other hand, are used where the referent is outside of the interlocutor's attention sphere, and relevant only generally but not right here, or simply impossible to attend to conjointly. Obviously, this can be the case where the referent is at a greater distance from both speaker and hearer, hence its characterisation as distal.

Lastly, DEM.SPKR forms are often used in two further contexts that belong to narrative texts, but are to be classified as exophoric-situational since they involve consideration of the communicative situation of the narration itself. The first of these are cases of *Deixis am Phantasma* (Bühler 1999[1934]) where a narrator uses the physical environment and/or their own body to illustrate aspects of the depicted reality of the narrative (see also Himmelmann 1996: 224). Thus, in (33) the speaker shows where a character is holding the different kinds of leaves (to signal his peaceful mindset). In (34), the narrator demonstrates how a piece of breadfruit is broken off. For this latter example, two interpretations seem possible: one in terms of the manner of breaking it off, and one in terms of the dimensions (size, shape) of the piece. In (35), the speaker illustrates the dimensions of a rock wall.

- (33) *di ga gis ēn du mēl val-gi agēnē wo =n seg*  
 3SG STAT hold ART leaf tree.sp opposite-3SG DEM.SPKR.A and =ART tree.sp  
*val-gi agēnē.*  
 opposite-3SG DEM.SPKR.A

'He was holding a *mēl* leaf in this hand here, and a *seg* leaf on the other side here.'  
 ISWM.258

- (34) *'ubu-gi =m 'uq rak den ēn menre-gi ne vōwal*  
 grandparent/child-3SG =TAM1 break.off out ABL ART piece-3SG NUM one  
*segēnē [...]*  
 MAN.DEM.SPKR

'His grandma broke off a piece (of breadfruit) like this.' MVB.149

- (35) *kel qa-qañ luwo segēn.*  
 big RED-walling big MAN.DEM.SPKR

'a wall big like this.' ISWM.175

These uses of DEM.SPKR forms are compatible with the hypothesis outlined above that these forms function to establish joint attention. The respective narrator is pointing out aspects of his body and corresponding aspects of the narrated reality that he believes the audience is not aware of. Similarly, and occasionally hard to distinguish from *Deixis am Phantasma*, narrative frames and meta-comments are essentially exophoric in nature. Narrative frames are those passages where a narrative is introduced or ended, or where the narrator makes meta-narrative comments, for example stating that the narrative will soon come to an end. As for the former case, speakers often start a narrative by referring to the act of narrating or the narrative (as a textual whole) that is going to follow. In these cases, DEM.SPKR forms are used, as can be seen from the following two examples:

- (36) *no =k kaka =n nelño vu' agēnē*  
 1SG =AOR:1SG story =ART voice- spirit DEM.SPKR.A  
 'I am going to tell the following story:' ISWM.001

- (37) *no ga moros no =k dedicatem ēn kaka agēnē mē =n e*  
 1SG STAT want 1SG =AOR:1SG dedicate ART story DEM.SPKR.A DAT =ART PERS  
*raga mērmēre*  
 HUM:PL kid  
 'I want to dedicate this story to the children [...]' MVBW.004

A similar context featuring DEM.SPKR use is the following, where the narrator announces a song to follow, sung in this case by another person, and meant to be sung by a character in the story:

- (38) *lē =n nes 'a bēne di =m van esegēn*  
 LOC =ART song ASS.SP OBL.PRO 3SG =TAM1 go DEM.SPKR.A  
 'The song belonging to it [i.e. the story] goes like this:' HHAK.091

Hence, we are dealing here with cataphoric uses of the speaker-oriented forms, which are notionally similar to *this-new* (Wald 1983: 93) uses in English, and which square with the attendance-establishing hypothesis: the function of DEM.SPKR forms here is to get the audience to attend to the story to come, which of course they are not familiar with, and which metaphorically rests with the speaker up to that point where they start the narration. As observed by Himmelmann (1996) for a range of languages, these instances of cataphoric reference with speaker-based forms to introduce new information are often restricted to discourse-deictic use, and this is true for Vera'a as well. Hence, DEM.SPKR forms are used cataphorically in this way only where an event or content noun is involved, as in examples (36–38).

Conversely, at the end of a story, narrators conclude the narration with reference back to the story, stating that it has come to an end. Interestingly, in these instances no demonstrative is ever used to modify the noun 'story'. However, a locative adverb of the DEM.ADDR series is used to refer to that end point in the story, for example:

- (39) *kaka wunva di =m diñ wuva ekēnē.*  
 story probably 3SG =TAM1 reach only LOC.DEM.ADDR  
 'The story, it is probably over at this point.' ISWM.361

- (40) *ba =n kaka =m qē' sa kēnē.*  
 but =ART story =TAM1 finish EMPH LOC.DEM.ADDR  
 '[...and what happened to them I don't know], but the story is over right here.'  
 MVBW.137

This context is not clearly exophoric, but can be seen as an instance of endophoric and discourse-deictic use. Two observations seem relevant here. For one thing, these examples highlight that DEM.ADDR forms are not markers of definiteness in endophoric use,

since the NPs ‘story’ are clearly to be understood as definite in both examples. For another thing, the use of DEM.ADDR locative adverbs suggests a spatial metaphor for discourse, where narrators frequently make meta-comments by referring to the point of the narration where ‘we are’ at a specific point (cf. Diessel 2006: 475). That DEM.ADDR is used is motivated by the speaker’s assumption that the addressee is conjointly attending to the narration, and to that moment in it.

Finally, there are examples where a story is referred back to by a plain DEM.ADDR form, which seems to be most similar to endophoric discourse-deictic use:

- (41) *so nē'ē =n ni'i kaka wo =n nes [...]*  
 ?? DEM.ADDR =ART small story and =ART song

‘So this is a little story and song [about how the incubator bird builds its nest].’

GATG.065

The DEM.ADDR form is used in these instances because the speaker assumes that the addressee is familiar with the referent and attending to it.

In sum then, Vera'a has a three-way system of demonstratives. The choice of forms is driven primarily by considerations of attention focus and information management: DEM.DIST forms are used where an entity is outside the *here-space* of both speaker and addressee, and joint attention to it is not relevant or cannot be obtained. DEM.SPKR forms are used where an entity is in the *here-space* of the speaker, excluding the addressee. It is used where the speaker seeks to draw attention to an entity that only they are currently familiar with or aware of. DEM.ADDR forms are used where speaker and addressee share a *here-space* with regard to the entity in question, and the speaker assumes the addressee to already be attending to the entity in question. The crucial aspect of this system is that it has a marked speaker-oriented *here-space* and attention focus, and that wherever the addressee is seen as sharing *here-space* and attention, the DEM.ADDR form is used. The functions of DEM.SPKR and DEM.ADDR forms are essentially different in that only the former alters the focus of attention. The function of DEM.ADDR is to maintain joint attention focus on an entity for what follows. This can then yield different pragmatic effects, as can be seen from the following examples (42) and (43):

- (42) *ei nīke anē sa =s dada kel ēn nak mu-k*  
 INTERJ 2SG DEM.ADDR.A EMPH =SIM RED:do back ART canoe POSS.GEN-1SG

‘Hey, so is it you who has been putting my canoe back up all the time?’ JJQ.064

- (43) *'ei kamadu anē =m van ma sir nik anē.*  
 INTERJ IDL.EX DEM.ADDR.A =TAM1 go hither for 2SG DEM.ADDR.A

‘Hey, we came here because of you, [because we want to be together with you].’

1.PALA.059–061

In (42), the DEM.ADDR-marked pronoun occurs in left-dislocated position, which is in other cases also associated with topicalisation. Here, however, it is clear that the referent has a role more akin to what has been called focus (Krifka 2008, Lambrecht 1994), picking out a referent from a putative open set (someone who can do things). Likewise,

the use of a DEM.ADDR form with the pronouns in (43) would be hard to motivate by considerations of identification, or topic marking. If anything, it seems, the subject pronoun would have to be construed as a 'topic', whereas the PP complement would be in 'focus' – 'we are not here just for the dancing or other people, but for *you*'. These examples thus underscore the point that demonstratives do not serve as markers of definiteness, since the personal pronouns already entail definiteness. Instead of definiteness, demonstratives seem to bear functions in the domain of information structure. However, it is also clear from these examples that they do not mark specific information-structural roles like 'topic' or 'focus'. Rather, in my view, the use of DEM.ADDR forms is motivated here by the same considerations of maintained attention focus as in other uses discussed thus far, and this has the effect of an inference that what follows is in some way relevant for the entities thus expressed. Given other structural properties, like left-dislocation and emphatic marking, this may produce a 'focus effect' (Matić & Wedgwood 2013). Moreover, it does seem to have the effect of singling out entities as 'information packages' (Ozerov 2015), the interpretation of which depends on the discourse context. I will take up this point in §4 and §5.

### 3.4 Endophoric use of Vera'a demonstratives

I now turn to endophoric uses of demonstratives within narrative texts, excluding its frame, meta-comments, and direct speech. I call this instance of discourse 'narration text'. The functions of demonstratives in this context are typically associated with anaphora and referent tracking (called 'tracking use' in Himmelmann 1996), but also with considerations of information packaging (Diessel 1999). In what follows I will go through the uses of demonstratives in different syntactic contexts. It should be noted at this point that I will be dealing almost exclusively with the use of DEM.ADDR and DEM.DIST forms since DEM.SPKR forms are very restricted in this context, occurring practically only in one interesting case which will be discussed first. It will be made clear in §4 below that the virtual absence of DEM.SPKR forms in narration text follows straightforwardly from their attention-establishing cataphoric function discussed in §3.3.

#### 3.4.1 Speaker-oriented forms in narrative discourse

The only example of a DEM.SPKR form in narration text is the following, where the narrator seems to slip into the report of a character's thought:

- (44) *di ne van ma ne rēre e ruwa agēn ō di rōs.*  
 3SG AOR:3SG go hither AOR:3SG head PERS HUM:DL DEM.SPKR.A INTERJ 3SG NEG2  
 'Then she would come over and take a closer look at "these two here, no, not him".'  
 ISWM.326

This appears to be one of many examples from Vera'a narratives where a narrator seems to slide seamlessly from the narration text into direct speech or thought. As in this example, such cases often feature interjections. Thus, in this example direct thought and

narration text are not clearly marked off. The use of a DEM.SPKR form here in fact already represents an instance of *Deixis am Phantasma*, and it is motivated by the same attention-directing principles discussed above. Hence, for the remainder of this section, I will be dealing only with DEM.ADDR and DEM.DIST forms.

### 3.4.2 Plain addressee-oriented forms on clause level in narration text

Plain, i.e. unprefixated, DEM.ADDR forms are very rare in narration text. One recurrent occurrence is their pronominal use in subject function. Their function here is discourse-deictic, as in the following example (45):

- (45) *nē* =*n* *tēktēk mu-n e Qo'*  
 DEM.ADDR =ART speech POSS.GEN-CS PERS PERS.NAME  
 'That was Qo' talking there.' JJQ.308

The DEM.ADDR form here refers back to the last few intonation units in which the narrator clarifies that it was the hero of the story, Qo', who said these things. As in exophoric use, a DEM.ADDR form can occur in clause-final position in narration text. Here, however, they seem to have a somewhat different function in maintaining the addressee's attention to a specific point in a narrative:

- (46) *di =m 'ōg kelkel 'ōg kelkel n= me' ne onon rōw*  
 3SG =TAM1 stay RED:back stay RED:back ART= reef AOR:3SG RED:lie at.sea  
*nē'* *di =m 'ōg kelkel [...] vavavavan.*  
 DEM.ADDR 3SG =TAM1 stay RED:back RED-go  
 'He was staying up (on the island), and the reef was lying down at the sea. So now he [the man] was spending his time (there) [and one night he was dreaming, the reef came to him in his dream]. ' ISAM.048

Such instances of DEM.ADDR forms are relatively rare in the corpus, and more data needs to be analysed before more substantial conclusions can be drawn. Nonetheless, I would like to argue that the use of the DEM.ADDR form here has the same function of maintaining joint attention to a specific point in a narration. This then has two related effects in this context, I believe. For one thing, it yields a simultaneity effect: while the reef is sitting down at the shore the man is up at the top of the shore. It also seems to have the effect of keeping the reef relevant for the following propositions, leading over to its appearance in the man's dream. Although these interpretations would have to be further substantiated, they do seem to square with the information-packaging effects to be discussed in §4.

### 3.4.3 Adnominal use of addressee-oriented versus distal demonstratives in narration text

DEM.ADDR forms occur adnominally in cases where the referent in question has been mentioned in the immediate context. A typical usage context is where the referent was introduced in the previous clause and is then taken up immediately again, for example:

3 Attention focus and information packaging in Vera'a demonstratives

- (47) *duru =k 'ēn ma =n lumgav ne vōwal lumgav ne vōwal*  
 3DL =AOR see hither =ART young.man NUM one young.man NUM one  
*anē di ne laa-laka senē wo ne virig ma [...]*  
 DEM.ADDR.A 3SG AOR:3SG RED-dance MAN.DEM.ADDR and AOR:3SG rush hither  
 'Then the two spotted a young man. And the young man, he danced, and then  
 (he) came over, [and sat down under the wild kava plant].' 1.PALA.044-045
- (48) *van ma diñ ēn bē bē ne vōwal anē =n so-gi =n*  
 go hither reach ART water water NUM one DEM.ADDR.A =ART name-3SG =ART  
*Bē'elmamgin.*  
 PLACE.NAME  
 'Went here and reached a river. This (some) river, its name (is) Bē'elmamgin [lit.  
 'Cold to dive water']. AS.1.071-073
- (49) *ote mu-n e ni'i- reñe anē ne ma' e duru =k*  
 mum POSS.GEN-CS PERS small- female DEM.ADDR.A AOR:3SG dead DISC 3DL =AOR  
*'ēn ...eh =n 'ama-gi ne 'ēn gōr ēn ni'i- reñe anē*  
 see COR =ART father-3SG AOR:3SG see secure ART small- female DEM.ADDR.A  
*vaavan 'e =n 'ama-gi anē ne ma'.*  
 RED-go DISC =ART father-3SG DEM.ADDR.A AOR:3SG dead  
 'Then the mother of the little girl died. So her father looked after the little girl, on  
 and on, and then her father died.' ANV.005-007

These examples show again that DEM.ADDR forms do not merely mark an NP as definite, and this is also clear from its compatibility with personal pronouns, see §3.3 above. Moreover, the total of 361 adnominal uses of demonstrative forms (including all adverbs) accounts for only a small fraction of full (lexical) NPs with given referents in our corpus, hence givenness/identifiability is likewise not *marked* by demonstratives. This was also made clear with respect to reference back to the story in narrative frames. The point is further supported by examples where DEM.ADDR is used with personal names or, as in the following example (50). Typically, these are nouns meaning 'older same-sex sibling, firstborn' or 'younger same-sex sibling, lastborn', with couples of siblings typically featuring as heroes in Vera'a literature.

- (50) *wo 'isimēre anē ne 'añ vē'ē =n dudu vada ne*  
 and firstborn DEM.ADDR.A AOR:3SG hand release =ART leaf pandanus NUM  
*vōwal.*  
 one  
 '(The devil was then sucking in the sea again, and the sea current [that arose  
 from that] brought the canoe [the two siblings are sitting in] ever closer to him.)  
 So then the older sister let go of a pandanus leaf.' 2.PALA.091

This example also underscores that DEM.ADDR forms are not merely used to differentiate between referents, since this function can be clearly ascribed to the use of the noun itself.

In contrast to DEM.ADDR forms, DEM.DIST forms are used adnominally where the referent of the NP has been mentioned a while ago in the previous discourse, for example:

- (51) *duru =k wos ēn n̄ar wos ēn n̄ar anē*  
 3DL =AOR hammer ART canarium.nut hammer ART canarium.nut DEM.ADDR.A  
*dir'ōl da =n wig me big 'ō sa =n rōrō' ē alē duru*  
 3TL do =ART wig FUT eat carry EMPH =ART k.o.cabbage DEM.DIST INTERJ 3DL  
 =k wos ēn n̄ar.  
 =AOR hammer ART canarium.nut

‘So they would smash up the canarium nuts. Smash up the canarium nuts to make wig (a kind of *nalot* (Bislama), i.e. K.o. pudding), which was to be had with that cabbage (that they had gotten earlier on). All right, so they smashed the canarium nuts (and then started making *nalot*).’ AS.1.028–030

- (52) *wede di =m luwo di ne le =n nak susu ē.*  
 rain 3SG =TAM1 big 3SG AOR:3SG take =ART canoe RED-paddle DEM.DIST  
 ‘Then the rain became big, and it took out that canoe.’ JJQ.104–105

A DEM.DIST form can also be used where the referent is merely evoked by or inferable from earlier happenings, as is the case in the following example:

- (53) *ba di =m gis ēn menre- kōlōv- 'ar-'ara ē ne mul 'ō'*  
 but 3SG =TAM1 hold ART piece chipping RED-chop DEM.DIST AOR:3SG go carry  
*lē =n lōlō- imē.*  
 LOC =ART inside- house

‘But he took a piece of that chipping, and took it home with himself.’ JJQ.052

Here, the actual chopping of the tree was mentioned seven intonation units away, and the DEM.DIST form is used because it requires the addressee to re-activate this event to relate the ‘piece of chipping’ to it. But apparently its inferability via frame semantics is sufficient to warrant the use of a DEM.DIST form that is otherwise used for individually given referents. Though there is good reason to assume that the DEM.DIST form in the previous examples is an NP-internal constituent, its position is nonetheless ambiguous between NP- and clause-final, the latter being another possible slot for both DEM.ADDR and DEM.DIST forms (see below). For the sake of completeness, the following example shows a DEM.DIST form in a subject NP. This is likewise an instance of inference, since the dancing was mentioned ten intonation units before inside a character’s direct speech who states that they want to dance:

- (54) *laklaka ē =m van.*  
 dance DEM.DIST =TAM1 go

‘And then that dance happened.’ ISWM.319

In this example, the narrator is referring back to the idea of holding a dance for the hero of the story, who is temporarily dead. After this was mentioned first by some of the characters ten intonation units earlier, it was reported how people were walking to the place where the dead would have to be found and the dances would take place.



### 3.4.4 Addressee-oriented and distal demonstratives in clause combining constructions

The prefixed basic DEM.ADDR form can occur in clause-final position where it is used in clause combining constructions. In the following examples, it occurs in clause-final position and the event described therein comes to an end once the second one sets in:

- (55) *dir =m suō kal wal diñ sar ma anē e Qo'*  
 3PL =TAM1 paddle up once reach inland hither DEM.ADDR.A PERS PERS.NAME  
*ne lañ wōr wal ēn nak.*  
 AOR:3SG slap split once ART canoe  
 'And as they had just come up on the shore, Qo' smashed the canoe to pieces.'  
 JJQ.257

- (56) *alē duru =m inin va-van anē e Dōl so o*  
 INTERJ 3DL =TAM1 RED:drink RED-go DEM.ADDR.A PERS PERS.NAME QUOT INTERJ  
*no man qē'.*  
 1SG PFV finish  
 'All right, so the two of them drank and drank until [up to this point, and then...]  
 Dōl said: "I am done. (The kava has kicked in.)"' 1.AS.039-040

In other instances, the two events are depicted as taking place simultaneously:

- (57) *lē =n masōgi di =m sagsag anē ba di ne susur lik*  
 LOC =ART time 3SG =TAM1 RED:sit DEM.ADDR.A but 3SG AOR:3SG RED:tie more  
*ēn aklē dudu woqe 'enge.*  
 ART some- leaf tree  
 'And as he was sitting (up at the top of the shore), he also assembled some leaves  
 (to make some decoration for himself).' ISAM.076
- (58) *ba dir'ōl =s vanvan anē =n 'isimēre mal lama'i so =n 'ama'.*  
 but 3TL =SIM RED:go DEM.ADDR.A =ART lastborn REM.PFV know CPL =ART devil  
 'But as the three were walking along, the younger sister had already realised that  
 it was a devil.' 2.PALA.018-019

These examples of DEM.ADDR uses are similar to the use of the plain form in (46). In yet other cases, the first clause marked by a clause-final DEM.ADDR form expresses a state of affairs that is a presupposition for the proposition of the following clause, expressing for example the reason for that proposition holding, as in the following example:

- (59) *so Qo' di ne sag 'i anē [...] di e lama'i ros so di*  
 ?? PERS.NAME 3SG AOR:3SG sit DEL DEM.ADDR.A 3SG NEG1 know NEG2 CPL 3SG  
*me 'isiw siviē.*  
 FUT climb.down how  
 '(And then they turned towards Gaua). But Qo', he was sitting up there, [that  
 darag towla it is so big so] he didn't know how to climb down.' JJQ.171-172

Generally speaking, clause-final DEM.ADDR forms seem to have the effect of interpreting the preceding clause as immediately relevant for the interpretation of the subsequent clause. By contrast, clause-final DEM.DIST forms have the effect of steering away from the proposition expressed in its clause, while keeping it on hold for future reference. The following example (60) is taken from the same story as (59), and occurs long before that latter. The DEM.DIST-marked clause expresses the same state as the DEM.ADDR-marked one in (59); but here, the subsequent clause is not immediately related to that proposition, but instead shows a shift in topic and theme, now dealing with Qo's brothers and their moving away from him. The story then goes on to recall how they steal his wife and canoe and travel to Gaua. Qo's situation is then taken up again in the clause preceding the one in (59).

- (60) *e Qo' ne sag rēn sag kēkē ē sag wo e raga*  
 PERS PERS.NAME AOR:3SG sit stuck up above DEM.DIST sit and PERS HUM:PL  
*'i-'isi-gi anē van rōw lē =n vunuō.*  
 RED-younger.same.sex.sibling-3SG DEM.ADDR.A go down LOC =ART village  
 'So Qo' was now stuck up there (in the tree). Sat (there) while his brothers went  
 down to the village. (They stole his wife and his canoe, and paddled off with it.)'  
 JJQ.151–152

Noteworthy in this example is also the switch of topic in the second clause and the concomitant use of an adnominal DEM.ADDR form. Another illustrative example involving a clause-final DEM.DIST form shows its theme-switching effect: in (61), the context is that two men find a turtle at the beach and tie it up to pick it up later. After these recountings, the two men walk away from the beach and up the shore to their home village. The following discourse is about the men's reporting back to their chief and the villager's planning to go down, cook the turtle, and hold a feast. The clause-final DEM.DIST forms in this instance have the effect of signalling this momentary switch in scene before the narration turns back to this referent later:

- (61) *ge'ew'i ne wil 'alañ ēn nuō ē qē' duru =k*  
 other AOR:3SG turn.over upside.down ART turtle DEM.DIST finish 3DL =AOR  
*vrig kal kēl lē =n lōlō vunu*  
 rush up back LOC =ART inside village  
 'And then the other one turned the turtle over onto its back, and after that the  
 two ran back up into the village.'  
 GAQG.057–058

Regarding this particular example, it should be noted again that the position and function of the DEM.DIST form is ambiguous here. The discussion of other examples of adnominal DEM.DIST forms above would suggest that its use in (61) is not to be classified as adnominal, since the turtle had just been the theme of the preceding discourse, and it seems more plausible to interpret it as clause-final, bringing about the effect outlined here. This conclusion should, however, be taken as preliminary, and further examples are required to substantiate – or falsify – it.

## 4 Discussion: Attention and information

I first summarise the findings from the discussion of exophoric and endophoric uses, and then present a preliminary analysis of these. In exophoric use, DEM.SPKR forms are used where only the speaker is familiar with or aware of an entity, and attends to it. The form is used in order to draw the addressee's attention to the same entity, thereby establishing a joint attention focus. Relevant contexts exemplified above are those where only the speaker can see (or otherwise perceive) the entity; where the speaker assumes that the addressee is not familiar with an entity, for instance the story in introductions to narratives; where the speaker assumes the addressee to be unaware of the entity to be talked about, for instance the piece of wood brought to a house builder, the enacting of bodily aspects in *Deixis am Phantasma*, or the light seen at night in the bush. The last example makes it clear that spatial considerations are not the relevant ones: what counts instead is the awareness-state of the speaker, and their assumptions concerning that of the addressee. Obviously, in communication the speaker will always be aware of the entities they verbalise and elaborate upon, thus speaker-oriented forms are naturally used when the addressee is assumed to lack that awareness or knowledge (see Mosel 2004 for the same point on Samoan proximal demonstratives). The DEM.SPKR forms are, however, never used cataphorically for new referents in a narrative, and it seems possible that this kind of use is typologically very restricted (English *new-this*), as already remarked by Himmelmann (1996), a tendency corroborated by the case of Vera'a. As for locative adverbs, DEM.SPKR forms are used where the speaker perceives their location as not overlapping with that of the addressee.

The addressee-oriented forms, DEM.ADDR, are used where the speaker assumes the addressee to already be aware of and attending to an entity. With the plain forms in pronominal function within exophoric use, this concerns mostly immediately perceived sensations, like sounds. In endophoric use, these pronominal instances of DEM.ADDR forms have discourse-deictic functions, referring back to the immediately preceding discourse. In adnominal use, the forms are used where the entity in question is already being attended to by the addressee. One effect of its use is that the referent has to be understood as individuated, whereas an unmarked NP can always have class reference; and given that Vera'a does not distinguish generic from specific contexts in other parts of the grammar, for instance tense, aspect, mood-marking, this is an omnipresent potential ambiguity. In narrative texts, a DEM.ADDR form is used adnominally in NPs whose referents are identifiable from the immediately preceding discourse context. This can be seen as equivalent to established attention to an entity in exophoric contexts. Their use does not *mark* the NP as having an identifiable referent, since most other NPs with such identifiable referents are unmarked, and DEM.ADDR forms also occur with pronouns and proper names. My hypothesis is that their use is connected to considerations of information packaging (see below). Finally, DEM.ADDR forms are used in clause-combining constructions where the clause they mark is immediately relevant for the interpretation of the subsequent clause.

Distal forms are used in exophoric contexts where an entity is outside of the speaker's and the addressee's interaction space, and also not within speaker's *here-space*. This was illustrated with an example from the house building video where the speaker refers to the cross beam of the scaffold, but obviously then wants the addressee to focus their attention on the wood in his hands. In endophoric use, a DEM.DIST form is used adnominally where a referent is being re-activated, and is used clause-finally at thematic or episodic shifts.

Comparison of DEM.ADDR and DEM.DIST forms reveals that the latter are used merely to activate information, but not to focus on it, whereas the former have the effect of demanding focus of attention. This was demonstrated in example (4), repeated here as (62):

- (62) *ne 'ēn e ruwa mālmalā ē =s sag 'i e ruwa mālmalā*  
 AOR:3SG see PERS HUM:DL girl DEM.DIST =SIM sit DEL PERS HUM:DL girl  
*anē so*  
 DEM.ADDR.A QUOT  
 '[...] and then (he) spotted those two girls (who were) sitting (there), and the two girls said: ...' 1.PALA.059-060

The use of a DEM.DIST form in the first mention of 'the girls' functions to re-activate the referent who had been mentioned before, but the few intonation units immediately before this dealt exclusively with the young man's dancing. In the second clause, a DEM.ADDR form is used, and here seems to have a topicalising effect, signalling that the clause is about them. This suggests furthermore that information packaging and referent activation are two different aspects of discourse structure, as illustrated in Vallduví (1993: Chapter 2), although this is often blurred in a Givón'ian sense of 'topic' that seems to conflate notions dealt with under the headings 'discourse referent', 'discourse topic', and '(sentence) topic' in other work.

But does a DEM.ADDR form as such have a topicalising function, or even 'topic-marking' function, as is sometimes claimed for Oceanic languages? At least in Vera'a, the answer should be no. We have seen in examples above that DEM.ADDR forms are in fact found to mark pronouns that are clearly in a relation one would traditionally call 'focus', namely where the pronoun is left-dislocated and marked with the emphatic marker *sa*. As outlined above, I suggest here that DEM.ADDR forms are not 'polyfunctional' in any way, sometimes 'marking or expressing topics', and in other contexts 'marking or expressing focus'. Instead, I analyse these uses in the spirit of Matic & Wedgwood (2013), Ozerov (2014) and Ozerov (2015) as *bringing about an effect* that is compatible with both 'topic' and 'focus', as discussed in the literature (Lambrecht 1994, Krifka 2008). In this way, a topicalising effect is merely brought about by the DEM.ADDR form meaning 'addressee keep attention focused on this', which can trigger the inference that something relevant will be said about the entity in question. Likewise, keeping attention focus can have the effect of stressing someone's involvement in a state-of-affairs, as in the examples where someone is asked whether he was the one who put a tree back up.

The clause-combining uses of DEM.ADDR forms can be accounted for in a similar manner: namely, they have the effect of holding a proposition in attention focus. Given the

maintained attention to the proposition, it is interpreted as immediately relevant for the proposition to follow, so that the latter is interpreted as being *about* the former. The use of DEM.DIST forms, on the other hand, has the general function of activating a referent, but not making it the attention focus. In clause-combining constructions, this bears the effect of topic and/or theme/episodic shift, together with the expectation that the previous episode may be relevant in some way at a later point in the discourse.

Therefore, the use of demonstratives in exophoric and endophoric contexts follows straightforwardly from their meaning related to attention focus, as shown in Table 5. This meaning of demonstratives can be stated as relatively slim, much in the spirit of Enfield (2003). All readings summarised above are the result of these stable meanings interpreted by interlocutors in relevant contexts.

Table 5: Meaning of demonstratives in Vera'a

speaker-oriented	you do not attend to this
addressee-oriented	I and you attend to this
distal	I do not attend to this

## 5 Conclusions

In conclusion, demonstratives in Vera'a bear attention-focusing meaning in the sense of Diessel (2006), and their interpretative effects result from interaction of speaker and addressee in relevant communicative contexts, much in the spirit of Enfield (2003). Spatial considerations are not primary, that is to say that orientation with regard to speech-act participants is not spatial, but communicative-interactional, relating to dimensions of knowledge and attention coordination. The interactional interpretations triggered by the different meanings of demonstratives produce different effects in different contexts, which means that we do not need to assume polysemy for demonstratives. I conclude that their meaning is absolutely stable across exophoric and endophoric uses, and sub-uses therein.

Finally, it should be noted again that more extensive examination of more video data – which has been collected in large amounts over the past ten years – is necessary to substantiate the extensional aspects of demonstratives in exophoric use, and this should be done in future research. Thus, for instance it would be interesting to see whether Vera'a speakers can use a speaker-oriented form to point to something unnoticed by the addressee on the latter's body or clothing, and the like. Possibly also the use of certain stimuli (like the MPI space games) may help clarify some usages. I do believe, however, that even these initial observations from the currently available data are sufficient to draw up the basic outline of the system as done here. Moreover, it should be noted that spatial considerations as observable in video data are not an objective heuristic to explain the use of demonstratives, as illustrated convincingly by Enfield's (2003) examination

of such data in Lao. It seems that Vera'a presents another illustrative example of the salience of interactional pragmatics considerations in accounting of multi-contextual uses of demonstratives.

## **Acknowledgements**

The research reported in this contribution was made possible through the following research grants: Australian Research Council DECRA, awarded to the author (grant no. DE120102017), and two VolkswagenStiftung's DoBeS grants (grant no. II/81 898 and II/84 316) awarded to Catriona Hyslop-Malau (PI) for the documentation of the Vurës and the Vera'a language. I also wish to acknowledge the ongoing support for my research within the ARC Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language and the School of Languages and Linguistics at the University of Melbourne. I warmly thank everyone in the Vera'a community who have been so kind and generous to host me for more than ten years of our joint effort to document the Vera'a language.

I would like to thank Birgit Hellwig for her insightful comments on a very early version of this paper. Furthermore, I thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments on the submitted manuscripts, and suggestions for improvement. All remaining errors are of course my own responsibility.

## Abbreviations

1	1st person	IN	inclusive
2	2nd person	INTENS	intensifier
3	3rd person	INTERJ	interjection
A	<i>a</i> prefix	LOC	locative
ABL	ablative	MAN	manner
ADDR	addressee-oriented	NEG.GEN	general negation
ADN	adnominal	NSG	non-singular
AOR	aorist	NUM	numeral article
ART	common article	OBL	oblique
ASS	associative	PERS	personal article
COR	correction	PFV	perfective
CPL	complementizer	PL	plural
CS	construct suffix	POSS.DOM	domestic possession
DAT	dative	POSS.GEN	general possession
DEL	delimitative aktionsart	POSS.HOUSE	house possession
DEM	demonstrative	PRO	pronoun
DISC	discourse marker	QUOT	quotative
DIST	distal	RED	reduplication
DL	dual	REM.PFV	remote perfective
EMPH	emphatic	SG	singular
EX	exclusive	SIM	simultaneous
FUT	future	SP	specific
GRAID	Grammatical Relations and Animacy in Discourse	SPKR	speaker-oriented
		STAT	stative
		TAM	tense-aspect-mood
HUM	human	TL	trial

## References

- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing noun-phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Bühler, Karl. 1999[1934]. *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Frankfurt: UTB.
- Cutfield, Sarah. 2012. *Demonstratives in Dalabon: A language of south-western Arnhem Land*. Melbourne: Monash University (Doctoral dissertation).
- Dawuda, Carmen. 2009. *Discourse functions of demonstratives and place adverbs with exophoric reference in Logea, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea*. Melbourne: Monash University dissertation.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4). 463–489.

- Enfield, N. J. 2003. Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79(1). 82–117.
- François, Alexandre. 2001. *Contraintes de structures et liberté dans l'organisation du discours*. Paris: Université Paris-IV Sorbonne (Doctoral dissertation).
- François, Alexandre. 2012. The dynamics of linguistic diversity: Egalitarian multilingualism and power imbalance among northern Vanuatu languages. *Language use in Melanesia. Special issue of International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 214. 85–110.
- Haig, Geoffrey & Stefan Schnell. 2014. *Annotations using GRAID: Grammatical relations and animacy in discourse: Manual version 7.0*. Köln: Universität zu Köln. <https://lac.uni-koeln.de/en/multicast/>.
- Haig, Geoffrey & Stefan Schnell. 2016. *Multi-CAST: Multilingual Corpus of Annotated Spoken Texts*. Cologne: Language Archive Cologne. <https://lac.uni-koeln.de/de/multicast/>.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Coherence in English*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Huang, Yan. 2000. *Anaphora: A cross-linguistic study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kalyan, Siva & Alexandre François. to appear. Freeing the comparative method from the tree model. In Ritsuko Kikusawa & Laurence Reid (eds.), *Let's talk about trees: Tackling problems in representing relationships among languages*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. Basic notions of information structure. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55(3–4). 243–276.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Malau, Catriona. 2016. *A grammar of Vurës*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Margetts, Anna. 2004. Spatial deixis in Saliba. In Gunter Senft (ed.), *Deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages*, 37–57. Canberra ACT Australia: Pacific Linguistics.
- Matić, Dejan & Daniel Wedgwood. 2013. The meaning of focus: The significance of an interpretation-based analysis. *Journal of Linguistics* 49(1). 127–163.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 2004. Demonstratives in Samoan. In Gunter Senft (ed.), *Deixis and demonstratives in Oceanic languages*, 141–174. Canberra ACT Australia: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ozerov, Pavel. 2014. *Information packaging in colloquial Burmese*. Melbourne: La Trobe University (Doctoral dissertation).
- Ozerov, Pavel. 2015. Information structure without topic and focus. Differential Object Marking in Burmese. *Studies in Language* 39(2). 386–423.
- Schnell, Stefan. 2016. Vera'a. In Geoffrey Haig & Stefan Schnell (eds.), *Multi-CAST: Multilingual Corpus of Annotated Spoken Texts*. Cologne: Language Archive Cologne.
- Terrill, Angela. 2001. Activation levels in Lavukaleve demonstratives: Oia versus foia. *Linguistic Typology* 5. 67–90.



### 3 *Attention focus and information packaging in Vera'a demonstratives*

- Vallduví, Enric. 1993. *The information component*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation).
- Wald, Benji. 1983. Referents and topic within and across discourse units: Observations from current vernacular English. In Flora Klein-Andreu (ed.), *Discourse perspectives on syntax*, 91–116. New York: Academic Press.

