Guaykuruan languages of the South American Chaco have rich sets of classifiers and demonstratives, marking deictic, visibility, postural, and recognitional meanings. There is lack of consensus in the Guaykuruan literature about determiner and demonstrative elements, even across closely related dialects. This chapter explores them in Pilagá, including their structure, discourse profile, extension into the tense-evidentiality domain, and grammaticalisation as subordinators. Corpus data show that mʔe is best viewed as ‘distance neutral’, contrasting with hoʔ ‘proximal’ (which also has adverbial uses), tʃaʔa ‘distal visible’, maʕa ‘unseen’, and naqae ‘recognitional’. Mʔe is dominantly endophoric and has grammaticalised as a relativiser. The ‘vertical’ classifying determiner daʔ has grammaticalised as a general subordinator.
subordination functions. Some determiners are simple, involving only what we call classifiers (clf),\(^2\) highlighted in (1); others are demonstrative word-level constructions, highlighted in (2).\(^3\)

(1) (190Verbos2 165)\(^4\)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{s-anem} & \text{heʔn} \\
\text{nsedaʔana} & \text{af daʔ} \\
\text{M-CLF:} & \text{near pole} \\
\text{ya-qaya-di-pi} & \text{CLF:} \\
\text{yi-ʔa-di-pi} & \text{POSI:} \\
\text{POS1-brother-PAUC-COL}
\end{array}
\]
'I give the pole to my brothers.'

(2) (Vidal 2001: 123)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{ha-da=ča-lo} & \text{yawoʔ} \\
\text{F-CLF:} & \text{VER=DEM1:DIST.VIS-PL} \\
\text{woman-PAUC}
\end{array}
\]
‘those women (standing)’

This chapter addresses the morphosyntax, meaning, and discourse uses of simple and complex Pilagá determiners and demonstratives.\(^5\) The study is based on a corpus of over 70 texts plus elicited data. §2 discusses definitions and terminology, and presents the three paradigms of key morphemes that figure in determiner and demonstrative constructions. Sections 3 through 6 focus on the morphosyntax and semantics of the constructions, supporting the claim that three distinct paradigms of key morphemes are involved. §7 discusses extensions into tense-evidentiality, and grammaticalisation of both the ‘neutral’ demonstrative root mʔe as a relativiser and of the ‘vertical’ clf daʔ as a more general subordinator. Throughout, issues of semantics and function are addressed, including how interaction among morphemes may affect interpretation. A conclusion is in §8.

\(^2\)Classifiers are usually pro- or enclitics. We write them with the clitic boundary = as part of demonstrative constructions, but as separate orthographic words before a noun in accord with Pilagá orthographic practice. Some nouns with possessor prefixes lack determiners, though they can co-occur.

\(^3\)Examples use a modified IPA representation with <y> for IPA /j/, <ń> for /ɲ/, <č> for /tʃ/, <b̶> for the bilabial fricative allophone of /w/; <λ> represents a palatal lateral sonorant. These are adaptations to the practical orthography.

\(^4\)All data were collected by Alejandra Vidal with Pilagá native speakers in Formosa, between 1988 and the present. Data citations like “190Verbos2 165” refer to line “165” in file or text number “190” in our Pilagá FLEX database. The database contains narrative and expository texts, and some elicited material. Examples with no citation are elicited and not in the database.

\(^5\)Previous studies of determiners and demonstratives in Guaykuruan discourse have focused on Toba, especially Carpio (2012) on Western Toba (which Vidal assesses as very close to Pilagá), Gonzálež (2015) on an eastern variety of Toba, and Messineo & Cúneo (2019) on Toba generally.
2 Classifier and demonstrative roots

There is lack of consensus in the Guaykuruan literature about what are called “demonstratives”. The issues concern terminology for cognate forms and the inventory of relevant elements and complex structures, which may vary by dialect and language (Vidal 1997; 2001; Carpio 2012; González 2015; Messineo et al. 2016; Cúneo 2016). We thus first clarify key terms as used in this work.

- **classifier (clf)**: Any of the six deictic or posture/shape clitics in Table 1.

- **demonstrative root (DEM1, DEM2)**: Any of the morphemes in Table 2 and Table 3, which have deictic, pointing-out, or joint-attention functions.

- **demonstrative construction (DEM)**: A word-level construction that contains a deictic or joint-attention establishing root other than just a classifier. All but one demonstrative construction contain a classifier; may function adnominaly, pronominally, and in one case adverbially; and may be endophoric or exophoric to the discourse.6

- **determiner (DET)**: Any classifier or demonstrative construction when functioning adnominaly. All determiners syntactically allow the noun (phrase) they accompany to function as a syntactic argument and/or as a referring expression in discourse. They may or may not be deictic.7

As the first two bullet points above suggest, we distinguish what we call classifiers (CLFs) from two sets of demonstrative roots (Table 1–3). Simple CLFs are the default determiner form in discourse (§3). Aside from a demonstrative construction with adverbial function (§4), all demonstrative constructions include a CLF. What we call DEM1 roots are preceded by a CLF (§5), while the DEM2 root is followed by a CLF (§6).

All the sets in Table 1–3 have some deictic semantics, and CLFs and DEM1 roots include visibility contrasts. The deictic overlaps might lead one to consider all three sets to be demonstrative morphemes. But there are functional reasons to distinguish classifiers from demonstrative roots. It would be unusual for a language to require every nominal to have a demonstrative, and this is one reason...
not to consider the default and ubiquitous classifier determiners to be demonstratives. The two sets of demonstrative roots are stronger orienting devices, pointing the hearer’s attention to a participant, place, or time, usually (but not always) via deixis or visibility features.

Table 1 presents the Pilagá singular classifiers. Underlyingly they contain glottals, but they often surface with weak to no glottalisation. Classifiers with /a/ and /i/ often undergo vowel harmony alternation to /o/. For instance, diʔ has allomorphs dyo and doʔ. Soʔ may undergo vowel harmony to saʔ, and sometimes we find esoʔ. We write the variations where they surface. The plural counterparts lengthen the vowel (Vidal 2001), though this is optional (especially when there is a plural affix on a noun).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic direction/Visibility</th>
<th>Posture/Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>naʔ ‘near’; ‘coming’ to the reference point</td>
<td>diʔ ‘horizontally extended’ (line or plane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soʔ ‘far’; ‘departing’ from the reference point; ‘past’</td>
<td>daʔ ‘vertically extended’; ‘abstract’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaʔ ‘unseen, absent’; ‘unknown, generic, non-referential’; ‘irrealis/future’</td>
<td>ŋiʔ ‘non-extended, bunched up, sitting’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 shows, the clf paradigm has two semantic subsets (they are not contrastive in morphosyntactic distribution). Guaykuru cognates of these morphemes have fascinated scholars due to the relatively unusual combination of their meanings, both basic and metaphorical (Klein 1979; Messineo et al. 2016). Relative to the physical world, the first semantic subset has deictic and/or visibility features, and in some contexts allows inference of motion semantics. The deictic meanings fit with Diessel’s (1999) definition of demonstrative elements, which leads some researchers to refer to all Table 1 morphemes as “demonstratives” for related languages (Messineo et al. 2016). Carpio (2012) refers to the Western Toba cognates as “demonstrative roots” (she also identifies a distinct set

---

8 Also note that doʔ is a dialect variant of daʔ ‘vertical; abstract’.
9 Messineo et al. (2016) do not mention cognates of the demonstrative roots we present in Table 2 and Table 3.
of morphemes – cognate with what we call “demonstrative roots” – to which the CLF cognates can attach). González (2015: 153) rejects calling the cognate Eastern Toba morphemes “classifiers” because, though they communicate a certain kind of nominal classification, a given nominal can occur with one or another according to the speaker’s perspective. (See also discussion in Messineo (2003: 145), who nevertheless uses the term “nominal classifier”.) However, in many classifier languages, classifier choice can be sensitive to varying speaker conceptions of the configuration of a concept. In Yagua, for example, ‘water’ can be conceptualised as long+horizontal or as round; ‘wood’ can be conceptualised as upright or as short+small (Payne 1986).

The second semantic subset most concretely indicates salient shape or postural configuration of a referent. For instance, daʔ in its concrete sense indicates vertically extended items like upright trees and people. It is also used for abstract nouns and has grammaticalised as a general subordinator (§7.3). The shape semantics lead Klein (1979), Vidal (1997; 2001), and Messineo & Cúneo (2019) to call all six “classifiers”. Our primary point here is not to argue that these six morphemes are (not) classifying or are (not) deictic in nature as the paradigm clearly has both types of semantic features. Rather, we wish to clarify that these comprise a distinct paradigm from what we call “demonstrative roots”, to which we now turn.

Pilagá demonstrative roots divide into two paradigms based on how they combine with classifiers: DEM1 roots follow CLFS, but the DEM2 root precedes CLFS. The DEM1 roots are deictic, indicating ‘proximal’, ‘distal’, and possibly ‘medial’ distinctions relative to a reference point, as well as visibility contrasts. To give an initial sense of their differing discourse profiles, Table 2 and Table 3 show the frequency of each demonstrative root in the corpus (whether as part of complex demonstrative constructions or not).

10For Western Toba, Carpio (2012: 47–49) identifies -ha ‘non-visible exophoric’ as a suffix on what we call CLFS. A possibly cognate Pilagá form surfaces in the frozen combination hoʔ daha ‘there, a place very far away’. We do not treat -ha further here but note its analogous position to hoʔ. Čaʔa (variant čʔa) comes from a motion verb and sometimes carries ‘itive’ and ‘ventive’ directionals that are characteristic of verbs, as in (38) and (39).
Table 2: Pilagá deictic and visibility demonstrative roots (DEM1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM1 Root</th>
<th>Major Senses</th>
<th>Instances in Corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>hoʔ</em></td>
<td>exophoric adverbial; ‘proximal’ (PROX); current discourse topic</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mʔe</em></td>
<td>exophoric ‘medial visible’; endophoric ‘neutral’ (NEUT)</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>čaʔa</em></td>
<td>‘distal visible’ (DIST.VIS)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>maʕa</em></td>
<td>‘unseen (NVIS)’; ‘inferential, uncertain’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

anaphoric referents. Endophoric use is also possible for *čaʔa*, but the referent is not considered close to the speaker or reference point. *Mʔe* is primarily endophoric, either anaphoric or cataphoric. Especially in its endophoric distribution, *mʔe* is best viewed as ‘distance neutral’ (Himmelmann 1996: 211) since it can occur with all the CLFs to mark referents as ‘proximal/(coming) in the visual field’, ‘distal/(going) out of the visual field’, ‘never seen’, or depending on the particular classifier to refer to ‘horizontal’, ‘vertical’, or ‘bunched up’ referents. It is not accompanied by pointing gestures. It has also grammaticalised as a relativiser (§7.4).

The DEM2 set contains just the root *naqe* (Table 3). It takes CLFs as enclitics, unlike the DEM1 roots which take CLFs as proclitics. We analyse it as a ‘recognition’ (RCG) demonstrative root, but in some contexts it may function more emphatically or mark unexpected information (§6).

Table 3: Pilagá recognitional demonstrative root (DEM2:RCG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM2 root</th>
<th>Major sense</th>
<th>Instances in corpus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Naqe</em></td>
<td>‘this/that familiar but previously inactive; recognitional (RCG)’</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having now introduced the CLFs and demonstrative roots in Table 1–3, §3–§6 will discuss the morphosyntax and functions of four constructions that employ them. In anticipation, Table 4 surveys the grammatical functions of the basic classifier (BCLF), simple demonstrative (SDEM), deictic demonstrative (DDEM), and
recognitional demonstrative (RDEM) constructions. A dash in Table 4 indicates the morpheme in the first column lacks the adverbial function.

Table 4: Syntactic distribution of basic classifier (BCLF) and demonstrative constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adverbial</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoʔ DEM1</td>
<td>SDEM,</td>
<td>SDEM (rare),</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘proximal/ unspecified’</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mʔe DEM1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>relativiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘medial visible’; ‘neutral’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>čaʔa DEM1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘distal visible’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maʕa DEM1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘non-visible’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naqa(e) DEM2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>RDEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘recognitional’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daʔ CLF</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>BCLF</td>
<td>BCLF</td>
<td>subordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘vertical; abstract’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CLFS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>BCLF (rare)</td>
<td>BCLF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across languages, demonstrative morphemes may have differing syntactic functions (Diessel 1999: 4; Krasnoukhova 2012). For example, in one language a single paradigm might function as demonstrative pronouns for participants or abstract concepts, as adnominal demonstratives, and as demonstrative adverbs for location or time. The Pilagá morpheme hoʔ distributes like this, though the particular construction it appears in (SDEM or DDEM) matters for syntactic function. In another language, a given demonstrative paradigm may have only a subset of functions. In English, for instance, *here/there* are adverbial demonstrative proforms.
for locations,\textsuperscript{11} and now/then are adverbial demonstrative proforms for time. But this/that/these/those function as both demonstrative participant pronouns and as demonstrative determiners.\textsuperscript{12} The DEM1 roots and the DEM2 root distribute like these last English morphemes when in particular constructions. Classifiers in the BCLF construction function primarily as determiners, and more rarely as pronouns.

3 Basic classifier construction

In Pilagá discourse, determiners most frequently have the structure in (3). We call this the basic classifier construction (BCLF). The only required element is one of the six clitics in Table 1, or a plural counterpart. BCLFs functioning as determiners are highlighted in (1) above and in the examples below.

(3) Basic classifier construction (BCLF)
\[(GENDER-)CLASSIFIER\]

The BCLF construction is illustrated in (4)–(6) with the posture/shape CLFS.

(4) (028SanMartin2 1.5)
\[diʔ naʔa-ik\]
\[CLF:HOR road-M\]

‘road’

(5) (190Verbos2 565)
\[da=mʔe yi-laʔa daʔ epaq\]
\[CLF:VER=DEM1:NEUT A3-find-OBJ.SG CLF:VER tree\]

‘She/He sees a tree.’

(6) (028SanMartin2 1.2)
\[se-bide-wʔo niʔ tamnaʔa-ki\]
\[A1-arrive-LOC:outward CLF:NO.EXT religion-place\]

‘I arrive at the church.’

\textsuperscript{11}This sets aside uses like this here dog, where here doubles this as a proximal determiner.

\textsuperscript{12}Diessel (1999: 90) also discusses presentational (what some call “predicational” or “identificational”) and other functions of demonstratives.
Examples (7)–(8) illustrate vowel-lengthened plural CLFs. Saaʔ occurs in (8), rather than sooʔ, due to vowel harmony with the following noun. Recall that the plural CLF forms are optional (especially when the noun is marked for plurality).

(7) **naaʔ** yʔaiʔte
   CLF:near.PL POS1-eyes
   ‘my eyes’

(8) (008ZorroPato 1)
   qančʔe yi-laeyʔa-lo **saaʔ** taʔaʔi k’oqte-1
   then 3-see.ahead-PL CLF:far.PL rosy.billed.duck offspring-PL
   ‘He suddenly saw some rosy-billed ducklings.’

Examples (9)–(11) show the BCLF with gender prefixes. Masculine is usually unmarked (formally and functionally), but an overt prefix *ho-/(h)e-* can be added for clarity.

(9) **ho-gaʔ** emek
    M-CLF:absent house
    ‘that (unknown) house’

(10) (011Kitilipi 1.20)
    qačʔe qo-i-law-lo **hoʔn** lʔaiʔte ekey
    CONJ SBJ.INDF-A3-see-PL M-CLF:near POS3-eye.PL INTJ
    qo-dʔoya-lo **soʔ** lʔaiʔte
    SBJ.INDF-A3-fear-PL CLF:far POS3-eye.PL
    ‘They saw the eyes (coming) and they got scared.’

(11) (005ZorroAvispa 1.1)
    yi-laʔa **ha-soʔ** waʔatʔo
    A3-find-OBJ.SG F-CLF:far wasp
    ‘They found a wasp (in the forest).’

Members of the deictic/visibility CLF subset in Table 1 can express metaphorical or cognitive distance, and sometimes a kind of evidentiality (§7).\(^{13}\) Example (12) describes customary actions. No particular mothers or carandillo palm leaves are

---

\(^{13}\)Messineo et al. (2016) observe similar uses for the Toba cognates.
physically near the narrator, yet the ‘near’ CLF naʔ occurs. Example (13) is the first line of a folktale in which the participants are not departing from view within the world of discourse, though they are apparently conceptualised as distal and hence coded with the ‘far’ CLF soʔ.

(12) (039Artesania 1.1)
naʔ qad-atʔe-l-pi daʔ set-ake dʔoʔo-n-aʔan
CLF:near POS1PL-mother-PL-COL SUB want-DES A3-weave-NPROG-CAUS
načʔe wʔae-ñe yi-lake naʔ laqata l-awa
then be.first-COMPL A3-look.for CLF:near carandillo POS3-leaf
‘When our mothers want to weave (make handicrafts), first they look for carandillo (trithrinax schizophylla) leaves.’

(13) (003Zorro Paloma 1.1)
wʔo soʔ n-loʔ soʔ waʕayaqalʔačiyi qataʔa soʔ
EXIST CLF:far POS.INDF-day CLF:far fox and CLF:far
doqotoʔ
dove
‘There was a day the fox and the dove met each other.’

Similarly, (14) and (15) are the initial sentences of two different explanations of fishing customs. They seem to be situationally identical in objective deictic/visibility features, but in (14) generic ‘people’ who go fishing take the ‘far’ CLF, while in (15) generic ‘people’ who go fishing take the ‘near’ CLF naʔ. Presumably they are conceptualised differently within the world of discourse.

(14) (013Pesca2 1.1)
soʔ siyaʕa-di-pi daʔ set-ake di-yʔako
CLF:far person-PAUC-COL SUB want-DES A3-fish
‘When the people want to go to fish,...’

(15) (14Pesca4 1.1)
daʔ ni-yʔakoʃo-k daʔ čʔe n-piyae-yi daʔ di-yʔako naʔ
SUB B3-fish-M SUB suddenly B3-gather-PL SUB A3-fish CLF:near
siyaʕa-di-pi
person-PAUC-COL
‘When it is fishing (time), when the people spontaneously gather to go hunter-gather (in general, lit. ‘fish’),...’
The CLFs can also show psychological deixis in the sense of empathy or point-of-view. For instance, in (16) from a folktale, the skunk beats both the peccary (by killing the peccary with its odour and then eating it) and the fox (by outsmarting the fox). With one exception, the poor peccary is consistently referred to with the ‘near’ CLF in the story, while the skunk and the fox who eat or attempt to eat the peccaries are referred to with the ‘far’ CLF.

(16) (004 ZorrinoZorro 1.4)

načʔe daʔ yi-lew naʔ owaqae, načʔe soʔ koñem ya-lik then SUB A3-die CLF:near peccary then CLF:far skunk A3-eat

ha-na=mʔe owaqae

F-CLF:near=DEM1:NEUT peccary

‘When the peccary dies, then the skunk eats this peccary.’

The third member of the deictic/visibility CLF subset is gaʔ ‘absent, unseen’. Its meaning ranges from ‘unseen now’ (i.e. absent, remote) to ‘never seen’ and hence ‘unknown’. Thus, it can indicate nonidentifiablity or nonreferentiality, as in (17).14

(17) (013 Pesca2 1.1)

yi-kʔataʕa-som-ʔa gaʔ lačiyaʔge

A3-go-LOC:down-OBJ.SG CLF:absent stream

‘They (prepare to) go to a/some stream.’

Finally, a diminutive tʔae(?) can intervene between a CLF and a noun. As we will see below, this diminutive is becoming morphologised as part of demonstrative constructions.

(18) (001 ZorroPichi 2.10)

soʔ tʔae napam

CLF:far DIM armadillo

‘the distant little armadillo’

We now turn to demonstrative constructions employing the roots in Table 2 and Table 3.

14 Also, some interrogative roots take the CLF gaʔ ‘unseen’, as in (22).
4 Simple demonstrative construction

The simple demonstrative (SDEM) construction contains only a demonstrative root and functions as an adverbial proform (cf. Table 4). This construction is limited to the ubiquitous DEM1 root hoʔ. Our understanding is that it is primarily used to draw the hearer’s attention to something in the context, much as a pointing gesture does. In fact, the SDEM is often, but not always, accompanied by a physical gesture. As a simple demonstrative, hoʔ mostly functions as an exophoric adverbial locative, as in (19)–(21). Hoʔ is often translated as aquí (‘here’) but also as allí (‘there’) in Spanish. As an attention drawing form, it allows some locational range; but it is primarily proximal, so we gloss it consistently as ‘proximal’ to reflect this dominant use.\(^{15}\)

(19) (006ZorroCompanero 1.8)  
a-wʔaʔa-nyi hoʔ naʔ yi-če  
A2-HIT-LOC:MIDDLE DEM1:PROX CLF:NEAR POS1-LEG  
‘Hit here (on) my leg!’

(20) (107Ethno26Grasa 3)  
heʔn četa ho-ga-mʔe siyak qanačʔe  
M-CLF:near grease M-CLF:absent-DEM1:NEUT animal then  
qo-y-ača-n-yi hoʔ ha-gaʔ alewanʔoʔona  
SBJ.INDF-A3-put-NPROG-LOC DEM1:PROX F-CLF:absent vessel  
‘Then the fat of whatever animal they put there in an (earthenware) vessel (alewanʔoʔona).’

(21) (007ZorroWaqaw 1.8)  
čʔe Ø-ek hoʔ de-mače-tape-get soʔ=n-egaʔa-wa  
soon A3-go DEM1:PROX A3-hear-PROG-VEN CLF:far=POS.INDF-friend-HUM  
wqaʔw bird.species  
‘Then, he (Fox) went away there [indicating the place where Waqaw was; not necessarily far or close], he heard his friend Waqaw (bird species) coming.’

Hoʔ can also have a temporal function, as in (22). (It also occurs in hoʔkalʔioʔ meaning ‘before, long ago’.)

\(^{15}\) Heʔn, as in (20), is a common contraction from he-naʔ; the two forms are equivalent in meaning.
7 Pilagá determiners and demonstratives

(22) (001ZorroPichi 1.7) qančʔe naeʔ=ga? aw-men hoʔ ñ-egaʔa-wa then INTG=CLF:absent A2-sell DEM1:PROX POS1:companion-HUM ‘So what will you sell now, my companion?’

Though the SDEM with hoʔ is primarily exophoric, it can be endophoric. In (23), it functions as a discourse anaphoric form, referring back to the act of being authorised to show a particular document.

(23) (067ToribiaAcosta.46–48) a. hayem kaʔ sepa čʔe algún documento daʔ daʔ 1SG before seem.to.me then some document SUB SUB Ø-ek-a soʔ sala-nek 3-go-LOC:specific CLF:far chief-AGENT ‘I believed that, that the chief came back with the document’
b. daʔ qomiʔ y-aloʔo-na-lo SUB 1PL 3-show-NPROG-PL ‘so that he could show us.’
c. daʔ kaʔ epaʔa autorisaw hoʔ eta-t SUB before it.seems authorised DEM1:PROX say-PROG ‘He was saying that he seems authorised for this.’

In the more complex demonstrative construction next discussed in §5, we find hoʔ in both adverbial and non-adverbial functions.

5 Deictic demonstrative construction

Pilagá has a complex deictic demonstrative (DDEM) construction involving the DEM1 roots (Table 2) plus the CLFS (Table 1). The elements of complex demonstratives show dialect and idiolect variation and may vary by speaker’s age. As noted in §2, some elements can undergo vowel harmony. The ‘near’ CLF naʔ often reduces to (?)n, and the ‘neutral’ DEM1 root mʔe often reduces to (?)m. There is considerable variation in the text corpus especially for mʔe. For instance, hogamʔe, hogamʔoʔ, and hoganʔe all contain mʔe and are alternative forms of ‘that absent/unknown’. Hoʔn is a contraction from ho-naʔ=miʔe (M-CLF:near=DEM1:NEUT). According to the consultant Ignacio Silva, some of the variant forms are “old words”, rarely heard now. All these factors result in a great variety of surface forms.
The deictic demonstrative (DDEM) construction has the structure in (24).

(24) Deictic demonstrative construction (DDEM)
\[(\text{GENDER-})\text{CLASSIFIER=} (\text{diminutive=} )\text{DEM1(-plural)}\]

The gender markers in the DDEM are ha- ‘feminine’ and (h)e-/ho-/Ø ‘masculine’, illustrated in (25)–(28). Sometimes the masculine is left unmarked for gender. We do not write the zero form in examples. Plural can be marked by lengthening the CLF vowel, and some DDEMs add -lo or -wa ‘plural’.

(25) (004ZorrinoZorro 1.4)
ha-na=mʔe owaqae
F-CLF:near=DEM1:NEUT peccary
‘this peccary’

(26) (136ethnograph55 6)
naqae=ga ho-ga=maʃəa piyʔofonaq
DEM2:RCG=CLF:absent M-CLF:absent=DEM1:NVIS shaman
‘(Death could result from the action of) some/any shaman.’

(27) (001ZorroPichi 2.14)
yeči ki hora da? ho-da=maʃəa y-em
evident what hour SUB M-CLF:VER=DEM1:NVIS A3-end
‘(I don’t know) what time that (the story) ends...’

(28) (032ColoniaEnsanchez 1.3)
ńi=maʃəa ŋiʔ qan-saʃəa-nek
CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:NVIS CLF:NO.EXT POS1PL-chief-M
‘that our chief’ (not present at the time of utterance)\(^{16}\)

‘Shape’ (rounded) or ‘size’ appears as a semantic extension of ‘feminine’ gender. However, not all nominals in Pilagá are marked for a particular gender distinction, regardless of their shape, nor is such marking synchronically predictable. As (24) indicates, a diminutive can occur between the CLF and demonstrative root, as in (29)–(30). The diminutive is acceptable after a DEM1 root only

\(^{16}\)A native speaker said this text line sounded redundant, apparently due to both the DDEM and the separate BCLF before ‘our chief’.
if the diminutive is preceded by a CLF (as if the diminutive morpheme is nominal); compare (31)–(32). The diminutive can communicate that one is feeling sorry for a referent.

(29) ñiʔ=tʔae=mʔe
   CLF: NO.EXT = DIM = DEM1: NEUT
   ‘that little rounded/sitting one’ (I may be seeing it or not)

(30) daʔ=tʔae=čaʔa
   CLF: VER = DIM = DEM1: DIST. VIS
   ‘that far little one’ (I see it)

(31) ñiʔ=mʔe ñiʔ tʔae
   CLF: NO. EXT = DEM1: NEUT CLF: NO. EXT DIM
   ‘that little rounded/sitting one’ (I may be seeing it or not)

(32) *daʔ=čaʔa tʔae
   CLF: VER = DEM1: DIST. VIS DIM

All members of the DEM1 paradigm (Table 2) occur in the DDEM construction. We illustrate this in combination with the ‘horizontal’ CLF diʔ. In (33), hoʔ indicates the object is close to the speaker and visible at the time of utterance. Mʔe is neutral in (34) about whether the object is visible at speech time. Čaʔa in (35) requires that the object be visible at speech time. Maʕa in (36) indicates the object is not present/visible to the speaker at speech time.

(33) yi-laʔa di=hoʔ siyaʕawa
   A3-see CLF: HOR = DEM1: PROX person
   ‘She/He saw this person lying down/asleep/dead.’ (The person is visible now and close; but need not currently be horizontal/dead.)

(34) yi-laʔa di=mʔe siyaʕawa
   A3-see CLF: HOR = DEM1: NEUT person
   ‘She/He saw a/that person lying/sleeping/dead.’ (The person may or may not be in sight at the time of speaking.)
(35) yi-laʔa di=čʔa siyaʕawa
A3-see CLF:HOR=DEM1:DIST.VIS person
'She/He saw that far-away lying-down/asleep/dead person.' (The person is visible now and far away; pointing to the person.)

(36) yi-laʔa di=maʕa siyaʕawa
A3-see CLF:HOR=DEM1:NVIS person
'She/He saw that person lying down/asleep/dead.' (The person is not visible to the speaker.)

Though all DEM1 roots occur in the DDEM construction, there are some co-occurrence restrictions with particular CLFs to avoid semantic clashes. This is particularly relevant for the deictic/visibility CLFs, as the posture/shape CLFs do not lend deictic information to the overall meaning of the demonstrative construction (as seen in (33)–(36) with diʔ ‘horizontal’).

Čaʔa ‘distant visible’ only occurs with CLFs that allow interpretation of a visible referent, i.e. naʔ ‘near, coming’, soʔ ‘far, departing’, and the posture/shape CLFs, as in (37)–(41). Examples (37)–(38) have a distal+visible referent, marked by čaʔa. The fact that it is approaching the reference point (potentially communicated by naʔ) may be communicated with or without the ‘ventive’ suffix -get on čaʔa. The ‘itive’ -geʔ is not possible with naʔ=čaʔa, but the ‘itive’ is possible with soʔ=čaʔa, as in (39).

(37) naʔ=čʔa
CLF:near=DEM1:DIST.VIS
‘far referent coming near’

(38) naʔ=čʔa-get
CLF:near=DEM1:DIST.VIS-VEN
‘far referent coming near’

(39) soʔ=čʔa-get
CLF:far=DEM1:DIST.VIS-IT
‘far referent going away’

(40) do=čʔa
CLF:VER=DEM1:DIST.VIS
‘that upright far referent’
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(41) \( \text{ña}=\text{čʔa}-\text{lo} \)
\hspace{1cm} CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:DIST.VIS-PL
\hspace{1cm} ‘those sitting there’

The three examples sets between (42) and (52) illustrate additional combinations of the deictic/visibility CLFs with the more frequent DEM1 roots. The specific interpretation of a combination may depend on pragmatic context. Examples (42)–(44) carry the ‘near, coming’ CLF \( \text{naʔ} \). In (44), the ‘distal’ feature of the DEM1 root \( \text{čaʔa} \) overrides any ‘near, proximal, coming’ meaning that might otherwise be associated with \( \text{naʔ} \); this suggests that \( \text{naʔ} \) may be bleaching of its spatial semantics. Along with a wave of the hand, (44) could serve as an answer to the question ‘Where is José?’

(42) \( \text{noʔ}=\text{hoʔ} \) \hspace{0.5cm} \( \text{naʔ} \) \hspace{0.5cm} tʔae
\hspace{1cm} CLF:near=DEM1:PROX CLF:near DIM
\hspace{1cm} ‘this little one’ (right here beside me and I see it)

(43) \( \text{naʔ}=\text{mʔe} \) \hspace{0.5cm} \( \text{naʔ} \) \hspace{0.5cm} tʔae
\hspace{1cm} CLF:near=DEM1:NEUT CLF:near DIM
\hspace{1cm} ‘this little one’ (the item may be present or not; the expression could refer to something I have been talking about)

(44) \( \text{naʔ}=\text{čaʔa} \) \hspace{0.5cm} \( \text{naʔ} \) \hspace{0.5cm} tʔae
\hspace{1cm} CLF:near=DEM1:DIST.VIS CLF:near DIM
\hspace{1cm} ‘(he’s) that little one’ (there, not moving)

Examples (45)–(49) combine \( \text{soʔ} \) with DEM1 roots. Our consultant found (45) unacceptable, explaining that it contradictorily combines \( \text{soʔ} \) ‘far’ with \( \text{hoʔ} \) ‘proximal’ (we return to this combination further below). When \( \text{soʔ} \) combines with ‘neutral’ \( \text{mʔe} \), as in (46), the result indicates a visible or identifiable referent departing from the deictic center; thus with \( \text{mʔe} \), the CLF yields the primary deixis/visibility meaning. In (47) with \( \text{čaʔa} \) ‘distal visible’ plus the ‘itive’ -\( \text{ge} (?) \), the overall reading is of an already distal but visible participant moving away. Without the ‘itive’ (48), one consultant finds \( \text{soʔ} \) incompatible with \( \text{čaʔa} \). This is because \( \text{soʔ} \) can sometimes be interpreted as ‘(going) out of view’, while \( \text{čaʔa} \) specifically indicates ‘visible’; but the combination was acceptable in (39). In (49) with \( \text{maʔa} \) ‘non-visible’, the speaker could possibly know the non-visible referent, though there is something uncertain about it in the speaker’s mind.
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(45) *soʔ=tʔae=hoʔ
   CLF:far=DEM1:PROX

(46) soʔ=tʔae=mʔe
   CLF:far=DEM1:NEUT
   ‘that small visible/identifiable departing referent’

(47) soʔ=tʔae=čaʔa-ge
   CLF:far=DEM1:DIST.VIS-IT
   ‘that small visible far-away departing referent’

(48) *soʔ=tʔae=čaʔa
   CLF:far=DEM1:DIST.VIS

(49) soʔ=tʔae=maʕa
   CLF:far=DEM1:NVIS
   ‘that little (stationary) unseen referent’ (perhaps I know it)

Possible interpretations of the ‘absent’ CLF gaʔ include unknown, non-specific, and non-referential readings, as in (50)–(53). It may combine with the ‘proximal’ and ‘neutral’ DEM1 roots, but not with čaʔa ‘distal+visible’, as shown by (50)–(52). This restriction is due to the semantic clash between the ‘visible’ feature of čaʔa and the ‘absent’ feature of gaʔ. The perhaps surprising example in this set is (50), as it might seem that the ‘absent’ feature of gaʔ should conflict with hoʔ. However, its acceptability reveals the expanding semantic domain of polysemous hoʔ; in particular, with a CLF, hoʔ can be used endophorically for a participant currently under discussion. In this use, it participates in topic marking. Example (51) shows that with the ‘neutral’ DEM1 root, the semantic features of the CLF again become especially evident.

(50) gaʔ=tʔae=hoʔ
   CLF:absent=DEM1:PROX
   ‘this little one’ (referring to something/somebody under discussion that is far or I do not remember well)

(51) gaʔ=tʔae=mʔe
   CLF:absent=DEM1:NEUT
   ‘that little one’ (not in view, never seen, or unknown, but I remember it)
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(52) $^*$gaʔ=taʔe=čaʔa
    CLF:absent=DIM=DEM1:DIST.VIS

If under the scope of negation, $gaʔ$ plus $mʔe$ may indicate ‘nothing, nobody’, as in (53).

(53) Qaya $gaʔ=mʔe$
    NEXIST.HUM CLF:absent=DEM1:NEUT

‘There is nobody.’

In (44), we saw that the meaning of $DEM1$ čaʔa overrides the spatial meaning that $CLF$ naʔ might otherwise carry. However, in some situations the meaning of a $CLF$ can override that of a $DEM1$ root. Thus, (54)–(57) were said to mean “basically the same” in terms of spatial/visibility deixis. They all carry the $CLF$ soʔ ‘far, departing (potentially to the point of being absent)’, regardless of choice of the demonstrative root. Notably, (55) was judged as fine, while (45) with the same key elements was rejected. We analyse the variability in speakers’ judgments as reflecting the polysemous nature of $hoʔ$: on one occasion its exophoric ‘proximal’ feature is conceptually prominent and thus it is viewed as conflicting with soʔ, but on another – as in (55) – $hoʔ$ is interpreted endophorically to indicate the participant under discussion in the discourse, so there is no spatial deixis conflict. The $DEM2$ root in (57) is discussed in §6.

(54) soʔ y-alek
    CLF:far POS1-son
    ‘my son (distant/absent)’

(55) so=hoʔ y-alek
    CLF:far=DEM1:PROX POS1-son
    ‘that my son (departing)’

(56) so=mʔe y-alek
    CLF:far=DEM1:NEUT POS1-son
    ‘that my son (distant/absent)’

(57) naqae=soʔ y-alek
    DEM2:RCG=CLF:far POS1-son
    ‘that (is) my son’ (understood to not be present)
The preceding discussion has focused on structure of the DDEM and meanings of composing morphemes. We now more explicitly address grammatical and discourse functions of this construction (cf. Table 4). DDEM constructions serve as adverbial and participant proforms or as determiners. The proform function is illustrated in (58)–(60) with the root hoʔ. The two senses of (58) show the adverbial exophoric locative function of the DDEM with hoʔ, and its participant reference function. In (59), the DDEM refers exophorically to an inanimate entity. In (60), it refers exophorically to a location.

(58) so=hoʔ
    CLF:far=DEM1:PROX
    ‘there’ (Spanish allá) / ‘one (who is) departing’

(59) ha-n=hoʔ
    mate
    F-CLF:near-DEM1:PROX mate(drink)
    ‘This is a mate (container).’

(60) (060TrabajoMadera 12)
    maʔaʔa qaga ha-ño=hoʔ naʔa na-ʔa
    yet NEXIST F-CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:PROX now B3-sit-OBJ.SG
    dyo=hoʔ Campo
    CLF:HOR=DEM1:PROX place.name
    ‘This [pointing to the location of the community] did not yet exist
     (which) is now (the spread-out community of) Estanislao del Campo.’

Example (59) is a zero-copula equational clause and the DDEM is not in the same phrase as mate. The pronominal DDEM with naʔ ‘near’ plus hoʔ indicates an item close enough to touch. The feminine gender prefix occurs due to the rounded shape of the container. In (60), ha-ño=hoʔ indicates a non-extended referent, pointing to the particular location (rather than extended shape) of the community.

Deictic demonstrative constructions with DEM1 roots other than hoʔ function only pronominally and as determiners (not adverbially; cf. Table 4). In (61), he-n=mʔe functions as a text-internal anaphoric pronominal. It refers to the story the speaker is in the midst of relating. (He-n=hoʔ with the ‘proximal’ DEM1 root in this context would mean ‘here, the place where I, the speaker, am’.)
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(61) (001ZorroPichi 2.13)

he-n=mʔe huw!
M-CLF:near=DEM1:NEUT wow
‘this (story), wow!’ (meaning ‘this story I am telling you’)

In (62), the highlighted DDEM functions as a cataphoric pronominal. Mʔe carries the ‘vertical’ CLF daʔ, but in this context it designates a propositional event which, as a whole, is an abstract concept.

(62) (048RecoleccionMiel 1.1)

a. so=mʔe siyaʔa-di-pi daʔ=mʔe
   CLF:far=DEM1:NEUT person-PAUC-COL CLF:VER=DEM1:NEUT
   qo-ilaʔa soʔ kon’ayaʔapoλoʔ
   SBJ.INDF-see-OBJ.SG CLF:far bee.hive
   ‘When the men find the bee hive,

b. nač’e w’ae-ne daʔ=mʔe
   soon be.first-COMPL CLF:VER=DEM1:NEUT
   ‘they first do this.’

b. qo-ya-lo-n soʔ doleʔ
   SBJ.INDF-A3-stir-NPROG CLF:far fire
   ‘they stir up the fire.’

A DDEM with čaʔa may function exophorically or endophorically. The exophoric function is dominant, but in (63d), from a story about competition between Fox and Toad, niʔ=čaʔa is endophoric, referring to the toad. Line (63d) also shows the pronominal DDEM soʔ=tʔae=mʔe functioning anaphorically.

(63) (002SapoZorro 1.11–1.14)

a. degesesow eso wayqal’ačiyi yači enaʔaye-ik
   quickly CLF:far fox certain dusty-AUG
   ‘Quickly, it is clear/certain that the fox stirred up a lot of dust.’

b. soʔ qololo daʔ Ø-wenot qanačʔe yitaʔa ne-noyo-segem soʔ
   CLF:far toad SUB A3-jump then again B3-move-upward CLF:far
   qololo l-qaya
toad POS3-sibling
   ‘But when the toad jumped, another toad appeared.’
Examples (64)–(65) show pronominal DDEMs with the ‘nonvisible’ root maʕa.

(64)  (032ColoniaEnsanchez 1.1)

\[
diʔ=maʕa \quad diʔ-ae \quad qad-ʔačaqaʔ \quad le-naʔat \quad \text{Colonia Ensanchez}\n\]

\[
\text{clf:hori=DEM1:NVIS} \quad \text{clf:hori-F} \quad \text{pos1pl=community} \quad \text{pos3=name Colonia Ensanchez} \quad \text{a3-be-it} \quad \text{clf:near north}
\]

‘This our community, its name (is) Colonia Ensanchez, is towards the north.’ (Context: The speaker is in a workshop talking about his far-distant community, probably looking at a map.)

(65)  (032ColoniaEnsanchez 1.3)

\[
\text{ñiʔ}=maʕa \quad \text{ñiʔ} \quad \text{qan-salaʕa-nek l-sek}
\]

\[
\text{clf:noext=DEM1:NVIS} \quad \text{clf:noext-pos1pl=chief-M} \quad \text{pos3=neighbor}
\]

\[
\text{f-clf:noext} \quad \text{religion-LOC}
\]

‘That (far away house) (that I’m talking about from memory) of our chief is between the church (and the school).’

We now briefly comment on adnominal DDEM uses. In (66), dyo=hoʔ refers exophorically to a concrete participant. In (67), he-n=hoʔ refers to a time.
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(66) dyo=ho? pioq čeʔeda weta-ñʔa kaliʔo
CLF:HOR-DEM1:PROX dog be.first be-LOC:below-OBJ.SG long.ago
‘This dog (present, that I am signaling) has been (lying) here a long time.’

(67) (077Sent09Cantidad 2)
sőʔ l-aqaya setaeʔ na-paʔagen-a daʔ paʔagentanaʔaik
CLF:far POS2-brother want B3-learn-OBJ.SG SUB teacher.M
he-n=hoʔ woʔe
M-CLF:near=DEM1:PROX year
‘Your brother wants to study teaching (to be a teacher) this year.’

Adnominal DDEMs with mʔe often mark already-mentioned participants, as in (16). But this is not always the case. In (68), diʔ=mʔe occurs on the first mention of ‘garden/field’; the consultant expressed the view that the sentence would mean essentially the same thing if a BCLF with just diʔ occurred instead.

(68) (035Linea 1.4)
daʔ set-ake a-e-ye diʔ=mʔe qad-an-aʔan-qaʔ
SUB want-DES A3-go-in.line CLF:HOR=DEM1:NEUT POS1PL-plant-CAUS-LOC
qanač’e o-ket’a-ge diʔ naʔa-ik Ø-lekaʔa-ege
then A2-continue-IT CLF:HOR road-M 3A-be.big-forward
‘If you want to get to our vegetable garden, you have to continue along the wide path.’

In (69), mʔe combines with the ‘absent’ CLF gaʔ, to determine the nonreferential phrase ‘our thought’

(69) (001ZorroPichi 1.1)
čaqaga daʔ gaʔ=mʔe qad-enat-aʔak
what SUB CLF:absent=DEM1:NEUT POS1PL-think-NMLZ
‘What (is) our thought? (i.e. ‘What shall we do?’)

6 Recognitional demonstrative construction

A second demonstrative construction has not, to our knowledge, been noted in previous Guaykuruan literature. We call this a recognitional demonstrative (RDEM) construction. In it, the root naqae co-occurs with a CLF, but naqae differs from the DEM1 set in taking the CLF as an enclitic, yielding the structure in (70).
Recognitional demonstrative construction (RDEM)
\[ \text{DEM2.root=CLASSIFIER(-plural)} \]

Naqae indicates that the speaker anticipates the hearer already knows or is familiar with the identity of the referent (whether or not it has already been mentioned in the discourse), but wishes to activate it in the hearer’s mind. There may be an assumption of shared knowledge about the referent, but there may be doubt or even disbelief that the hearer is currently attending to it, so the speaker is activating it for the hearer. This is similar to what Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999) call a “recognitional” demonstrative. We consider naqae to be a demonstrative root as it orients the hearer’s attention to a participant.

Though consultants specifically comment that naqae means the hearer knows the referent, in some contexts we think naqae would be better characterized as indicating a familiar concept, as it can also be used for non-referential mentions. Speakers suggest it sometimes indicates a note of surprise or unexpectedness about a known but previously inactive referent, as if something has just activated it in the mind of the speaker. This is the case in (71), which stacks naqae=ñi together with hoʔ and ñiʔ. Here, hoʔ is verbally signalling (verbally “pointing”) to the person, who is sitting.

(71) naqae=ñi hoʔ ñiʔ siyaʕawa
\[ \text{DEM2:RCG=CLF:NO.EXT DEM1:PROX CLF:NO.EXT person} \]

‘Ah, that/this is the person!’ (I see him/her, sitting)

The RDEM construction is attested in pronominal and adnominal functions (cf. Table 4). In (72), naqae=na-wa functions pronominally.\(^{17}\) Naqa=ñi is also pronominal in (73). However, naqae=naʔ in (73) appears to be adnominal. In the discourse just prior to (73), the fox is annoyed by a wasp and says, “Why are you always in my path? I’m going to hit you.” Fox then utters (73). Here, naqaenaʔ indicates some emotiveness or unexpectedness.

(72) (017Pesca1 1.4)
\[ \text{qataʕa da? an-awa?-ʔ-n naa? l-ʔawɑʔak-o} \]
\[ \text{and SUB B2-watch-PL-NPROG CLF:near.PL POS3-water.channel-PL} \]
\[ \text{naqae=na-wa naa? n-aya-pe-egʔa-lo} \]
\[ \text{DEM2:RCG=CLF:near-PL CLF:near.PL B3-leave-PROG-LOC:specific-PL} \]

\(^{17}\)The second instance of the CLF naaʔ in (72) functions like a relativiser to introduce a clause modifying naqae=na-wa.
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he-n  ninyaq-pi  
M-CLF:near fish-COL

‘Also to watch the water channels, these are where from the fish emerge.’

(73)  (005ZorroAvispa 1.2)

lʔeʔ  naqa=ñi  y-ʔata-ʔnyi  naqae=naʔ  
y-adik  
pos1-path

‘Why does this one move (be) in this my path?’

The RDEM construction can be anaphoric. In (74d), naqae=na-wa refers back to ‘the place where the fish pass’ mentioned in (74b).

(74)  (017Pescal 1.1–104)

a. w’ae-ñi  qomi  qo-ya-paʔage-nek-e  daʔ  
be.first-COMPL 1PL  SBJ.INDF-A3-teach-AGENT-PL SUB  
qo-y-eʔet  naʔ  čikena  
SBJ.INDF-A3-prepare CLF:near arrow

‘First they taught us to prepare the arrows’

b. qataʕa  naʔ?  Ò-wapiñ’a-lo  qataʕa  naʔ?  
and  CLF:near 3-be.place-PL and  CLF:near  
n-aeya-pe-ege-ʔa  naʔ  ninyaqa-pi  
B3-go-IPFV-opposite-OBJ.SG  CLF:near fish-COL

‘and (to know) the places and where the fish pass by.’

c. qataʕa  qomi  qo-ya-paʔage-nek-e  daʔ?  
and  1PL  SBJ.INDF-A3-teach-AGENT-PL SUB  
qo-ya-ye-n  naʔ  ninyaq  
SBJ.INDF-A3-throw-NPROG CLF:near fish

‘Also they taught us how to stab a fish’

d. qataʕa  daʔ?  an-awa-ʔ-n  naʔ?  lʔawaʕako  
and  SUB  B2-watch-pl-nprog CLF:near.PL POS3-caudal  
naqae=na-wa  naʔ?  n-aya-p-ege-ło  
DEM2:RCG=CLF:near-PL CLF:near.PL B3-go-PROG-opposite-PL  
he-ʔn  ninyaqa-pi  
M-CLF:near fish-COL

‘and how to watch the flow where the fish come out.’

Finally, (26) suggests that Pilagá allows stacking of RDEM and DDEM.
7 Further grammaticalisation: Nominal TAM and subordination

7.1 Overview

Having now discussed the morphosyntax and basic functions of CLFs and demonstratives, we turn to extended uses for nominal tense, mood/evidentiality, and clausal subordination. Pilagá adds to the body of data showing how demonstratives and determiners can further grammaticalise (Diessel 1999; 2003; Gildea 1993; Aikhenvald 2015).

7.2 Incipient nominal tense, mood, and evidentiality

Like other Guaykuruan languages, Pilagá lacks grammatical tense forms. However, some CLFs and DEM1 roots implicate temporal meanings in certain contexts, and visible versus inferred source of evidence or (un)certainty. The temporal and evidentiality/modality meanings sometimes relate to evaluation of a nominal referent and sometimes to the proposition. Pilagá thus pertains to the set of languages having nominal TAM (Nordlinger & Sadler 2004). The role of CLFs in conveying temporal, modal, and evidential meanings in Guaykuruan has been discussed in other works (Messineo et al. 2016; Messineo & Cúneo 2019), including for Pilagá (Vidal & Klein 1998; Vidal & Gutiérrez 2010). Here we also note the role of DEM1 roots in marking these concepts.

In Pilagá, temporal use of CLFs and DEM1 roots is pragmatic rather than fully grammaticalised, and interpretations interact with person and lexical meanings. First, (75)–(76) reveal the possible present-time interpretation of posture/shape CLFs versus the past-time effect of soʔ ‘far, departing’. Daʔ is the CLF for abstract nouns like lasook ‘custom’, as well as for vertical ‘person’. The overall interpretation in (75) is present time. In (76), soʔ occurs with both nouns. Given the abstract concept of ‘custom’, soʔ cannot be interpreted as meaning that lasook is spatially distant or moving away, so a space-to-time metaphorical inference yields the understanding of a ‘distant’ or past time situation. This likely also affects the use and interpretation of soʔ with ‘person’.

(75)  eta  hoʔ  daʔ  lasook daʔ  siyaʕawa
      it.is.said DEM1:PROX CLF:VER custom CLF:VER person
   ‘This is the custom of the person.’ (present)
(76) eta hoʔ soʔ lasook soʔ siyaʔa-di-pi
it.is.said DEM1:PROX CLF:far custom CLF:far person-PAUC-COL
'This was the custom (of) the people.'

To more clearly see the possible temporal effect of soʔ when applied to concrete objects, consider (77). Hoʔ occurs in soʔ=hoʔ because 'my son' is in the speaker’s vicinity at the time of utterance. Since ‘my son’ is locally present, soʔ ‘far’ can only be interpreted as indicating a temporally distant or past event. In this instance the CLF has propositional/event-scope, while the DEM1 root has nominal scope related to the speech time.

(77) (052RelatoAnciana 62)
n-oye-tak naʔa soʔ=hoʔ y-alek n-woʔom da?
B3-cry-PROG now CLF:far=DEM1:PROX POS1-son B3-feel CLF:VER
l-qowaʔa
POS3-hunger
‘My son here/now was crying because he felt hunger.’

Soʔ does not obligate a past-time propositional interpretation if contextual factors indicate otherwise. Because of qomle ‘later’ in (78), soʔ is interpreted as applying to the past-time of the events involving ‘our ancestors’ and not to the event of telling.

(78) (Vidal & Gutiérrez 2010: 1353)
qomle s-aqtanaʔan soʔ qadetalpi
later A1-tell CLF:far our.grandparents
‘I’m going to tell you about our ancestors.’

In contrast to soʔ, the CLF gaʔ ‘unseen’ pragmatically allows that the “event in which it is embedded is an expression of the ignorance, the desires, or the intentions of the speaker, rather than a realized event” (Vidal & Klein 1998: 176). Gaʔ often occurs in clauses with conditional, obligation, or prospective meaning, as in (79).

(79) (025EspirituSuri 1.3)
awa-wʔo-e gaʔ ade-wo ...
A2-make-PL CLF:absent POS2-clothes
‘you have to make your costumes ...’

Temporal interpretation is affected by pragmatic interaction between person, proximity of a referent to the speaker versus other referents, and the semantics
of lexemes, CLFs and DEM roots. In (80)–(82), the speaker and the grammatical subject are the same person. *Taqa* ‘talk’ plus *ño=hoʔ* ‘non.extended=proximal’ implies a present-time action because the first-person speaker can talk ‘now’ to someone who is physically near.

(80) se-taqa-tap-ege *ño=hoʔ* siyaʕawa
A1-talk-PROG-IT CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:PROX person
‘I am talking to a/this person (sitting next/close to me).’

In (81) with ‘talk’, the ‘neutral’ DEM1 root *mʔe* with a posture/shape CLF allows a present or past interpretation. In (82), ‘distal+visible’ *čaʔa* implies a past event because – ignoring telephones – one cannot talk ‘now’ to someone far away.

(81) se-taqa-tap-ege *ní=mʔe* siyaʕawa
A1-talk-PROG-IT CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:NEUT person
‘I am talking now to a/that person (who is sitting).’ / ‘I talked to that person (who is now sitting).’

(82) se-taqa-tap-ege *ní=čaʔa* siyaʕawa
A1-talk-PROG-IT CLF:NO.EXT=DEM1:DIST.VIS person
‘I was talking to that person now sitting (far from me).’ (Since he/she is far away, it is impossible to be talking to him/her right now.)

DEM1 roots also play a role in expressing a speaker’s (un)certainty. Compare (83)–(84), which show that *maʕa* is a marker of uncertainty compared to *mʔe*.

(83) eta *ho-da=maʕa* lasook
it.is.said M-CLF:VER=DEM1:NVIS custom
‘It is said that is how the custom must have been.’ / ‘That seems to have been (how) the custom (was).’

(84) eta *ho-da=mʔe* lasook
it.is.said M-CLF:VER=DEM1:NEUT custom
‘It is said this is what the custom is (like).’ (speaker is certain)

7.3 *Daʔ* as clausal subordinator

Elements of the determiner and demonstrative systems have become markers of subordination (Vidal 2001). The CLF *daʔ* ‘vertically extended’ introduces clauses
with a variety of adverbial, complement, and nominal-modifying functions. This needs more exposition than can be taken up here, but we note that it introduces readings of at least adverbial ‘when’ in (15)–(16), ‘conditional’ in (68), and ‘purpose’ in (85). In (77), daʔ occurs before an abstract nominal ‘hunger’, but the phrase with daʔ communicates an adverbial ‘because’ notion. The complement function is illustrated in (23c), (74c), and (86), and a nominal-modifying (i.e. relative) function surfaces in (27) and (87).

(85) (004ZorrinoZorro 1.1)
soʔ koñem wʔo soʔ maečʔe la-wa-naʔanqaʔ daʔ
CLF:far skunk exist CLF:far own POS3-trap-NMLZ:place SUB
na-wa-n naʔ owaqae
B3-trap-NPROG CLF:near peccaque
‘The skunk had his own trapping place in order to trap the peccary.’

(86) (015Pesca3 1.2)
wacʔe qo-dʔoʔa daʔ ne-matae-yi ga=mʔ
because SBJ.INDF-A3-fear SUB B3-puncture-PL CLF:absent=DEM1:NEUT
n-oʔonek
POS.INDF-fish
‘Because they feared that the fish would damage it.’

(87) (003ZorroPaloma 1.2)
yi-pit-etpa-lo sa-wa lʔaiʔte soʔ doqotoʔ daʔ toʔomaqčiglo
A3-want-PROG-PL CLF:far-PL POS3-eyes CLF:far dove SUB be.red
‘He wanted dove eyes that were red.’

Historically, the daʔ subordinator is likely connected to the ‘abstract’ nominal determining function of daʔ. As daʔ is the CLF for abstract nominal referents, it is well-suited to mark nominalised propositions, which are typically rather abstract conceptual entities. These then come to serve as subordinate clauses.

7.4 Mʔe as a relativiser

Mʔe is a highly frequent demonstrative root (Table 2). We have seen that in contrastive elicitation, it allows a ‘medial’ spatial contrast between hoʔ ‘proximal’ and čaʔa ‘distal visible’, and a visibility contrast with maʔa ‘not visible’. However, it can occur with all deictic CLFS to mark referents as ‘proximal/in the visual
field’, ‘distal/(going) out of the visual field’, or ‘never seen/absent/nonreferential’; and it occurs with all posture/shape CLFs. We also noted that *mʔe* demonstratives can be used cataphorically, as in (62), though they are usually anaphoric. Given its range of collocations and uses, we conclude that *mʔe* has developed a ‘distance/deictically neutral’ role (Himmelmann 1996: 211).

Perhaps concomitant with its neutral deictic use, *mʔe* has developed as the most common relativiser. It follows a head noun to anaphorically introduce a modifying relative clause, as in (88)–(89). As a relativiser, it does not occur with classifiers or gender affixes (this is also true of the Western Toba cognate; Carpio 2012: 53). It thus diverges from the DDTEM construction involving this root, which requires a classifier.

\[
\text{(88) (052RelatoAnciana 52)} \\
\text{ad-apenaʔ I-tʔa diʔ=m ad-apenaʔ} \\
\text{POS2-grandfather POS3-father CLF:HOR=DEM1:NEUT POS2-grandfather} \\
\text{mʔe yi-wa} \\
\text{DEM1:NEUT POS1-spouse} \\
\text{‘the father of your grandfather (deceased) that was (my) husband’}
\]

\[
\text{(89) (071Sent03Comunidad 7)} \\
\text{naegaʔ waʔa-ege nqoʔ gaʔ=nadik mʔe yi-lotʔa} \\
\text{where be-opposite when CLF:absent=road DEM1:NEUT A3-see-OBJ.SG} \\
\text{gaʔ=Joel CLF:absent=Joel} \\
\text{‘Where is the road that goes directly to (lit. sees) (the house of) Joel?’}
\]

*Mʔe* also introduces headless relative clauses, as in (90).

\[
\text{(90) (013Pesca2 1.4)} \\
\text{yi-laʔa-ge načʔe yi-loʔt-ege mʔe t-a-yʔa} \\
\text{A3-see-IT soon A3-see-opposite DEM1:NEUT A3-go-inside-OBJ.SG} \\
\text{‘He follows it (a bee, with his gaze) to see (the place) where it goes inside} \text{(of the honeycomb).’}
\]

The relativising use of *mʔe* might at first appear to be the SDTEM construction; but by itself, *mʔe* is not synchronically attested as a proform. Nevertheless, it is largely associated with discourse anaphoricity. It has become the unmarked means to refer to a just-mentioned referent. Historically, this may have come about via an adjoined clause. That is, a conceivable earlier analysis of (89) might
have been ‘Where is the road, that one (i.e. ‘road’) sees Joel?’ The relativiser function then developed by reanalysing the modifying clause (‘that [one] sees Joel’) as embedded. If this scenario is correct, then contra Himmelmann’s (1996) suggestion, it is not the distal member of the demonstrative paradigm which has extended its meaning to become grammaticalised as a relativiser, but the ‘middle (visible)’ and/or ‘neutral’ member of the paradigm.

8 Conclusions

This study contributes to our understanding of the typological range of determiner and demonstrative systems. It has especially highlighted the demonstrative roots, which have not received much previous study in Guaykuruan languages.

Anyone who has examined a substantive discourse sample for any language, and over that sample tried to specify “all and only” the componential semantic features that distinct demonstrative forms have, can surely attest that choice among demonstrative morphemes cannot be tied exclusively to literal spatial deixis nor to “clean” endophoric versus exophoric factors. The choice is always sensitive to the speaker’s conceptualisation of referents on particular occasions of speaking, and to assumptions about the hearer’s continually changing state of mind in the endeavour to establish joint attention. With these important cautions in mind, the following is nevertheless a summary of our understanding of the prototypical functions of the demonstrative roots presented in Table 2–3.

- **hoʔ** Adverbial; extended to participants when combined with CLFS; visually or conceptually proximal (e.g. in the flow of the discourse); typically exophoric
- **mʔe** Cognitively activated for speaker; assumed to be already activated for hearer; mostly endophoric and anaphoric
- **čaʔa** Visually distal; typically exophoric
- **maʕa** Unseen, uncertain; inferred
- **naqae** Speaker instructs hearer to activate information that is assumed be already identifiable, known, or familiar

Relative to syntactic function, both deictic demonstratives (DDEM; with all DEM1 roots) and the recognitional demonstrative (RDEM) serve as determiners
and as participant pronouns; but only combinations with *hoʔ* function adverbially to signal location and time. The **SDEM** with *hoʔ* and some **DDEMs** with *hoʔ* function adverbially. It has been suggested that such a system, where the number of deictic distinctions in the pronominal domain supersedes the number of distinctions in the adverbial domain, may be comparatively rare (Levinson 2018: 19). However, the Pilagá system somewhat corresponds to the most frequent type found in Krasnoukhova’s (2012) South American study, namely a system in which the same demonstrative form is used in participant-pronominal and adnominal functions (i.e. the **DDEM**), but not in adverbial functions (which in Pilagá mostly uses the **SDEM** with *hoʔ*). Clearly, *hoʔ* is a versatile element, occurring in the **SDEM** construction as an adverbial pro-form and in the **DDEM** construction for participant pronominal and determiner functions. **Naqae** functions as part of a recognitional demonstrative.

In our database, the demonstrative root tokens with exophoric function outnumber the tokens with endophoric function. Anaphoric uses are much more frequently attested than cataphoric uses. Anaphora has been pointed out as a possible source for further grammaticalisation of *mʔe* as a relativiser. This development suggests that it is not always the most distal (nor proximal) member of a demonstrative system that is subject to further grammaticalisation (Himmelmann 1996: 217). What appears significant in the development of *mʔe* as a relativiser is its endophoric+anaphoric profile, not a distal/proximal feature. If the subordinator *daʔ* is historically related to the **CLF** *daʔ* ‘vertically extended’, the semantic pathway must be via the extension of *daʔ* for abstract nominal concepts.

Corpus examination shows that essentially all determiners contain a **CLF**. In fact, the basic determiner is just a **CLF**, either deictic or postural. It would be communicatively unusual for essentially every nominal in discourse to be marked by a demonstrative; therefore we conclude that **CLFs** do not have the typical usage profile of demonstratives.

The extension of some **CLFs** and demonstrative roots into temporal and evidential/certainty meanings does not appear to be a widespread cross-linguistic feature of demonstrative systems. However, it is found in nearby Nivaclé (Gutiérrez 2015) and Wichí (Nercesian 2014: 175); in Chorote (Carol 2011); and in Movima, possibly Chapacuran Wari’, and some other South American languages (Krasnoukhova 2014). The postural information found in the Guaykuruan demonstrative systems is rare, but it is also attested elsewhere, for example in the demonstrative system of the Chadic language Goemai (Hellwig 2018). The evidential/(un)certainty semantics found in the Pilagá system is connected
to speaker-anchored distance/non-visibility of referents. Evidential functions of demonstratives and determiners also appear to be typologically rare. The extent to which these relatively unusual features occur in other languages of the Chaco, South America, and beyond merits further study.
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Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>roughly active set of verbal person markers</th>
<th>INTG</th>
<th>interrogative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>augmentative</td>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>roughly stative set of verbal person markers</td>
<td>INTSF</td>
<td>intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCLF</td>
<td>basic classifier construction</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>itive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLF</td>
<td>classifier</td>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>neutral deixis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMLZ</td>
<td>nominaliser</td>
<td>NON.EXT</td>
<td>non-extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>completive</td>
<td>NPROG</td>
<td>non-progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>NVIS</td>
<td>non-visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDEM</td>
<td>complex deictic demonstrative</td>
<td>PAUC</td>
<td>paucal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>desiderative</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
<td>POS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distal</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>PROX</td>
<td>proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR</td>
<td>horizontal</td>
<td>RCG</td>
<td>recognitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>human</td>
<td>RDEM</td>
<td>complex recognitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDF</td>
<td>indefinite/nonspecific</td>
<td>SBJ</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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