

Maarten Kossmann
Universiteit Leiden

Deixis in Figuig Berber narrative texts

to the memory of Prof. Andrzej Zaborski

Abstract

Figuig Berber (eastern Morocco) has a large number of deictic constructions. Among these, a construction with a preposed pronominal element followed by a genitival phrase is by far the most common. All deictic constructions use a basic contrast between two elements: *-u* and *-ənn*. In exophoric deixis, the former has proximal interpretation, while the latter has distal interpretation. In endophoric deixis, the situation is more complicated. For some speakers, only constructions with *-ənn* are permitted in this use, while other speakers use both constructions with *-u* and *-ənn*, without clear contrast. In the article, emphasis is laid on when endophoric deictic marking is used, and when it is absent. In principle, such marking shows that the referent has already been mentioned in the previous context, and can be regarded anaphoric. However, in such situations, it is still possible not to mark the noun. This is mainly the case when there is only one potential referent in a given situation, as, for example, in the case of kings, or as is often the case with nouns modified by a genitival phrase.

Keywords

Berber, deixis, Figuig, anaphora, reference tracking.

In Berber studies¹ the exact usage of deictic expressions in texts has only received little attention. While all grammars give some information as to the basic meaning of the deictic markers (Bentolila 1981: 55–56, Penchoen 1973: 13–17;

¹ I wish to thank here the story tellers who were so kind to let their traditions be recorded for me, their family members that made the recordings, or brought me into contact with them, and the many people that helped me in transcribing the recordings. Because of the importance attached to privacy by most Figuig women, the names of the story tellers have been anonymized.

Heath 2005: 239–242, and many others) and a great deal of attention has been devoted to the structural analysis of different deictic expressions (e.g., Galand 2010: 97ff.; 155ff.), the exact uses of these elements in discourse are mostly neglected. The most important exceptions to this are a number of articles by Amina Mettouchi (Mettouchi 2006, Mettouchi 2011), that give a short but precise analysis of reference construction in Kabyle.

In this article, I will give an analytical overview of the use of nominal and pronominal deictic expressions in one Berber language, the language of Figuig, in one specific genre, fictional narratives.

Figuig is an oasis in eastern Morocco. It consists of seven villages (kçour), one in the lower part of the oasis (Zenaga), and six in the upper part, also known as High Figuig. The corpus on which the analysis is based is almost exclusively from Zenaga; only one story teller, <F>, comes from Elmaiz in High Figuig.

The deictic system in Figuig is quite different from that found in most other Berber languages (cf. Naumann 2001 for an overview), in that there is no dedicated anaphoric marker, and because of the existence of pre-nominal deictic marking. The latter may constitute a calque on Maghribian Arabic (Kossmann 2013: 322–324), but its use is not necessarily the same as in Arabic.

The data on which the present article is based come from a corpus of about 4.5 hours of (fastly) spoken narrative texts from different speakers recorded in the early 1990s in Figuig. Even though such texts include both direct speech and narrative sequences, they cannot, of course, be considered representative of the whole language. As a consequence, certain elements of deictic use are difficult to establish. As this is especially the case for deixis to the physical world surrounding the speaker (i.e., exophoric uses in the terminology of Diessel 1999), the main focus of this article lies on deixis that tracks reference within a text (endophoric uses in Diessel's terminology). For the latter purpose, fictional narrative texts present a great advantage. The delivery of these texts is based on the mutual understanding that the story teller is omniscient, while the listener only has his knowledge of the world at his disposition. Put otherwise, the story is told as if it were entirely new to the listener. As a result, it is relatively easy to analyze reference tracking in this type of texts, as the question about what is old and what is new information can always be retrieved from the text itself. This is very different from what one finds in other text types, like conversations or personal narratives, where the presupposed common knowledge may be much more specific to the individual speaker and the individual listener, and therefore much less straightforward to an outside observer.

1. Basic facts

Figuiq Berber has a two-way deictic contrast,² distinguishing between a proximal marker (near the speaker) and a non-proximal marker (not near the speaker). The proximal marker always includes the element *u*, the non-proximal marker the element *ənn*.³ Different from most Berber languages, there is no dedicated anaphoric marker.⁴

While the number of deictic distinctions is smaller than in most Berber languages, the number of constructions is larger. In the first place, it is possible – though not very common – to use the normal northern Berber construction, in which a deictic clitic follows the noun, e.g.:

² The following non-IPA transcription conventions were used: *ʃ* for [ʃ], *ʒ* for [ʒ], *y* for [j]; *ɛ* for [ɛ], *h* for [h]. Except with *h*, a dot underneath the letter means pharyngealization. The glossing system follows similar conventions to those used in Kossmann (2013: 6–10), although abbreviations are slightly different. The following abbreviations are used: A = Aorist; AD = the particle *ad/a/ala* that indicates a non-realized event; AS = Annexed State (état d'annexion); DEM = demonstrative base; DST = non-proximal; DO = direct object; F = feminine; FS = Free state (état libre); FUT = future; I = Imperfective; IMPT = Imperative; IO = indirect object; M = masculine; NEG = (preverbal) negation; NI = Negative Imperfective; NP = Negative Perfective; P = Perfective; PL = plural; PRED = the predicative particle; PRX = proximal; S = singular; VNT = ventive. For an analysis of the meaning behind these labels, see Kossmann (1997). Elements between square brackets are hesitations or false starts. Underlining marks the noun phrase in the example that is relevant to the discussion.

The story tellers are identified by an anonymizing abbreviation between \diamond following the example. At the time of the recordings, A, B, F and O were middle-aged and old women, Z a young woman, M a middle-aged man, and D and E young men. All story tellers cited in the article are from the village Zenaga, except F, who is from the village Elmaiz. The same corpus is the basis of Kossmann (2014), fc.-a and Kossmann fc.-b.

Figuiq Berber has been studied in a number of publications, most notably Saa (2010, originally 1995), Kossmann (1997), Ben-Abbas (2003), Sahli (2008) and Benamara (2013). Texts editions include Benamara (2011); Kossmann (2000: 104–125) and Sahli (2008: 337–406). In the present article, only the texts recorded by the author have been analyzed comprehensively. For preliminary descriptions of the usage of the deictics, see Kossmann (1997: 235–237) and Naumann (2001: 31–34).

³ The length of the final element is difficult to hear in most contexts. Saa (2010: 307, originally 1995) corrected earlier notations by me in which I wrote it short, a critique taken into account in Kossmann (1997). Ben-Abbas (2003: 130) and Benamara (2013: 327) write single *ən* for the deictic. In pre-nominal position the forms ending in *-(ə)nn* are always followed by the preposition *n*, which makes it impossible to decide on the underlying length, as *nn + n* is regularly simplified to *nn*. I will consistently write a long final consonant in all contexts; in citations from sources that write a single *n*, I put the second *n* between brackets, e.g. *ay-ən(n)*. Otherwise, their transcriptions have been adapted.

⁴ Traces of an older three-way contrast are found with the word *ass* 'day', which has three degrees in deixis: *ass=u* 'today'; *ass=ənn* 'that day'; *ass=in* 'formerly' (Kossmann 1997: 236); cf. also Benamara (2013: 327) for similar forms with *asəkk^was* 'year'.

(1)

a ssya n-ay d l̥ziht=u.
 AD thence 1PL-take:A with side=PRX
 ‘let’s pass by this side’ <O>

In the second place, it is possible to have a pre-nominal determiner construction consisting of a pronominal element *a* or *ay* followed by the deictic clitic,⁵ and linked to the noun by means of the preposition *n* ‘of’, e.g.:

(2) Context: a slave girl checks whom the ring would fit that was left behind by Cinderella.

wi dd xəf mma y-us ay-u n uxelxal
 who VNT on who.ever 3S:M-come:P DEM-PRX of ring:AS
 ‘whomever may fit this ring...’ <O>

(3) Context: a man claims that he has a magical rat. He goes to a shop to show it. The shopkeeper asks:

manay-ənn ay-ənn n uyərda?
 what-DST DEM-DST of rat:AS
 ‘what is that rat?’ <M>

Finally, it is possible to combine the pre-nominal and the post-nominal deictic constructions:

(4)

ay-u n nkalimt=u
 DEM-PRX of word=PRX
 ‘this word’ <Z>

The constructions with post-nominal deixis only are quite rare, except in a number of set expressions and constructions. In the corpus, post-nominal deictics are mainly found in the expressions *ass=u* ‘today’ (lit. this day), *yud=u* ‘now’ (lit. this moment), *yud=ənn* ‘then’ (lit. that moment), and *ssuq=u* ‘this thingy’ (lit. this market); they are also part of ‘what’ interrogatives (Kossmann 1997: 235) and a couple of adverbial expressions (e.g., *amm=u* ‘like this’). In addition to this, they are conventionally used in a specific construction involving the exclamative question word *matta* ‘what’ (cf. Benamara 2013: 307):

⁵ In Kossmann (1997: 136–137), I called the *a(y)*-DEICTIC *n* NOUN construction an “article en émergence”, without giving more arguments than its sheer frequency. This idea has been criticized in a well-argued discussion in Naumann (2001: 33–34), whom I will follow here. For an overview of the Berber varieties that have this construction, see Kossmann (2013: 321–324).

(5)

matta zzbəlt=u?

what trash=PRX

‘what (the heck) is this trash?!’ <E>

The deictic clitics are also combined with pronominal heads in order to create demonstratives (Kossmann 1997: 192-195; Sahli 2008: 256):

M:S *w-u w-ənn*F:S *t-u t-ənn*M:PL *in-u in-ənn*F:PL *tin-u tin-ənn*

Examples:

(6)

w-u d mmi-s n nmalik

DEM:S:M-PRX PRED son-3S of king

‘he (lit. this one) is the son of the king’ <O>

(7)

tan w-ənn d yuma.

look! DEM:S:M-DST PRED brother

‘lo, that one over there is my brother.’ <A>

(8) Context: The slave girl Yaya Ambruka and her mistress switch roles.

t-əḏḥa=dd yaya ambruka t taməllalt,

3S:F-become:P=VNT Yaya Ambruka PRED white:F:S:FS

t-ənn t-əḏḥa=dd t tahərdant.

DEM:F:S-DST 3S:F-become:P=VNT PRED black.person:FS

‘Yaya Ambruka became white and that one became black.’ <C>

The demonstratives can be combined with the pre-nominal construction, e.g.

(9)

i-kkər a-nn n mmi-s n tməttut

3S:M-rise:P DEM-DST of son-3S of woman:AS

a-nn n w-u i-lla i-ddr-ən

DEM-DST of DEM:M:S-PRX PTC-be:P PTC-live:P-PTC

‘well this son of the woman rose, the one that was (still) alive’ <E>

- (10) Context: the parents give good horses to the healthy children, but a limping horse to Insis.

a-nn *n* *t-ənn* *mmutr-ən* *t* *taridalt*
 DEM-DST of DEM:F:S-DST see:P-3PL:M PRED lame:F:S:FS

uš-n=as=tt *ukk* *u-nn* *n* *yinšiš*.
 give:P-3PL:M=3S:IO=3S:F:DO to DEM:AS-DST of Insis:AS

‘as for the one that they saw was limping, they gave it to that Insis’ <E>

The pre-nominal elements *a-nn*, *ay-ənn* and *ay-u* are based on a further pronominal element, neutral *ay* (Kossmann 1997: 192). When used outside the pre-nominal construction, *ay* can lack the deictic element, e.g.:

- (11)

ttitš-ən=as *nday* *ay* *ttitš-ən* *ikk* *iydan*
 give:I-3PL:M=3S:IO just DEM give:I-3PL:M to dogs
 ‘they gave her only what they gave to the dogs’ <F>

- (12)

waqila *ay* *d* *mmi-s* *n* *nmalik*
 probably DEM PRED son-3S of king
 ‘probably this is the son of the king’ <O>

In our corpus, this construction is very rare,⁶ except in cleft-like focus constructions, where *ay* is the head of the relative clause (Kossmann 1997: 320).

Independent *ay* can also be followed by a deictic element. In the corpus, these forms always refer to physically present referents (i.e. exophoric). Examples are very rare in the corpus studied here, cf. however the following forms from the stories edited by Hassane Benamara (2011):

- (13)

axəmma, *ay-u* *t* *taməddayt!*
 probably DEM-PRX PRED trap:FS
 ‘probably, this here is a trap’ <Benamara 2011: 108>

⁶ The use in a non-verbal sentence as in *ay d mmi-s n nmalik* is not found in all varieties of Figuig Berber, and was characterized as typical for High Figuig by my spokesmen and by Ben-Abbas (2003: 130), while Zenaga would have *aw* in this construction. It does, however, appear in my corpus with <O>, who is from Zenaga, so the dialectal distribution may be less sharp. Cf. Kossmann (1997: 192); Benamara (2013: 156; 164).

(14)

dɣya! *ax=am* *ay-u!*
fast take!=2S:F:IO DEM-PRX

‘make haste! take this here!’ <Benamara 2011: 140>

Ay + deictic also occurs in some set expressions, such as the ‘TEMPORAL EXPRESSION ago’ phrase, e.g.

(15)

aḥəṣraḥ i-zwa ay-u šḥal mən ɛam
alas 3S:M-go:P DEM-PRX how.much from years

‘alas! he has gone so many years ago’ (lit. ‘this how many years’) <A>

Moreover, it occurs in the set expression *ay-ənn n uy-ənn* or *a-nn n uy-ənn*, used when a speaker cannot find a word, or wishes to remain vague about it. In this expression, the element *a(y)*-DEICTIC occurs twice, once as the center of the noun phrase, and once as a pre-(pro)nominal determiner, e.g.:

(16) Context: a woman has found a special pomegranate and takes it home.

t-əнна=yaš¹ nday kks-ən ay-ənn n uy-ənn
3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO just take.off:P-3PL:M DEM-DST of DEM:AS-DST

t-əнна=yaš, i-ban=dd ssyin uyənsu n bnadəm.
3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO 3S:M-appear:P=VNT thence face:AS of human.being
‘You know, as soon as they took off that thingummy (i.e., the skin), you know, a human face appeared from there’ <O>

¹ *T-əнна=yaš* ‘she said to you’ is a common expression that establishes a link with the listener. It is translated here by the vague expression “you know”.

(17)

i dd=i-dwəl a-nn n uy-ənn
when VNT=3S:M-return:P DEM-DST of DEM:AS-DST

əhh may das=qqaṛ-ən, d tṭir.
what 3S:IO=say:I-3PL:M PRED bird

‘when he became this thingummy, what is it called, a bird’ <D>

The exact form of the elements is subject to dialectal variation. The element *ay-u* is the same all over the corpus, but Benamara (2011: 164) also notes *awu* as an idiolectal variant. The non-proximal element has variation between *ay-ənn* and *a-nn*. The dialectal distribution of these variants is unclear. Ben-Abbas

(2003: 130)⁷ reports *ay-ənn* as the form in Zenaga and *a-nn* as the High Figuig variant. Benamara, who is from Zenaga, consistently has *ay-ən(n)*. Kossmann (1997), on the other hand, describes *ay-ənn* as the Elmaiz (High Figuig) variant and variation between *ay-ənn* and *a-nn* as typical for Zenaga. Sahli (2008), who undoubtedly comes from one of the High Figuig *kçour*, has *ay-ən(n)*; similar pre-nominal forms were found in texts dictated to me from the High Figuig *kçour* Hammam Foukani and Laabidate. My data on Oulad Slimane (High Figuig) show consistent use of *a-nn*. Within the corpus, which mainly comes from speakers from Zenaga, pre-nominal *ay-ənn* and *a-nn* are subject to variation, even within the speech of a single story teller: thus, <A> uses both forms, without a clear distribution. Others, such as <O>, rather have *ay-ənn*.

There is also variation in the use of Annexed State forms of the pre-nominal deictics. Most speakers in the corpus only have Annexed State forms (*u-yu*, *u-nn*, *u-yənn*)⁸ when the deictic follows a preposition, but have Free State forms when it is part of a post-verbal subject – a situation in which bare nouns obligatorily have the Annexed State, e.g.:

(18)

yawkan i-səll=as a-nn n nmalik
 Then 3S:M-hear:P=3S:IO DEM-DST of king
 ‘then the king heard her’ <A>

(19)

qql=idd ukk u-nn n tməttut
 look:A:IMPT:S=1S:IO to DEM:AS-DST of woman:AS
 ‘look for me at this woman’ <A>

Only <F> uses the Annexed State forms of the deictics also with post-verbal subjects, e.g.:

(20)

t-şərd=it uy-ənn n təydətt
 3S:F-swallow:P=3S:F:DO DEM:AS-DST of dog:AS
 ‘the dog swallowed her’ <F>

⁷ It is not clear whether Ben-Abbas refers to forms in pre-nominal position or forms that are used independently. As in our corpus, there are only very few instances of *ay-ənn* ~ *a-nn* in other than pre-nominal position, only the pre-nominal cases will be taken into account. It is possible that the distribution is different in independent usage.

⁸ In one – probably idiomatic – example cited by Benamara, the Annexed State is *wayən(n)*: “ayn izru d wayn izru i tmurawin! *il a vu tant et tant de pays!*” (Benamara 2013: 164).

This may be a case of dialectal variation, as <F> is the only speaker from Elmaiz in the corpus; however, one remarks that Benamara, who is from Zenaga, also consistently has Annexed State forms of *ay-* with post-verbal subjects, e.g.:

(21)

i-nna=yas *uy-ənn* *n* *urgaz*
 3S:M-say:P=3S:IO DEM:AS-DST of man:AS
 ‘the man said to him’ <Benamara 2011: 48>

In addition to these formal differences, there is one important point of variation in our corpus that involves the structure of the deictic expression. As shown above, the most common pattern in pre-nominal deixis shows an opposition between *ay-u n* NOUN and *ay-ənn n* NOUN which, in the case of exophoric deixis, is clearly related to the position of the referent in space. One story teller, <A>, does not have a deictic opposition in this construction and uses the non-proximal form, *ay-ənn* or *a-nn*, in all contexts.⁹ This includes cases of exophoric deixis where the referent is clearly close to the speaker, e.g.:

(22) Context: a woman explains how she came to live in the village where she is now.

nəts *zwi-x=dd* *yəl-da* *n* *u-nn* *n* *udəwwar*
 I go.away: P-1S=VNT to-here to DEM:AS-DST of village: AS
 ‘I went away hither, to this (a-nn) village’ <A>

(23) Context: a man explains his quest for hospitality.

a-nn *n* *vid* *t-əlla* *tbiša* *d* *užris*.
 DEM-DST of night: AS 3S:F-be:P rain with ice: AS
 ‘this (a-nn) night there is rain and ice’ <A>

In anaphoric deixis, <A> also consistently uses *ay-ənn* or *a-nn* (see below). On the other hand, in post-nominal deixis and with demonstratives, <A> distinguishes *u* from *ənn*, cf. (24), which has both pre-nominal deixis with *a-nn* and post-nominal deixis with proximal =*u*:

(24)

mani *t-rah-əd* *ay* *a-nn* *n* *nxir=u* *n* *uyənsu*
 where 2S-go:P-2S o DEM-DST of goodness=PRX of face:AS
 ‘where are you going, o (this) person with the beautiful face?’ <A>

⁹ For <A>, it should possibly be considered a single morpheme that cannot be divided into further components. In order to remain consistent within the article, forms from this speaker will still be glossed as DEM-DST.

2. Exophoric uses

Exophoric deixis refers to an entity that is present in “the situation surrounding the interlocutors” (Diessel 1999: 94). In our corpus of narratives, exophoric uses are only found in dialogues and – rarely – in comments by the story teller, e.g. when <O> explains the meaning of *tanyirt* ‘forehead’ by the phrase *t-u t tanyirt* ‘this is the forehead’, pointing to her forehead.

Exophoric deixis is expressed both with post-nominal deictic clitics and with pre-nominal deictics. Unproblematic instances of the combination of post- and pre-nominal clitics in exophoric context were not found in the corpus, but this is probably accidental, as the construction is very rare in the corpus anyhow. Both constructions contrast proximal tot non-proximal deixis,¹⁰ e.g.:

(25)

ha t-εəql-əd s tyəkk^watt=u?
 look! 2S-recognize:P-2S on belt:AS=PRX
 ‘so do you recognize this belt?’ <O> (post-nominal proximal)

(26)

day ad dur-əx ay-ənn n rrkən
 just AD go.round:A-1S DEM-DST of corner
 ‘I will just turn that corner’ <M> (pre-nominal non-proximal)

(27) Context: a man comes with his mother to the king, who does not want to see the woman any more. The king invites the man to come in. He answers:

day mta t-utəf akid-i ay-u n nxəlqət sad atf-əx.
 just if 3S:F-enter:P with-1S DEM-PRX of creature FUT enter:A-1S
 ‘only if this creature (here) comes in with me shall I enter’ <O>
 (pre-nominal proximal)

As mentioned above, <A> has no opposition in the pre-nominal forms. In other constructions, such as pronominal demonstratives, she makes the difference, and proximal forms are well-attested, e.g.:

(28)

iwa t-u² d mmi-š, w-u d yelli-š
 well DEM:F:S-PRX PRED son-2S:M DEM:M:S-PRX PRED daughter-2S:M
 ‘well, this one (here) is your son and this one (here) is your daughter’ <A>

² The story teller erroneously uses the feminine pronoun to refer to the son and the masculine pronoun to refer to the daughter.

¹⁰ In the corpus, no cases of the exophoric use of post-nominal =ənn were found, cf. Kossmann (1997: 85) and Benamara (2013: 327) for examples.

3. Endophoric uses: constructions and oppositions

All three deictic constructions are used in endophoric contexts, i.e., in order to track reference within the text. This is, of course, common in long narratives, such as those that constitute the bulk of our corpus. The following examples illustrate the different constructions:

(29)

yawkan *lbasint=ənn* *amm=u* *t-ətšur* *day* *ləhnuša*.
 then basin=DST like=PRX 3S:F-fill:P just snakes
 ‘then that (aforementioned) basin filled thus, only snakes.’ <A>

(30) Context: the story teller pronounces the conclusion of the story.

šafi, *i-mnəε* *a-nn* *n* *ssəyyd=u*
 enough 3S:M-be.saved:P DEM-DST of gentleman=PRX
 ‘so this (aforementioned) man was saved.’ <D>

(31)

akəd mi *dd=t-us* *a-nn* *n* *tməttut* *sikk* *iyam*
 with when VNT=3S:F-come:P DEM-DST of woman:AS from drawing:AS
 ‘and when the (aforementioned) woman came back from drawing (water)’ <A>

Story tellers differ in their use of proximal and non-proximal pre-nominal deictics. As mentioned above, <A> only has *a-nn* ~ *ay-ənn*, both in endophoric and in exophoric use. The following fragment illustrates her consistent use of *a-nn* ~ *ay-ənn*:

(32)

iwa i-rah *an* *ay-ənn* *n* *tiddart* *n* *uy-ənn* *n* *nmalik*, (...).
 well 3S:M-go:P until DEM-DST of house of DEM:AS-DST of king

i-rah *yəl-din* *ay* *nətta* *a-nn* *n* *urgaz* *əh d* *zzin*
 3S:M-go:P to-there also he DEM-DST of man:AS PRED beautiful:M

i-rah *n* *uy-ənn* *n* *tməttut*
 3S:M-go:P to DEM:AS-DST of woman:AS

a *tət=dd=i-xtəb* *d* *zzina*.
 AD 3S:F:DO=VNT=3S:M-ask.in.marriage:A PRED beautiful:F

‘well he went to that house of that king, (...). He went there, that beautiful man went to ask the hand of that beautiful woman.’ <A>

Other story tellers allow for both proximal and non-proximal deictics in anaphoric use, but story tellers clearly have different preferences. Thus almost consistently has proximal *ay-u* (there are a few cases of *ay-ənn* showing the possibility of an opposition for this speaker), e.g.:

(33)

al idžən n umullu y-awəy=dd ay-u n ɛmər ifunasən.
 until one:M of time:AS 3S:M-carry:A=VNT DEM-PRX of Omar oxen

t-əffəy yah ay-u n twəssart nəttat t-ənnə=yas
 3S:F-exit:P indeed DEM-PRX of old:F:S:AS she 3S:F-say:P=3S:IO
 ‘until one day this (aforementioned) Omar brought oxen. This (aforementioned) old woman went out and said...’

On the other hand, <O> vacillates between the two uses, e.g.

(34)

haşuləşši t-us=dd ay-ənn [nqa... n t...] n nqabla,
 you.know 3S:F-come:P=VNT DEM-DST [nqa... n t...] of midwife

a stt=t-qabəl. i-zayəd=dd yr-əs ləwərt,
 AD 3S:F:DO=3S:F-help.with.delivery:A 3S:M-be.born:P=VNT at-3S boy

ay-ənn n nəwərt i-xləq di-s [yišš...] yišš n nmarət da (...)
 DEM-DST of boy 3S:M-be:P in-3S one:F of sign here

iwa t-ənnə=yas [i-kkər əhh] nəttata,
 well 3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO 3S:M-rise:P she

yah ay-u [n əhh] n t-u [yu...] y-uṛw-ən,
 indeed DEM-PRX of DEM:F:S-PRX PTC-give.birth:P-PTC

fəlmatal t-əttəs,
 for.example 3S:F-sleep:P

nəkd-ənt=as tiləttətt n uy-u n ssabi,
 cut.off:P-3PL:F=3S:IO little.finger:FS of DEM:AS-DST of baby

yy-ənt=as=tt da ikk mi nn-əs.
 do:P-3PL:F=3S:IO=3S:F:DO here in mouth of-3S

‘well, that midwife came in order to help her with the delivery. A boy was born to her, and that boy had a sign here (...). Well you know, she, this one that had given birth, that is to say, she was asleep and they cut off the little finger of this baby and put it here, in her mouth.’ <O>

There is no clear difference in use between *ay-u n* and *ay-ənn n*. The logical assumption that the proximal form conveys stronger involvement of the story teller in the story or with the entity described is not borne out by the texts. For example, <O> uses proximal and non-proximal deictics with different kinds of protagonists, both those the listener is supposed to sympathize with (the poor mother, the child) and unsympathetic characters (the jealous co-wives, the corrupt mid-wife), as shown in the following fragment in which the unsympathetic characters are marked by a proximal:

- (35) Context: The mother explains to her son what has happened. The other women and the midwife are not present on the scene.

fəlmatal [əhh kri-nt əhh]

for.example hire:P-3PL:F

kri-nt ay-u n tɛədnan nniḍən n ppa-š,
hire:P-3PL:F DEM-PRX of women:PRX other of father:2S:M

kri-nt ay-u [n əhh] n nqablət a šəkk=əny-ənt.
hire:P-3PL:F DEM-DST of midwife AD 2S:M:DO=kill:A-3PL:F
'that is to say, these other women of your father hired this mid-wife in order to kill you' <O>

Proximal and non-proximal demonstratives have similar behavior. Again, story tellers have different preferences, some of them using *w-u*, *t-u* more often than others, e.g.

- (36)

ay-u n t-u t-əɛləm lmal; t-u
DEM-PRX of DEM:F:S-PRX 3S:F-have:P property DEM:F:S-PRX

stt=i-rappa-n.

3S:F:DO=PTC-raise:P-PTC

'this one had riches, the one that had raised her' <O>

- (37) Context: an ogre is sitting on the clothes of a group of girls that is swimming. He asks them to laugh, in order to show their teeth if they want to have their clothes back. All girls do so, except for one girl, who has a green tooth.

i-rr=asənt. al t-ənn, [al uyənn...]

3S:M-give.back:P=3PL:F:IO until DEM:S:F-DST

t-ənn yah t-uyyəy a das=t-ḍəš.
DEM:S:F-DST indeed 3S:F-refuse:P AD 3S:IO=3S:F-laugh:A

'he gave (the clothes) back to them, until (he asked) that one, that one refused to laugh for him' <Z>

Note that the difference between proximal and non-proximal deixis is not used for marking contrast, as English does in sentences such as ‘this girl wants a candy and that girl wants a cooky’. In such cases, the same deixis is used for both members of the pair, e.g.

(38)

iwa t-ənn t-ʂəbḥ=ədd t tanəxdamt,
 well DEM:F:S-DST 3S:F-become:P=VNT PRED servant:FS

t-ənn t-ʂəbḥ=ədd yah dəx ɛəzz-ən=tt
 DEM:F:S=DST 3S:F-become:P=VNT indeed then love:P-3PL:M=3S:F:DO

ayətma-s.
 brothers-3S

‘well this one became the servant, and that one became the beloved of her brothers’ <Z>

4. Anaphora

By far the most common use of endophoric deictics is anaphora: a referent is marked as having been mentioned in the discourse before. The earlier mention can be quite close to the anaphor, as in the following example:

(39)

t-bədd t-əkkər=dd di-s yišš n r̄rəmmənət.
 3S:F-stand:P 3S:F-rise:P=VNT in-3S one:F of pomegranate.tree

ay-ənn n r̄rəmmənət t-əffəy=dd d ddwa n
 DEM-DST of pomegranate.tree 3S:F-exit:P=VNT PRED medicine of

təmsi.
 fever:AS

‘a pomegranate tree grew there. This pomegranate tree turned out to be a medicine for fever.’ <O>

Tail-Head constructions such as these, in which a newly introduced element is the topic of the next sentence and lexically expressed there, are uncommon in our narratives. Rather the topic is not expressed by a lexical subject at all in the next sentence. Most cases of this type of construction have some special features, for example in (40), where the story teller inserts a comment between the two sentences:

(40)

t-ɾəwl=as *yišš* *n* *təsləmt* *taməqqrant.* [*i* *das...* *əhh*]
 3S:F-flee:P=3S:IO one:F of fish:AS big:F:S:FS when 3S:IO

t-u *day* *d* *ləkdub* *ha!*
 DEM:F:S-PRX just PRED lies ha!

i *das=t-əɾwəl* *ay-u* *n* *təsləmt* *t-əmma=yas*
 when 3S:IO=3S:F-flee:P DEM-PRX of fish:AS 3S:F-say:P=3S:IO

‘a big fish got away. When – eh! this is all nonsense, ha! – when this fish got away, it said...’ <O>

On the other hand, anaphora can also refer to somebody that has not been mentioned for a long time. Thus in the final scene of the story of the Singing Bird (cf. Kossmann 2000: 116–125), the king reappears, who has been out of focus ever since the first scenes of the story.

(41)

an *i* *dd=y-us* *yah* *a-nn* *n* *nmalik*
 until when VNT=3S:M-come:P indeed DEM-DST of king

a *tt=i-xtəb*
 AD 3S:F:DO=3S:M-ask.in.marriage:A

‘until that king came in order to ask her hand’ <A>

Anaphora concerns the referent, not the specific lexical item. If the same referent is referred to by different lexical expressions, there is no impediment to using anaphoric deictics, as in the following example, where *idžən n nəwərt* ‘a male child’ is taken up by the anaphoric expression *a-nn n mmi-s* ‘that son of hers’:

(42)

iwa *amm=ənn* *day* *t-əcləm* *idžən* *n* *nəwərt,*
 well like=DST just 3S:F-have:P one:M of boy

yah *a-nn* *n* *mmi-s* *t-əssrus=i.*
 indeed DEM-DST of son-3S 3S:F-put.down:I=3S:M:DO

‘well, like that, she had only one (male) child, well, as for that son of hers, she used to put him down’ <A>

It is quite common in the corpus that the noun phrase marked by the anaphoric expression adds new information about the referent, e.g., by providing the name of the protagonist:

Similarly, in (45), ashes and earth get anaphoric marking, even though they were not mentioned before. In this case, they are implied as the result of burning a bird in the fireplace:

(45)

iwa t-akkər ay-u n tməttut n ppa-s
 well 3S:F-rise:P DEM-PRX of woman:AS of father-3S

t-əssəry=as=s
 3S:F-burn:P=3S:IO=3S:M:DO

t-əyr=as=s ikk ləmsi. i-ryu.
 3S:F-throw:P=3S:IO=3S:M:DO in fireplace 3S:M-be.burned:P

ay-ənn n yiyəd, ay-ənn n ušal
 DEM-DST of ashes:AS DEM-DST of earth:AS

yr-ən=t ikk idžən n umšan
 throw:P-3PL:M=3S:M:DO in one:P of place:AS

‘well this wife of his father burned him and put him in the fireplace. These ashes, this earth they threw it somewhere.’ <O>

In (46), the midwife is clearly a new player in the story. The use of anaphoric *ay-ənn* is possible here, because the presence of a midwife is expected at a childbirth.

(46)

t-ənnə=yaš sənt yah ul elim-ənt lbəzz,
 3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO two:F indeed NEG have:NP-3PL:F children

yışš [əhh] tuy sa dd yr-əs [əhh] a dd=i-xləq lbəzz.
 one:F PAST FUT VNT at-3S AD VNT=3S:M-be:A children

kk-ənt yar-ənt zzi-s ay-u [n əhh] n
 rise:P-3PL:F be.jealous:P-3PL:F with-3S DEM-PRX of

sənt n tzednan.
 two:F of women:AS

nna-nt=as ukk ay-ənn n təmqibəlt nn-əs
 say:P-3PL:F=3S:IO to DEM:AS-DST of midwife:AS of-3S

‘you know two (of the women) did not have children, one was on the point ehh, she was getting a child. These two women were jealous and they said to that midwife of hers’ <O>

Generally speaking, examples of anaphoric expressions for referents whose presence is inferred from the context, but not explicitly mentioned before, are

rare among the most experienced story tellers, such as <A> and . They are much more common in stories told by the men and in those told by <O> and <Z>, which are also sloppier in their style otherwise, as shown by their excessive use of stop-gaps and occasional distortions in the chronological order of the events. It seems therefore, that “good” story telling style has rather precise usage of anaphoric expressions in order to express a referent that was mentioned before, while in less confident narrative style this may be extended to inferred referents.

Among further instances which have anaphoric marking in spite of the fact that the referent has not yet been introduced, some may be simple errors—the story teller may have forgotten that (s)he did not yet introduce the referent in question.¹¹ There are a few of such cases, however, that cannot easily be interpreted as errors in this sense:

(47)

iwa t-əkkər yišš n tudayt t-us=dd t-əzznuz
 well 3S:F-rise:P one:F of Jew:F 3S:F-come:P=VNT 3S:F-sell:I

ay-ənn n nəətrəyyət, əhh lməšwaš, zəzəfran, tiwinas, ləbzər [qir....]
 DEM-DST of spices tanbark saffran rings:FS pepper

‘well, a Jewess came selling those spices, tanbark, saffran, rings, pepper...’ <O>

A similarly unclear case is the following comment to the field worker in which *a-nn n nxit əzdad* ‘that thin thread’ is given as an explanation of *ussu* ‘warp’:

(48)

t-əнна=yaš t-isi=dd idžən [n u...] n
 3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO 3S:F-take:P=VNT one:M of

ušur n wussu,
 ball:AS of warp:AS

n wussu, a-nn n nxit əzdad
 of warp:AS DEM-DST of thread thin:M:S:FS

‘that is to say, she took a ball of warp – of warp, that thin thread’ <O>

These two examples suggest that the consistently anaphoric reading of the deictic constructions in our corpus may be the effect of their narrative nature. It is very well possible that a study of other text genres would provide a more diverse pattern.

¹¹ I found less than ten of such instances in the corpus, most of them from less confident story tellers.

5. Absence of anaphoric marking

The use of anaphoric expressions is extremely common in the narratives studied here: in total over 750 cases of the *a(y)*-DEICTIC *n* NOUN construction are found in the corpus. Therefore it is relevant to ask to what extent the use of this construction is obligatory when referring to an entity that is already known from the context.

The easy answer to this is negative; there are cases where the anaphoric construction is not used, even though there is clearly reference to a previously mentioned item, e.g., in the following passage, where *limam* ‘the imam’ is already introduced in the previous sentence, but there is no anaphoric marking.

(49)

i-kkər *limam ləbda* *i-təddən* *i-təddən*
 3S:M-rise:P imam always 3S:M-announce.prayer:I 3S:M-announce.prayer:I

i-tšəddəe *žhħa* *ikk* *iḍəš* *nn-əs,* *idžən* *n* *umullu*
 3S:M-disturb:I Jehha in sleep:AS of-3S one:M of time:AS

i-nna=yas (...)
 3S:M-say:P=3S:IO

lmuhimm *limam* [*əhh*], *i-yill* [*d... day i-lla əhhh...*]
 well imam 3S:M-think:P

day *žəhħa* *i-lla* *d* *afyul*.
 just Jehha 3S:M-be:P PRED fool:M:S:FS

‘the imam always announced the prayer (in the early morning) and disturbed Jehha in his sleep. One day he (i.e., Jehha) said to him: (...). Well the imam just thought that Jehha was a fool’ <M>

It is possible to give a more interesting account of the absence of anaphoric marking, however, as cases of previously mentioned items lacking anaphoric marking seem to cluster around a restricted number of contexts.

5.1. Absence of anaphoric marking in nouns with a single referent

The first type are nouns that have only one single possible referent. Thus, in the case of *limam* in (49), one may suppose that there is only one imam in the village. Such single-referent NPs are mainly names (on which see below), and professions which – within a certain community – have only one member, e.g:

(50)

an idžən n umullu i-lla i-rah yah
 until one:M of time:AS 3S:M-be:P 3S:M-go:P indeed

ad i-həwwəs lmalik
 AD 3S:M-tour:A king

‘until one day the king went on a journey’ <A>

In this fragment, the king has already been mentioned before in the story (he is the husband of the heroine); however, he needs not to be marked anaphorically, as there is only a single king in the country.

The single referent interpretation extends to cases where a certain type of actor functions similar to a name. This is especially the case of *tamza* ‘ogress’, *amza* ‘ogre’ and of animals in animal tales. Such terms are quite often found without anaphoric marking; one way of rendering this usage in English would be to capitalize the words. For example, in the following passage, *uššən* ‘jackal’ and *ikeəb* ‘fox’ are consistently used without anaphoric marking.

(51)

i-kkər amm=u uššən, d ikeəb.
 3S:M-rise:P like=PRX jackal with fox

rah-ən ttašr-ən ləbšəl ikk idžən n iyrən.
 go:P-3PL:M steal:I-3PL:M onions in one:M of field

iwa [uššən...] ikeəb day ad i-təš,
 well [jackal] fox just AD 3S:M-eat:A

i-žərrəb [am... a] iman nn-əs i ləqbu.
 3S:M-try:P self of-3S in hole

targa zəema waš ad i-ddza nix la.
 ditch:FS thus whether AD 3S:M-fit:A or no

uššən i-lha day d ləmeaš n nəbšəl. day
 jackal 3S:M-be.occupied:P just with eating of onions just

yah amm=u.
 indeed like=PRX

ikeəb ad i-žərrəb, day ad i-təš i-žərrəb iman nn-əs,
 fox AD 3S:M-try:A just AD 3S:M-eat:A 3S:M-try:P self of-3S

day ad i-təš i-žərrəb iman nn-əs.
 just AD 3S:M-eat:A 3S:M-try:P self of-3S

y-us=dd bab n iyrən i-rzəm=dd, ikeəb i-ṛwəl.
 3S:M-come:P=VNT master of field 3S:M-open:P=VNT fox 3S:M-flee:P

uššən *y-us=dd* *ad* *i-ɾwəl* *d* *ləqbu*, *i-ħšəl*.
 jackal 3S:M-come:P=VNT AD 3S:M-flee:A with hole 3S:M-be.stuck:P
 ‘there were (a) j/Jackal, and (a) f/Fox. They went stealing onions in a field. Well, Fox, each time he ate, he would try himself in the hole. The ditch; whether he still fitted in or not.¹² Jackal was just busy eating onions. It was like this. Fox would try, each time he ate, he would try himself, each time he ate, he would try himself. The owner of the field came, he opened (the door of the garden wall) and Fox fled. Jackal tried to flee through the hole, but remained stuck.’ <E>

Similarly, in (52), *tamza* ‘ogress’ seems to be taken as a name, which only has a single referent.

(52) Context: Two women have fled an ogress.

i *t-ədɥəl* *təmza* *t-ɾraεa=tənt* *a* *dd=as-ənt*
 when 3S:F-return:P ogress:AS 3S:F-wait:I=3PL:F:DO AD VNT=come:A-3PL:F
 ‘when Ogress came back she waited that they would come’ <A>

Anaphoric marking is by no means impossible when there is a single referent. In fact, single-referent entities such as *lmalik* ‘king’ often occur in the *ay-ənn n X* construction, e.g.

(53)

yawkan *i-səll=as* *a-nn* *n* *nmalik* *i-nna=yas:*
 then 3S:M-hear:P DEM-DST of king 3S:M-say:P=3S:IO
 ‘then the king heard her and said’ <A>

The situation in this example is very similar to that in example (50) (from the same story) where *lmalik* was used without anaphoric marking: the king is the husband of the main character, and there is no doubt about the singleness of the reference.

Similarly, with name-like expressions (on names, see section 5.4), such as *tamza* ‘Ogress’ and *uššən* ‘Jackal’, the story teller can switch between anaphorically marked and unmarked uses. Cf. the continuation of the story of Jackal whose first part was presented above (51) as an example of the absence of anaphoric marking. In this fragment, in both cases that *uššən* ‘jackal’ appears, it is used with the anaphoric construction.

¹² That is, the hole in the wall through which the irrigation ditch enters the field; this is the only way in or out for the animals.

- (54) Context: The owner of the field has thrown out the jackal (who he thought was dead) from the field. The jackal only pretended he was dead.

yawkan i-dʂu xʃ-əs a-nn n uššən, i-nna=yas: hay!
 then 3S:M-laugh:P on-3S DEM-DST of jackal 3S:M-say:P=3S:IO hey

hši-y=aš=dd! i-ɾwəl. i-zwa a-nn n uššən.
 pull.leg:P-1S=2S:M:IO=VNT 3S:M-flee:P 3S:M-go.away:P DEM-DST of jackal
 ‘then the jackal laughed at him and said: - hey! I got you, and fled. The jackal went away.’ <E>

5.2. Absence of anaphoric marking in nouns with a possessive phrase

A very common situation in which there is a single (or very restricted choice of) referent are possessive constructions with pronominalized possessors: “his wife”, “his foot”, etc.¹³ In such cases, the same obtains as with the professions and name-like constructions mentioned above: normally, there is no anaphoric marking. For example, in the following fragment, the mother is introduced in the first sentence, but there is no anaphoric marking in *yamma-tsən* ‘their mother’ shortly afterwards.

- (55)

t-əkkər yišš n tməttut, t-əɛləm səbea n nwašun,
 3S:F-rise:P one:F of woman:AS 3S:F-have:P seven of children

tmanna-n twašunt.
 wait:I-3PL:M girl

iwa qqim-ən qqaɾ-n=as i yamma-tsən:
 well sit:P-3PL:M say:I-3PL:M=3S:IO to mother-3PL:M

‘there was a woman who had seven sons, who waited for a girl. Well, all the time they said to their mother...’ <A>

Similarly, in (56) the husband of the woman is already known and quite an important player. The absence of anaphoric marking can be understood from the fact that the woman only has one single husband.

- (56)

day yišš n tʒəqqa i-nna=yas urgaz nn-əs
 just one:F of room:AS 3S:M-say:P=3S:IO man:AS of-3S

‘only about one room her husband had said ...’ <A>

¹³ In addition, of course many instances of pronominalized possessive constructions present new information and are therefore not expected to have anaphoric marking anyhow.

Unsurprisingly, body parts with pronominalized possessors (“his foot” etc.) are hardly ever combined with anaphoric marking, cf.

(57)

i-ttəf=tt=dd *i-nəkḍ=as* *iləs* *nn-əs*
 3S:M-take.hold:P=3S:F:DO=VNT 3S:M-cut.off:P=3S:IO tongue:FS of-3S

amm=ənn ul t-əssəʃhim.
 like=DST NEG 3S:F-make.understand:NI

i das=i-nkəḍ *iləs* *nn-əs,*
 when 3S:IO=3S:M-cut.off:P tongue:FS of-3S

nəttət t-əyyu=dd afuḥ amm=u n idammən sikk
 she 3S:F-do:P=VNT bit:FS like=PRX of blood from

iləs *nn-əs,*
 tongue:AS of-3S

t-əṭla i llbab n-sən.
 3S:F-smear:P in door of-3PL:M

‘he took her and cut out her tongue so that she would not be understandable. When he had cut out her tongue, she took some blood from her tongue and smeared it on their door’ <E>

5.3. Anaphoric marking in nouns with a possessive phrase

It should be stressed that anaphoric marking is not impossible in nouns with a possessive phrase. When present, it often fulfills one out of two functions.

In the first place, it may stress emotional or geographical distance. This is very clear in the following example about a mother who is trying to kill her daughter, while the daughter is living far away from her.

(58)

t-əkkər t-səll=as ay-u n yamma-s
 3S:F-rise:P 3S:F-hear:P=3S:IO DEM-PRX of mother-3S

t-azən=dd t-ənnə=yaš tmuššəyt nn-əs
 3S:F-send:A=VNT 3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO cat of-3S

‘So this mother of hers sent, you know, her cat’ <O>

Other examples do not have the emotional distance, but still have the geographical distance, e.g.

- (59) Context: A boy has been expelled from the country by his father. After his father has died, his mother is confronted with her situation. At this point in the story the boy is living in a different country than his mother.

iwa sukk ud=ənn yah şafi, dəhy-ən ay-u
 well from moment=DST indeed enough push:P-3PL:M DEM-PRX

n yamma-s
 of mother-3S

‘well from that time on they pushed this mother of his’ <O>

The second function is disambiguation. Possessive pronouns normally, but not necessarily, refer to the closest preceding possible referent. When this is not the case, anaphoric marking may be used to make clear that the referent is the one mentioned earlier on, and not a new referent. Cf.:

- (60) Context: The trickster is alone with the daughter of the ogress.

t-ənnə=yaş yah i-ttyənni
 3S:F-say:P=2S:M:IO indeed 3S:M-sing:I

iwa yawkan t-ənnə=yas ay-ənn n yəlli-s
 well then 3S:F-say:P=3S:IO DEM-DST of daughter-3S

‘you know, he sang and then this daughter of hers said...’ <Z>

In (60), the immediately preceding possible referent of *-s* (3S) is the trickster, not the ogress. As no daughter of the trickster has been mentioned before, the use of the anaphoric deictic automatically creates a connection with the aforementioned daughter of the ogress. Another example is the following:

- (61) Context: Harun al-Rashid brings Abu Newwas to court.

iwy-ən=t=id l lməhkamət, (...)
 bring:P-3PL:M=3S:M:DO=VNT to court

t-əkkər ay-ənn n yəlli-s, t-əqqim t-rəkkəb=dd
 3S:F-rise:P DEM-DST of daughter-3S 3S:F-sit:P 3S:F-look.down:I=VNT

yah [sa ss əhh] sa xf-əs həkm-ən s liədām.
 indeed FUT on-3S judge:A-3PL:M with capital.punishment

t-əkkər ay-ənn n yəlli-s, tuy t-rəkkəb=dd si ttaq.
 3S:F-rise:P DEM-DST of daughter-3S PAST 3S:F-look.down:I=VNT from window

‘they brought him (i.e., Abu Newwas) to court, (...), lots of people. This daughter of his looked down – they were going to put him to death. This daughter of his looked down from the window.’ <M>

- (64) Context: The king has asked who would be able to spend the night alone and naked on top of the minaret

qaε u ss=i-wažəb hədd day žəhha. (...)
 entirely NEG 3S:M:DO=3S:M-answer:NP anybody just Jehha

i-kkər i-nsu din, ns-ən lməxzən
 3S:M-rise:P 3S:M-spend.night:P there spend.night:P-3PL:M soldiers

tteəssa-n xf-əs,
 guard:I-3PL:M on-3S

yah žəhha ikk id tuy t-tiban=as=dd
 indeed Jehha in night:AS PAST 3S:F-appear:I=3S:IO=VNT

išš n tfawt,
 one:F of light

t-bəεεəd bəzzaq.
 3S:F-be.far:P much

‘nobody answered him (to the king) except Jehha. (...) He spent the night there and soldiers guarded him. Well, Jehha, during the night, a light was visible to him, very far away.’ <M>

In this fragment, the second mention of Jehha is clearly reporting known information, but there is no anaphoric marking.

Names of fairy tale characters, on the other hand, more often than not have anaphoric marking in the narrative parts of the story, e.g. (see also example (10) above):

- (65)

yah a-nn n təmza day mi sa t-rah
 well DEM-DST of ogress:AS just when FUT 3S:F-go:A

l šra n umšan
 to some of place:AS

i-ttizar=it ay-u n hdidwan.
 3S:M-precede:I=3S:F:DO DEM-PRX of Hdidwan

‘well that ogress, every time she went somewhere, this Hdidwan went before her’ <Z>

One may think of several reasons for the different behavior of fairy tale names. In the first place, the use of anaphoric marking may be a way to create distance. This could be part of the general distancing characteristics of fairy tale style

end she takes revenge on Omar – she is to a large part responsible for Omar’s actions, and far from a positive character,¹⁵ e.g.:

(68)

iwa i-kkər ay-u n ɛmər i-ffəy taqbilt nn-əs,
 well 3S:F-rise:P DEM-PRX of Omar 3S:M-exit:P tribe:FS of-3S

i-rah ad y-irza s uy-u n lila.
 3S:M-go:P AD 3S:M-search:A on DEM:AS-PRX of Lila

‘well this Omar went away from his tribe and went searching this Lila.’ <O>

6. Cataphoric deixis

The *a(y)*-DEICTIC *n* NOUN construction is sometimes used in cataphoric deixis, i.e., referring to a referent that has not been mentioned before, but which is identified by the context that immediately follows. This is only found with heads of relative clauses, e.g.:

(69)

t-uš-m=as a sidi [a-nn əhh] a-nn n nəksəwt
 2PL:M-give:A-2PL:M=3S:IO o sir DEM-DST of clothes

t-əkks-əm ukk u-nn n urgaz
 2PL:M-take.off:P-2PL:M to DEM:AS-DST of man:AS

‘you must give him those clothes that you took from that man’ <A>

In the context of the dialogue, the clothes have not yet been mentioned, but the following relative clause provides the anchor for the cataphoric deictic.

7. Conclusions

Figuig Berber has a large number of deictic constructions, which are all used both in exophoric and in endophoric contexts. Among these, the pre-nominal construction, *a(y)*-DEICTIC *n* NOUN, is by far the most common. In endophoric contexts, in Figuiq Berber fictional narratives, deixis is almost exclusively used as a reference-tracking device, i.e., it signals that a certain referent has already been introduced in the story, or that it is implied by the context. It is used in a rather consistent manner to single out the known referent in situations where there are several potential referents to a certain noun. When there is no

¹⁵ The name *Lila*, which is the local equivalent of the well-known Arabic name Layla, is traditionally a dispreferred name in Figuiq because of this story (Benamara 2013: 293).

ambiguity as to the possible referent of the noun (phrase), deictic marking is less consistent, and may have additional evaluative values (marking emotional or geographical distance in particular). This is the case of nouns with only one possible referent (within the world of the story), such as the king, and of nouns whose reference is delimited by a possessive phrase.

Of course, the analysis presented here can only pretend to apply to the use of deictics in the text type it is based on, fictional narratives; the situation may turn out to be more multifaceted if one takes other genres into account as well.

Our analysis is different from the one provided for Kabyle in Mettouchi (2006), who also uses a fictional narrative as her point of departure. She stresses that in her corpus anaphora seems to be only one among several functions of the “anaphoric” deictic marker. It would be interesting to see whether this is due to a linguistic difference in the meaning of the deictic expressions (i.e., in endophoric context Figuig deictics simply mark anaphora, while their meaning is more diverse in Kabyle); or a difference in narrative style (i.e., taking the language as a whole, the uses would be similar in Kabyle and in Figuig, but stylistic conventions in Kabyle allow the performers a larger variety in uses of the anaphoric deictic than in Figuig); or that we are dealing with different analyses of similar facts.

References

- Ben-Abbas, Mostafa. 2003. Variation et emprunts lexicaux. Étude sociolinguistique sur le parler amazigh de Figuig. PhD Thesis, Université Sidi Mohamed Ben Abdellah, Fes.
- Benamara, Hassane. 2011. *Contes berbères de Figuig (Sud-est marocain)*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe.
- Benamara, Hassane. 2013. *Dictionnaire amazighe–français. Parler de Figuig et ses régions*. Rabat: IRCAM.
- Bentolila, Fernand. 1981. *Grammaire fonctionnelle d'un parler berbère. Aït Seghrouchen d'Oum Jeniba (Maroc)*. Paris: SELAF.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Galand, Lionel. 2010. *Regards sur le berbère*. Milan: Centro Studi Camito-Semitici.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 2005. *A Grammar of Tamashek (Tuareg of Mali)*. Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 1997. *Grammaire du parler berbère de Figuig (Maroc oriental)*. Paris & Louvain: Peeters.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 1999. «Fadna et Omar», g n se d'un conte berb re. *Awal* 19. 85–96.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2000. *A Study of Eastern Moroccan Fairy Tales*. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2013. *The Arabic Influence on Northern Berber*. Leiden & Boston: E.J. Brill.
- Kossmann, Maarten. 2014. The use of the ventive marker *dd* in Figuig Berber narratives, *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 23/4. 241–291.
- Kossmann, Maarten. fc.-a. The interplay of style, information structure and definiteness: Double indirect objects in Figuig Berber narratives. *Corpus* 14 (special issue, ed. by Sabrina Bendjballah and Samir Beni Si Said).

- Kossmann, Maarten. fc.-b. On word order in Figuig Berber narratives: The uses of pre- and postverbal lexical subjects. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 106.
- Mettouchi, Amina. 2006. Anaphoricité et appel à l'attention partagée dans un conte oral en kabyle (berbère). In: Pier G. Borbone, Alessandro Mengozzi & Mauro Tosco, eds., *Loquentes Linguis, Studi linguistici e orientali in onore di Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 499–507.
- Mettouchi, Amina. 2011. Démonstratifs et construction de la référence en kabyle. In: Amina Mettouchi, ed., *«Parcours berbères», Mélanges offerts à Paulette Galand-Pernet et Lionel Galand pour leur 90e anniversaire*, Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. 469–484.
- Naumann, Christfried. 2001. *Vergleich demonstrativer Formative ausgewählter Berbersprachen*. (University of Leipzig Papers on Africa 18/19). Leipzig: Universität Leipzig.
- Penchoen, Thomas G. 1973. Étude syntaxique d'un parler berbère (Ait Fraḥ de l'Aurès). Naples: Centro di Studi Magrebini.
- Saa, Fouad. 2010. *Quelques aspects de la morphologie et de la phonologie d'un parler amazighe de Figuig*. Rabat: IRCAM (originally PhD Thesis, Paris, 1995).
- Sahli, Ali. 2008. *Mu^cḡam 'amāzīgī-^carabī (ḥāṣṣ bi-lahḡat 'ahālī Fiḡtǧ)*. Oujda: Al-'anwār al-maḡribiyya.