

Deixis and deictic oppositions in discourse: Evidence from Romani[☆]

Yaron Matras*

Department of Linguistics, University of Manchester, Manchester M13 9PL, UK

Received 19 June 1996; revised version 14 May 1997

Abstract

Studies of indexical devices differ in their analysis of ‘textual’ deixis, some advocating an overlap of deictic and anaphoric functions, while others argue in favor of a consistent form–function correlation. This ‘grey area’ of deixis is conventionalized in Romani, which has a complex four-term opposition system of demonstratives and place adverbs. Drawing on examples of natural discourse in the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect, I argue that deixis in Romani identifies the source of knowledge about the object of reference, distinguishing between extra-linguistic, perceptual reality of the speech situation, and intra-linguistic or conceptual reality established via the discourse context. A second opposition line is drawn between general and discrete objects of reference. The fact that situation and context-based mental representations are kept apart grammatically, strengthens the argument in favor of their analytical separation, as suggested in Functional Pragmatics, while the overall arrangement in Romani suggests that the distal/proximate opposition cannot always be considered as basic in a typological classification of deictic systems.

1. Introduction

Deixis is often considered to be the prototypical case of a reflection of pragmatic relations within a category of grammar (cf. Levinson, 1983: 54). In its primitive or primary function, deixis is associated with the gesture of pointing in actual space,

[☆] The study draws on an earlier discussion of deixis in Romani presented in Matras 1994, Chapter 3. The data were obtained in Germany in 1990–1992 among speakers of a Kelderaš/Lovari contact variety, most of whom are second generation immigrants from Poland, and trilingual in Romani, German, and Polish. The data collection was supported by grants from the Hamburg University and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Earlier versions of this paper were presented in Hamburg, Amsterdam, and Naples. I am grateful to M. Bolkestein, K. Bühlig, W. Griebhaber, M. Hartung, G. Reershemius, J. Rehbein, G. Schön, J. C. Smith, and L. de Vries for comments and discussions about the data and theoretical issues. All shortcomings are of course my own responsibility.

* Phone: +44 161 275-3975; Fax: +44 161 275 3187; E-mail: y.matras@man.ac.uk

from which it derives its appellation, and there appears to be general agreement among pragmatic and functional approaches to deixis as regards its role as a device through which this situation-bound, gesticulative action of pointing to a physical object is formalized in grammar. Defining the role of deixis beyond the physical settings of the speech situation, however, is a more difficult task and a matter on which opinions diverge. Language enables to portray and process events and states of affairs which are not part of the immediate speech situation. The occurrence in speech of indexical devices irrespective of the actual physical presence or absence of the referent suggests that physical pointing is transferrable, as a cognitive action, to a discourse-based linguistic context (see Bühler, 1934: 121ff.). This is where the notion of 'deixis' often clashes with that of 'anaphora'.

Beside the problems of defining the borderline between deixis and anaphora in view of what is often referred to as the anaphoric use of demonstratives and place adverbs, there are also problems of typological classification of deictic systems. Person deixis might usually allow for a relative straightforward description of semantic oppositions within the system, as those would relate in some way or another to the participants in the interaction. However, with third person demonstratives, place adverbs, and perhaps time deixis, the exact nature of the opposition is often more difficult to capture. Proximity vs. remoteness are usually taken for granted in binary systems, while a reflection of both proximity/remoteness and participant-roles is often associated with tripartite ones such as Latin or Turkish (cf. Anderson and Keenan, 1985; Levinson, 1983: 62). But such spatial definitions of deictic oppositions have been challenged in discourse-oriented studies. Kirsner (1979) for example distinguishes a 'high' and a 'low' deixis in Dutch demonstratives, based on the intensity of reference; Bolkestein (in print) points out a series of factors connected to the discourse-based accessibility of the referent which determine the choice of demonstrative in Latin texts, and Smith (1995) defines the principal opposition in place adverbs in French as involving speaker subjectiveness. Thus there appear to be reasons for re-considering conventional views on semantic oppositions within deictic systems, and moreover, for re-defining the choice of deixis in terms of discourse-pragmatic relations (cf. Bolkestein et al., forthcoming).

The present paper offers a discourse-related, pragmatic account of the system of oppositions in deictic expressions (demonstratives and adverbs of place) in Romani, based primarily on a corpus of tape-recorded oral speech in the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect. The multiplicity of forms is a characteristic feature of the Romani deictic paradigm. While multiple forms can partly be accounted for by interdialectal borrowing (cf. Boretzky, 1995), in most dialects of Romani a quadripartite system of oppositions is not just basic, but it is also functional. I argue that the functions associated with the choice of an element within the paradigm, in fact the meanings assigned to the categories intrinsically, do not refer to actual physical distance in space. Rather, they accommodate two key dimensions related to understanding and evaluating 'worlds' of knowledge: deictic expressions in Romani identify the *source* of knowledge by indicating whether access to a referent is perceptual, i.e. guided by sensual perception of the speech situation, or conceptual, i.e. gained through processing discourse-based, contextual knowledge. In addition, they can also convey

separation of a referent from the group of potential referents, thereby indicating referential *discreteness*.

This arrangement of oppositions supports the claim made for some deictic systems that distance in space is just one, perhaps even a secondary or derived dimension of deictic reference (cf. Blühdorn, 1995: 128–136). At the same time it allows for an examination of the deixis/anaphora continuum on the basis of a system in which the distinction between situational and contextual pointing is formalized. Given the importance of the latter issue in the context of a more general debate on the relations between grammar and pragmatics (cf. Schiffrin, 1990: 263–267; Blühdorn, 1995: 119), I devote the first section to problems of defining deixis, discourse and textual deixis, and anaphora, paying special attention to studies within the framework of Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich, 1979, 1982, 1983). I then discuss the structural formation of deixis in Romani, and examine the distribution of demonstratives and place adverbs in the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect, looking first at the situation–context opposition, then at the feature of discreteness and the issue of markedness within the deictic system.

2. Discourse deixis, textual deixis, and anaphora

While it is widely agreed that anaphora are coreferents of linguistic expressions that precede them in a common linguistic context (see Levinson, 1983: 86; Brown and Yule, 1983: 214–222; Fox, 1987; but see also more critical discussion in Cornish, 1996),¹ there are at least two types of views concerning the relation between textual deixis, which points to elements of the discourse, and anaphora. The first may be exemplified by Lyons' (1979) discussion of deixis and anaphora. Anaphora according to Lyons presupposes that the intensional correlate of the referent should already have its place in the universe-of-discourse, while deixis does not (Lyons, 1979: 102). Deixis is therefore assumed to be primary, both in language acquisition and in the historical evolution of a given language. Textual deixis, Lyons maintains, establishes the link between the two. It follows that deixis can, at least at an intermediate stage, assume anaphoric functions, and indeed textual deixis, when referring to a previous proposition, is characterized by Lyons (1979: 96) as 'impure', falling somewhere between anaphora and deixis (see also Fillmore (1972) for a view of discourse deixis as an extended use of deixis). Bühler (1934) gives a psychological account of deixis as an action of *Zeigen*, through which the speaker activates a *Zeigfeld* which he shares with the addressee. Bühler's *demonstratio ad oculus* is the prototypical or primary use of deixis, where the point of orientation is the *Origo*, based on the coordinates 'here', 'now', and 'I' (Bühler, 1934: 102ff.). Bühler also recognizes an anaphoric use of deictic expressions, called *anaphorisches Zeigen*. Anaphoric pointing according to Bühler is based on the promotion of context to a *Zeigfeld* in its own right. Anaphora thus point to elements of the context, which are

¹ Schiffrin (1990), however, uses the term 'context' to denote the non-linguistic world, and 'text' to denote the linguistic world to which anaphora prototypically refer.

either sentences or parts of sentences, or else to the mental representation of states of affairs (Bühler, 1934: 388–391). This makes anaphora a distinct class of linguistic expressions, one that is associated with processing linguistic content (*reflexives Zeigen*, in Bühler's terminology), rather than with pointing to real objects (*sachliches Zeigen*). But the relation between deixis and anaphora in Bühler's view is still, as far as its formalization in the grammar of a language is concerned, transitional, and so expressions such as German *da*, while basically having a deictic function, may also be used anaphorically.

Bühler's theory of language as human action and of linguistic expressions as elements through which action is performed, and especially his distinction of various *fields* of language leading to a new categorization of linguistic expressions based on the type of action which they trigger, has inspired the theoretical foundations of Functional Pragmatics, as represented in the works of Rehbein (1977), Ehlich (1979), Ehlich and Rehbein (1986), Redder (1990), and others (see also Brünner and Graefen, 1994). Ehlich's (1979) work on deixis, which constitutes one of the basic pillars of Functional Pragmatic methodology, emphasizes the functional distinction between deixis and anaphora as separate linguistic-mental actions, and so it parts with the notion in Bühler's theory that allows for the anaphoric use of deictics (see also Ehlich, 1982, 1983).²

Ehlich's investigation is based on the system of demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adjectives, and third person pronouns in Biblical Hebrew, and so in order to explain the Functional Pragmatics view on deixis and anaphora it is necessary to review briefly the basic facts of this system. Hebrew indexical expressions are divided into two paradigms, the *ZE*- and the *HU*-paradigm. Both can appear either in a simple, 'indefinite' form, that is as *ze/zot/le* and *hu/hi/hem/hen* respectively,³ or in a 'definite' form, with the definite article *ha-* attached to the expression (*ha-ze*, *ha-hu*, etc.). In the 'indefinite' form, *ZE* is a demonstrative, while *HU* is the third person pronoun. In the 'definite' form, all expressions are adjectival demonstratives; in structural descriptions, *ha-ZE* is defined as 'proximate', *ha-HU* as 'remote'. Ehlich shows, however, that the *ZE*-series consistently points to elements of the extra-linguistic situation, while the *HU*-series, whether personal pronouns or adjectival demonstratives, always has coreferent expressions in the discourse context. Thus, the structural affinity within each of the two paradigms is interpreted as a functional affinity, reflecting the functional distinction between them. Ehlich terms the *ZE*-paradigm 'deixis', and the *HU*-paradigm 'anaphora'.

There are two essentials associated with deixis in Ehlich's analysis. First, deixis consists of a special referential relation between the speech situation and the speech action: The speech situation is defined as a 'demonstration space' (*Verweisraum*)⁴

² Cf. Ehlich (1979: 421): "Bühler verwendet den Ausdruck 'Anapher' ... [for 'text deixis', Y.M.]. Die Bezeichnung ist wenig glücklich und m.E. Ausdruck der noch relativ unentwickelten Analyse der entsprechenden sprachlichen Phänomene bei Bühler".

³ The distinctions reflect gender (masculine/feminine) and number (singular/plural).

⁴ The translation 'demonstration space' suggested by Ehlich et al. (1994: 16) is intended to capture both the demonstrating gesture associated with deixis, and the aspect of perception in actual (physical) space.

for the speech action. Second, by applying a deictic procedure, the speaker focuses on an element of the situation, and transmits this focus to the hearer.⁵ This is defined in Functional Pragmatics as a ‘transfer of focus’, a notion for which, however, no precise definition is ever provided. In broad terms, ‘focus’ is perceived of as the mental attention given to a referent. Unlike other approaches, Functional Pragmatics reserves the notion of ‘focus’ to instances involving explicit deictic reference. ‘Transfer of focus’ is the procedure by which a speaker invites the hearer to share the mental attention granted to a particular referent, a procedure which is signaled by means of a pointing gesture expressed linguistically.

While this general notion of deixis does not differ significantly from other pragmatic approaches, Ehlich’s concept of anaphora is designed to eliminate transitional occurrences. Ehlich defines anaphora as a class of elements through which (back-)reference (*Rückbezug* or *Bezug*) is established to a verbalized element of knowledge within the speech action or sequence of speech actions,⁶ and established focus is sustained (cf. Ehlich, 1982: 329). Thus, ‘anaphora’ is intrinsically connected to continuous processing as opposed to focusing, and to a linguistic context as opposed to situational or perceptual space. The anaphoric procedure according to Ehlich is a linguistic-mental task involved in processing language and linguistic content, and so it is in Functional Pragmatic terminology ‘operational’.

How does Functional Pragmatics deal with those extended usages of the *ZE*-deixis in discourse or text? The prototypical deixis according to Ehlich points within the real world of the speech situation, or in Functional Pragmatic notation, within ‘P’ (cf. Rehbein, 1977: 35). Now the linguistic-propositional representation of real-world states of affairs – ‘p’ – can also be regarded as a situational event, if an act of speech is interpreted as a fragment of actual (perceivable) reality. There is thus no theoretical problem with extending deictic reference to acts of utterance within the speech situation, as long as such reference is made to the speech event itself, rather than to the abstract mental representation of its content (cf. Ehlich, 1979: 384–386). The difficulty arises with respect to deictic reference to the abstract representation of reality within the interlocutors’ domain of knowledge – in Functional Pragmatic notation ‘ π ’. Processing the π -domain is a function usually reserved for what is termed operational procedures, including anaphora. But Ehlich argues that deixis may assume the role of a frame in structuring chains and sequences of speech actions. In such cases, is it often the sum of a series of propositional elements represented within the π -domain, or else the illocutionary force of the speech action, that are the object of pointing. Speech deixis (*Rededeixis*), as Ehlich terms such occurrences, is related to drawing conclusions from, and organizing entire actions of speech, and so it focuses on components of speech as situational occurrences. Text deixis presupposes that a speech situation encoded in the text is activated when the

⁵ Cf. Ehlich (1983: 86): “Der Sprecher überträgt durch die deiktische Prozedur eine Fokussierung auf den Hörer”.

⁶ Cf. Ehlich (1979: 718): “Durch HU wird innerhalb einer Sprechhandlung oder innerhalb einer Sprechhandlungsfolge (-verkettung oder -sequenz) ein (Rück-)Bezug auf schon vorher verbalisierte π -Elemente hergestellt”.

text is read and interpreted. The text itself, while being interpreted, generates a supplementary situation which is treated as a demonstration space. Ehlich (1979: 425ff.) refers to this situational quality of the text as a 'textual space' (*Textraum*). The idea that speech and text can, under certain circumstances, be treated as pseudo-situations, i.e. as demonstration spaces, allows for the incorporation of extra-situational, non-prototypical or derived usages of deictic expressions into the theoretical definition of deixis as situational focusing.

The notion that the separation of deictic and anaphoric functions is congruent with the separation of structural paradigms is extended to other languages, such as German (Ehlich, 1982). Here, deixis comprises all demonstratives, proximate and remote, while anaphora is restricted to personal pronouns of the third person (Ehlich, 1982: 317). This is because only the latter consistently have coreferential expressions in the linguistic context. Thus, what is regarded as an anaphoric use of demonstratives (cf. Levinson, 1983: 86–87) or as textual deixis (Lyons, 1979) in some approaches, is assumed in Functional Pragmatics to be anaphoric in Hebrew, but deictic in German, based on the intrinsic assignment of functions to the entire structural paradigm (but see Schön (1993) for a more critical view on the deixis/anaphora continuum in Swedish). Rehbein (1995) for example defines the deictic component in German *da*- compounds such as *dadurch* or *deswegen* as a focusing procedure applied to the π -domain, promoting abstract knowledge to an 'imagination space' (*Vorstellungsraum*) within which pointing is made possible. The evolution of *da*-compounds, Rehbein (1995: 182) argues, is connected to the possibilities of dealing with knowledge beyond the actual speech situation, a development which is connected to the emergence of literacy. Deixis in texts is therefore derived, insofar as texts themselves constitute a secondary form of transmitting knowledge through language.

The diachronic development from deixis to anaphora is acknowledged in Functional Pragmatics through the idea of 'field transposition' or movement from the deictic into the operational field (see Ehlich, 1994). The deictic origin, and in some cases residues of an original deictic meaning, of operational expressions have been discussed for German conjunctions by Ehlich (1987) and by Redder (1990), for a Romani conjunction by Matras (1994: 231–233), and recently for topic markers in Papuan languages by de Vries (1995). The issue of form–function correlation during the transitional stage, however, remains largely unexplored, though for Swedish *den/det* Schön (1993: 83ff.) demonstrates that an overlap of deictic and anaphoric functions is indeed possible, and argues that referential function correlates with the thematic status of the object of reference, or, more generally, that the prevalence of one procedure over the other within a single expression is connected to the grammatical structure of the utterance.

I have so far mentioned two approaches to the issue of deixis–anaphora opposition: According to the first view, anaphoric usages of deictic expressions, or an overlap of deictic and anaphoric functions in the use of some expressions, is theoretically admissible (Levinson, 1983; Lyons, 1979; Bühler, 1934). Indeed, some carry this argument even further and question the analytical separation between the speaking world associated with deixis, and the textual world associated with

anaphora (see Schiffrin, 1990). The second view, represented by Functional Pragmatics, distinguishes deixis and anaphora as distinct linguistic-mental procedures triggered consistently by separate linguistic expressions, representing distinct ‘fields’ of language (Ehlich, 1979, 1982). Demonstratives used to refer to linguistic elements of text or speech are therefore either intrinsically anaphoric (as in the case of the ‘remote’ demonstratives in Biblical Hebrew), or else they are considered to be special cases of deixis where text and speech are themselves treated as pseudo-situations that constitute demonstration spaces (cf. Rehbein, 1995). Both views recognize a grammatical separation, at least to some extent, of deictic and anaphoric functions in language. It is on the definition of the ‘grey area’ between these functions, exemplified in some languages by the use of certain expressions for both extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic reference, that the two opinions diverge.

In the following I suggest a third view: pointing to processed elements of the linguistic context is a potentially independent function, representing a cognitive action in its own right. Back-pointing to coreferent expressions is a component of this function; it is expressed in some languages, such as Biblical Hebrew, by the same paradigm which encodes continuous contextual coreference (anaphora), in other languages it is encoded by analogy to situational pointing (deixis), while in Romani it constitutes a distinct sub-category of the deictic paradigm. Thus, transfer of focus within the context-based π -domain is not secondary or derived (cf. Rehbein, 1995: 180–184, 194), but conventionalized in the language. This does not challenge the view that deixis requires a demonstration space within which a transfer of focus can occur, but it does question the basic association of focus with situation, and the notion that processing the π -domain is a function reserved for operational, in this case anaphoric, procedures. On the other hand, the arrangement of deictic and anaphoric expressions in Romani strengthens the notion that anaphora conveys strictly focus-continuity, but not re-focusing or transfer of focus. Anaphoric functions are assumed in Romani by third person pronouns, while transfer of focus within the discourse context is achieved by a sub-category of the deictic paradigm. Contextual back-reference alone is therefore not sufficient for an expression to qualify as ‘anaphoric’.

3. The structural formation of deixis in Romani

More than any other area of Romani morphology, the deictic system is subject to constant structural renewal through either interdialectal grammatical borrowing (see Boretzky, 1995), or contamination of forms and subsequent re-structuring within the paradigms. The result is a variation of deictic expressions among Romani dialects (cf. Boretzky and Iglá, 1994: 387). All demonstratives, and usually place adverbs as well, show a basic distinction in the stem-component between forms in *-a-* and those in *-o-* (with *-u-* as a variant of the latter). In structural descriptions of the language the former are generally regarded as proximate, the latter as remote. Apart from this vowel alternation within the deictic stem, all demonstrative paradigms show compound formations which draw on at least two consonantal components from an

inherited inventory of forms in *k-*, *d-*, *l-*, and *v-*, the latter two never occurring initially. In addition, a prefix *a-/o-*, which is often interpreted as representing underlying long forms in *aka-*, *ada-* etc. (cf. Sampson, 1926: 163), might be added to the first component. Gender distinction is expressed either by adding the usual adjectival ending (m. *-o*, f. *-i*) to the final consonantal component of the deictic stem (e.g. m. *kado*, f. *kadi*), or else by an alternation of a consonantal stem representing the masculine, and *-j-* for the feminine (e.g. m. *dava*, f. *daja*). Plurality is typically expressed by a final *-l-*, which either follows or substitutes the final consonant component of the singular deictic stem (as in sg. *kada*, pl. *kadala* or *kala*).⁷ Non-nominative case-endings are added either to the final consonantal stem, or to an affix *-l-* that follows it (e.g. nom. *kad-o*, acc. *kada-l-es*).

Most systems, it appears, make use of this inventory of underlying historical forms in such a way that enables to maintain a basic quadripartite system of oppositions in which the vowel alternation *a/o* is always present, while combinations of the consonantal components vary. I argue below that the vowel component represents the opposition between perceptual (or situational) access to the object of reference, and conceptual (or contextual) access to it, or, to employ the notation used in Functional Pragmatics (Ehlich, 1979), between deictic reference within 'P' and deictic reference within 'π' (as derived from 'p'). The relevant forms for demonstratives (pronominal and adjectival) and place adverbs in Lovari are arranged as illustrated in Table 1. (Stress is placed on the final syllable. Both pronominal and adjectival uses of the demonstratives show case inflection when reference is made to animates).

Table 1
Deictic expressions in the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect

	Situational/perceptual		Contextual/conceptual	
	General	Discrete	General	Discrete
'this'/'that'				
m.sg.	kado	kako	kodo	kuko
f.sg.	kadi	kaki	kodi	kuki
pl.	kadala	kakala	kodola	kukola
'here'/'there'	kathe	kadka	kothe	kudka

Descriptive analyses of Romani dialects mention similar systems. On the whole the reduplicated forms in Kelderaš/Lovari, which I refer to in Table 1 as the 'discrete' deixis, and their counterparts in other dialects seem to be highly specialized forms that are extremely difficult to define within the framework of a structural investigation (given that proximity/remoteness is taken for granted for the vocalic

⁷ In some cases, where *-l-* figures as the final consonantal component in the singular form, number is indicated by vowel alternation and the insertion of the plural adjectival ending *-e*. Soravia (1977: 58) for example notes the forms *kola* (sg.) and *kole* (pl.) for Lombardian Sinti.

opposition). They also appear to be less frequent, and so more difficult to document. This pertains especially to the situational discrete deixis (Kelderaš/Lovari *kako*), which is quite rare in narratives and stories, material upon which many studies are based. But the discrete deixis also appears to be highly marked, and so in cases of significant structural shifts within the deictic system it is subject to simplification and even loss.

Miklosich (1880: 15–21) already points out the multiplicity of demonstrative forms in the Romani dialects, admitting that, although the *a*-component seems to denote proximate objects, while the *o*-component denotes distant objects, the exact meaning of the demonstratives is extremely difficult to determine.⁸ Descriptions of the closely related dialects of the Vlach group, to which Kelderaš/Lovari belongs, present an inventory of forms quite similar to the one in Table 1. For a Kelderaš variety, Gjerdman and Ljungberg (1963: 95) present identical forms, *kado*, *kako*, *kodo*, *kuko*, with an additional lexicalized form *kova* denoting ‘thing’, which surfaces in other descriptions as well (eg. Sampson, 1926: 165). For Lovari, Pobožniak (1964: 49) has *kado*, *kodo*, and *kuko*. The latter, according to Pobožniak, means ‘this here’, an indication of its specificity or discreteness. *Kako*, the situational discrete demonstrative, is missing in Pobožniak’s description. For a Kelderaš dialect spoken in former Yugoslavia, Boretzky (1994: 54–55) lists a variety of items which constitute four basic categories, *kadavá/kadó/kavá*, *kodová/kodó/ková*, *kakavá/kakavá*, and *kuková/kuková*, and states that the latter two are less frequent in use. Tálos (1988:200), in a description of a Cerhari dialect (a Vlach dialect in contact with the Central group, sometimes referred to as the dialect of the Čurari or Kherari), also presents a quadripartite system, *adò*, *odò*, *kakò*, *kokò*, in which the forms for the discrete deixis are Vlach, while the general forms are apparently borrowed from the Central dialect. For the Central dialect itself, as spoken primarily in the Czech and Slovak Republics and in southern Poland, Hübschmannová et al. (1991: 622) mention in their grammatical outline a tripartite system consisting of (*k*)*ada*, (*k*)*oda*, and *oka*, but their dictionary also includes an entry for *aka*, and so here too the symmetrical quadripartite system surfaces. Again it is the situational discrete deixis that is disregarded in the descriptive analysis.

Sampson’s (1926) outline of Welsh Romani, which covers word formation and morphology in great detail, mentions a tripartite system of demonstratives. Sampson (1926: 164–165) distinguishes between *akavá* ‘hic’, *odova* ‘iste’, and *okova* ‘ille’. However, Sampson’s (1926: 172) overview table of pronominal adjectives and adverbs does include *ad-* as a variant of *ak-*, which suggests a quadripartite symmetrical system *adava*, *akava*, *odova*, *okova*, and so it appears that two forms have been grouped together by Sampson in order to allow for an analytical replication of the tripartite Latin system. In a description of the dialect of the English Gypsies, which draws heavily on Welsh Romani material as well, Smart and Crofton (1875: 44)

⁸ Cf. Miklosich (1880: 16): “Eine Frage, die ich nicht beantworten kann, ist die nach der Bedeutung der einzelnen Pronomina demonstrativa, deren Menge im rumun.-zig. [the Vlach dialects, to which Kelderaš/Lovari belongs, Y.M.] geradezu verwirrend ist und der andere Sprachen höchstens drei gegenüberstellen können”.

mention *akóvva*, *kóvva*, *adóvva*, and *dóvva*,⁹ implying that a quadripartite system was indeed in use, although differences in the paradigmatic arrangement between this variety and the one discussed by Sampson are also apparent. The Welsh and English dialects show certain affinities with what is known as the Balkan group of dialects. For one such variety, the Arli (or Erli) dialect of Macedonia, Kepeski and Jusuf (1980: 78–82) mention only three demonstratives in their ‘standard’ (i.e. prescriptive) grammar: *akava* is classified as ‘near to the speaker’, *kava* as ‘farther away from the speaker’, and *okova* as ‘remote from the speaker’.¹⁰ Again this might be the result of a simplifying interpretation, perhaps even inspired by Sampson’s Latin translations. For a different variety of the Balkan group, the Bugurdži-dialect of Kosovia and Macedonia, Boretzky (1993: 47–48) notes two parallel quadripartite sets, *kada*, *koda*, *kaka*, *kuka* and *kava*, *kova*, *akava*, *okova*, the former, which parallels the Vlach set, being the more widespread one. Boretzky suggests that the *o*-component indicates remoteness (*dieser* vs. *jener*), but states that the functional distinction within the rest of the paradigm remains obscure, though *kaka* appears to be the most proximate in both temporal and spatial terms.¹¹

A genuine simplification of the paradigm might be encountered in the Northern (Polish and North Russian) dialects, as well as in the Sinti-Manuš group centered in Germany and surrounding regions. For the former, Wentzel (1988: 90) has *adavá* and *odová*. For Sinti, an older description by Finck (1903: 31) includes *káwa*, *dáwa* for ‘this’ (*dieser*), and *kówa*, *dówa* for ‘that’ (*jener*). More recent studies however show that contemporary Sinti dialects, while each drawing on what appears from Finck’s description to have been the earlier inventory of forms, tend towards the formation of binary systems. Thus Soravia (1977: 54–72) notes for Piedmontese Sinti *kavá*, *dová*, for Lombardian Sinti *káva*, *kóla*, and for Venetian and Istrian Sinti *káva*, *kóva*. Similarly, for (German) Gadškene Sinte and (Bohemian) Lalere Sinte, Holzinger (1993: 74–76) distinguishes merely two forms of the demonstrative, although the adjectival demonstratives have both short and long forms (see also Valet (1991: 119) for the Manuš dialect of Alsace): *kava/kau*, *kova/ko*. Holzinger also mentions an indeclinable or ‘neuter’ use of the demonstrative in narratives, where it appears as a discourse deixis which does not refer to concrete entities, but to states of affairs (*Sachverhalte*). However, this only applies to *kova*, while *kava* according to Holzinger (1993: 75) appears in conversation, but not in narratives. Thus there is an indication of the contextual–situational opposition, but the forms indicating discreteness may have been lost.

3.1. Discourse deixis versus anaphora

Below I shall argue that Romani demonstratives of the *-o* class, labelled in Table 1 ‘contextual/conceptual deixis’, constitute a structural conventionalization of the

⁹ *doóva* is probably a typographic error.

¹⁰ Interestingly, Kepeski and Jusuf (1980: 78) do not use the term ‘speaker’ in the Romani text, but speak of *o manuš kaj sikavel*, ‘the person who is showing/pointing’.

¹¹ Cf. Boretzky (1993: 48): “Bislang ist dunkel, wie *kada*, *kaka* (und *kava*) funktionell auseinandergehalten werden. Man kann nur sagen, daß *kaka* räumlich und zeitlich das Nächstliegende ist”.

class of ‘discourse deixis’; that is, they are deictic expressions used to single out entities introduced in the discourse context, or represented in a conceptualization which is based on the discourse context. ‘Contextual’ and ‘conceptual’ are complementary notions associated with the discourse deixis: items referred to with an *o*-deixis are not accessible through direct perception of situational reality, but through a conceptualization of items explicitly named in the linguistic context of the discourse or implicitly inferred from it. ‘Context’ is thus used to mean strictly linguistic context and is thus congruent with ‘discourse’, but opposed to ‘situation’.

Alongside the discourse deixis presented on the right-hand side of Table 1 (the contextual/conceptual or *o*-deixis), Romani also possesses a closed set of third person and reflexive pronouns. In the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect personal pronouns have the nominative forms *vov* (sg. masc.), *voj* (sg. fem.), and *von* (plural); other dialect groups have corresponding stems with either an initial vowel or a palatal consonant (*ov*, *jov* etc.). The non-nominative forms are generally based on the stem *l-*, to which oblique affixes representing gender and number are added, followed by case affixes (*l-es-ke* ‘to him’, *l-a-ke* ‘to her’, etc.). Reflexive pronouns are generally based on the stem *pe-* and show similar declension patterns. In the following discussion I shall be referring to these items as ‘anaphora’, primarily since they are the type of expressions for which this label is indisputable in the literature: they constitute a paradigm whose function is to express continuity of reference to single referents which have been explicitly named in, or inferred from the linguistic context. How then do these ‘genuine’ anaphora differ from the class of discourse-deictic expressions discussed here under the labels ‘contextual/conceptual deixis’ or *o*-deixis?

A first distinction can be made on structural grounds. Members of the *o*-deixis paradigm, like all items in Table 1, may be used as demonstrative adjectives in combination with the referent, in other words, they may be used to qualify a named referent. This is not possible with the class of anaphora (third person and reflexive pronouns), which can only be used for back-reference to an entity, but not for qualification of it. Thus, the class of items defined here as Romani anaphora show only partial overlap with Ehlich’s (1977) Hebrew anaphora, the adjectival use of which is indeed possible.

Second, the two classes differ with respect to their potential object of reference. Anaphora as labelled here (third person pronouns and reflexives) can only refer to single named actors, while the *o*-deixis can be used to refer to entire stretches of discourse content, to ideas, or propositions; that is to abstract representations. In addition, anaphora in Romani may only refer to animate referents (‘he’, ‘she’, ‘they’) in the case of personal pronouns, and to the subject of the clause in the case of reflexives, but not to inanimate or abstract entities. Thus, ‘it’ in Romani is always expressed by the *o*-deixis, and not by an anaphoric pronoun. This feature in itself, especially if considered in isolation from the other traits, does not make personal and reflexive pronouns intrinsically ‘more’ anaphoric than the *o*-deixis, no less than English ‘he’ or ‘she’ should be considered more, or more genuinely anaphoric than English ‘it’. But the fact that inanimate and abstract entities cannot be captured by the set of expressions referred to here as Romani anaphora, but need to be covered instead by the *o*-deixis, can be regarded nonetheless as a correlate of referential

intensity which differs for the two classes of expressions. Thus anaphora, whose referential force is limited to indicating reference continuity (or in Ehlich's terms to continuous already-in-focus status), are in Romani not equipped to deal with entities which in real-world terms are less likely to be the centre of attention. The central role of animates (represented by personal pronouns) and syntactic subjects of the sentence (represented by reflexives) is on the other hand taken for granted. They require less referential force or intensity as their continuity as referents throughout the discourse is expected on the basis of their frequent appearance as actors and so as topics of human conversation (cf. Givón's notion of referentiality and referential prominence, 1990 and elsewhere).

This leads us to the final and, in a functional perspective, most significant distinctive feature separating discourse deixis as represented in Romani by demonstratives of the *o*-deixis paradigm, and (genuine) anaphora as represented by the set of personal and reflexive pronouns: referential intensity. On a hierarchy of potential reference devices, personal pronouns score higher for proximity to the previous mentioning of their co-referent and so higher for continuous topicality than demonstratives (cf. Holzinger (1993: 289ff.) for a discussion of the use of referential devices in the Sinti dialect of Romani). Reflexives, for reasons that have to do with the obvious syntactic constraints on their appearance (as co-referents of the subject of the sentence) will score even higher. Demonstratives, which include the *o*-deixis, are frequently used as means of re-establishing topicality by bridging a greater referential distance. In so doing they draw on their intrinsic properties of referential intensity, or, to follow Ehlich (1977), they provide a transfer of focus of attention. The accommodation of the Romani discourse deixis or *o*-deixis within the overall class of deictic-demonstrative expressions (Table 1) is in line with this class of referential devices with a high referential force. The striking feature of the Romani structural arrangement, as pointed out above, is the separation of deictic force and the source of knowledge about the referent, leading to a distinction within the deictic paradigm between situational and contextual or discourse-deixis.

4. Situational and contextual deixis

4.1. *The basic functions*

My first claim in this paper is that Romani conventionalizes and formalizes the distinction between situational deixis and contextual or discourse deixis. Both involve pointing to or focusing on an object of reference, in the sense that the hearer's attention is drawn to an identifiable element of a shared demonstration space, to use Ehlich's (1979) terms. The vowel component of the deictic expression specifies the nature of this demonstration space. Let us first examine the function of the vocalic opposition within what I refer to as 'general' deixis.

In (1), the speaker is telling about an experience she had had during her stay at a hotel in a small town in eastern Germany. The story comes as a response to a question about interesting experiences she might have had during a business trip with her

family in the region (most Lovara in Germany are travelling salesmen, and members of the extended family usually take part in sales trips). She announces the story, having briefly considered the question, with the words *daravenas ame mule* ‘we were haunted by spirits of the dead’.¹² The speaker is then encouraged to continue and begins with the part cited in (1), where she establishes the background for the episode:¹³

- (1) a. Samas ande ek hotelo, **kodo** sas ando/ aštar sar bušolas
we-were in a hotel this was in wait how was-called
kodo foro/ ando Mierhof.
that town in
- b. Taj **kothe** sas o Jani maj anglal taj lesko phral.
and there was the more before and his brother
- c. Taj avilas jekh gažo ta marelas lenge ande felastra, no
and came a man and knocked to-them in window well
taj daravelas le.
and frightened them
- d. No ame či žanasas pa **kodo** ta areslam pale ande
well we not we-knew about this and we-arrived again in
kodo foro, aj gelam pale ande **kodo** hotelo, feri o Jani
this town and we-went again in this hotel only the
či phendas amenge ke **kodo** hotelo daravel.
not told to-us that this hotel frightens
- a. ‘We were in a hotel, this was in/ wait, what was that town called/ in Mierhof.
b. And Jani had been there before with his brother.
c. And a man came and knocked on their window, well, and he scared them.
d. Well, we didn’t know about this, and we arrived in that town, and we went back to that hotel, but Jani didn’t tell us that this hotel was haunted.’

The first part of the utterance in (1a) describes the narrower setting of the episode (the ‘hotel setting’); this setting is then defined in terms of a geographical location (the ‘town setting’). The name of the small town, although quite meaningless to the hearer, is nevertheless significant as it represents a specific stage in the route the family had followed on its sales trip. It allows the speaker to insert the hotel setting into the context of a pre-categorized, overall conception of the time spent ‘on the road’. The first deixis is thus used to re-direct the hearer’s attention to the hotel setting, allowing its placement within a broader setting of time, place, and progression

¹² For a discussion of the belief in the spirits of the dead and its position in Romani culture see Rao (1975) as well as Fraser (1992: 242).

¹³ The discourse excerpts are segmented according to content-related and intonation-based criteria, following some of the rules for partly-interpretative working transcriptions formulated by Ehlich and Rehbein (1976). Code switches into German are presented in Italics. ‘/’ denotes self-repairs by the speaker which override immediately preceding fragments of the utterance. The glosses include a literal interpretative rendering of the Romani forms. For information on the structural formation of the dialect cf. Gjerdmann and Ljungberg (1963), Pobožniak (1964), and Boretzky (1994).

of events. It points to the hotel setting as a complete picture which is now accessible to both speaker and hearer as a mental representation or π -element.

What is the function of the second deixis in (1a)? We saw that the speaker is trying to position the hotel setting as a single frame within her own overall conception of the sales trip. The name of the town provides an external and, despite the fact that it is unknown to the hearer, an objective point of reference. The speaker therefore needs to overcome the memory gap she encounters when trying to recall the name. Her strategy for keeping the turn in the meantime involves verbalizing the mental scanning process she applies to her own memory, pretending to share her conception of the town setting with an imaginary addressee whom she addresses in *sar bušolas kodo foro* ‘what was that town called’. The adjectival demonstrative in *kodo foro* ‘that town’ points to an item in the speaker’s own conception of the journey, its stages, and the details associated with it. Thus, the second occurrence of *kodo* may be described as pointing to a π -element which for discourse-strategic purposes (keeping the turn and, along with it, the speaker’s authority as storyteller) is treated as if it were shared knowledge.

From this point on, deictic reference in the excerpt is used to point to conceptual representations which have actually been established as a shared ‘sphere of knowledge’ (cf. Rehbein, 1977: 35) by acts of speech conveying propositional contents. In Schiffrin’s (1990) terms, *kodo* refers within the ‘textual world’ established via the discourse. In (1b) *kothe* ‘there’ points to the location named in (1a). The place adverb itself is ambivalent and could be taken to refer to either the hotel or the town, and it is not until the next utterance (1c) that it becomes clear that ‘Jani and his brother’ had actually stayed at that very same hotel. In (1d), the first, pronominal occurrence of *kodo* is comparable with its first occurrence in (1a): it focuses on the conceptual representation of an entire state-of-affairs established in the previous utterance in (1c). The other, adjectival uses of *kodo* in (1d) all involve entities introduced in the previous discourse. Although it may seem attractive to define the *o*-deixis as one which simply points back in the discourse, the occurrences in (1a,c) show that we are not dealing, strictly speaking, with back-reference to verbalized elements of the linguistic context. Rather, reference is made to mental representations acquired by the hearer through the processing of a series of propositional acts. As Rehbein (1995: 172) points out, the propositional act or a series of propositional acts allow speaker and hearer to establish shared knowledge, which is taken as the basis for a demonstration space within which deictic procedures can be applied. *Kodo* is not a reference to single linguistic items in ‘p’, but to representations in ‘ π ’ that have been acquired or established through ‘p’. Thus, reference to an item that is not explicitly addressed in the context, but is inferable from it, is also treated in Romani as contextual, hence the cover term ‘contextual/conceptual deixis’ (cf. also section 3.1).

We now turn to deixis as situational *Zeigen* centered around the *Origo* here-now-I (Bühler, 1934) of the actual (physical) speech situation, or ‘speaking world’ (Schiffrin, 1990). Example (2) is taken from a debate at a political conference of Romani organizations, the subject of which is the establishment of a new political forum. The speaker, who is also the host of the conference, has distributed among

the delegates a draft of his concept of the aims, the tasks, and the structure of this forum. This draft, a document written in Romani, is now put to the assembly formally as a motion, and each of the delegates is holding a copy. The excerpt in (2) follows a ten-minute contribution by the speaker in which he presents his criticism of other organizations and explains the need to establish a new one. His following remarks introduce the motion, and he later goes on to read aloud each of the points in the document, before the delegates cast their vote whether to accept or reject them. In example (2) he first directs the attention of the delegates to the document itself, inviting them to express their views on it and to introduce changes:

- (2) a. Me phenav/ e struktura pala muro gindo/ dem tume **kadala**
 I I-say the structure after my thought I-gave you those
 lila ando vast.
 papers in hand
- b. Me žanav ke kam/ vi me sim manuš sar sako kaver,
 I I-know that maybe also I I-am human-being like every other
 kam si felero andre ande **kado** kaj či dikhlem les.
 maybe is mistake inside in this REL not I-saw it
- c. Pe **kodo** ame kidas ame **kathe**, pe **kodo** sas tume **kadala**
 for this we we-meet us hier for this was you these
 lila ando vast.
 papers in hand
- d. Aj kam naj lašo, šinas le, šudas le.
 and maybe is-not good we-cut them we-throw them
- a. 'I say/ the structure according to my concept/ I have given you these papers.
 b. I know that perhaps/ I am also a human-being like everybody else, perhaps
 there is a mistake in this which I have not noticed.
 c. This is why we are meeting here, this is why you have had these papers
 handed out to you.
 d. And it might not be good, [then] we [shall] edit it, [or] drop it.'

First note again, as in (1), the difficulty in rendering the Romani demonstratives through the English expressions 'this' and 'that'. With *kadala lila* 'these papers' in (2a) the speaker directs the attention of his audience to an aspect of the immediate situation. The same effect is achieved by means of the *a*-deixis in (2b). In (2c), however, we find a mixed pattern. Here the speaker is trying to integrate possible counter-arguments and objections by critics into the situation-bound agenda that foresees a discussion and a (supportive) vote on his motion. The situational aspects, representing the contents and objectives of the agenda, are highlighted in *kathe* 'here' and *kadala lila* 'these papers'. The first captures the entire setting for which the speaker as host and initiator of the conference is directly responsible. The second focuses on the documents which have been created by the speaker and for which he is asking for the support of the delegates. While the *a*-deixis remains situation-oriented, the *o*-deixis in (2c) refers back to the content of the arguments put forth in (2b): The speaker had confessed that there might be mistakes in the documents.

Sceptical delegates might conclude that there is therefore no point in a discussion. But the speaker wishes to encourage them to present their own views, rather than reject the motion. To put it more precisely then, *kodo* in both occurrences in (2c) does not point to the content of what has actually been said, but to possible conclusions that some delegates might have drawn from it, that is, to anticipated processing of ‘p’ by the hearers and so to possible hearer-related π -elements.

A further example for a mixed pattern of deictic usage is found in (3), taken from the back cover of a booklet in a very closely related Kelderaš dialect published for schoolchildren in Sweden:¹⁴

- (3) **Kodol** kaj skirisarde **kado** bufari zumade te len laši
 those REL they-wrote this book they-tried that they-take good
 ortografia
 orthography
 ‘Those who wrote this book tried to adopt a suitable orthography.’

The *o*-deixis in *kodol* points to an entity the identity of which becomes clear to the reader by processing information provided within the text itself. The *a*-deixis in *kado bufari* ‘this book’ in a way ‘pops’ out of the text as the reader is directed to an object present in the situation while the book is being read, but, unlike in direct speech, not shared with the author at the moment of writing. As Ehlich (1979: 425ff.) puts it, the textual deixis supplements a shared demonstration space which is activated while the text is being read and interpreted. *Kado* is seen to correspond in its various occurrences to Ehlich’s category of deixis: it is prototypically situational, but it can also be used in a secondary type of demonstration space which Ehlich refers to as the textual space.

Examples (2)–(3) shed new light on the notion of ‘proximity’ associated with the *a*-deixis in structural investigations of Romani. They illustrate that use of the *a*-deixis is not motivated by physical proximity as such, but by the physical presence of the referential objects in the speech situation (or in the case of example (3), in the writing situation, which is placed ‘on hold’ and activated at the moment of reading), while those of the *o*-deixis are merely conceptually present, having been established as mental representations in the linguistic context of the discourse (or the text), and so they tend to be interpreted as ‘remote’. One further example is provided by the distribution of place adverbs in the following excerpt from a biographical narrative:

- (4) a. Bešasas ande Beči, či žanav akana pa sosko berš,
 we-lived in Vienna not I-know now until which year
 b. sodengi simas deš-u-trine beršengi, akana sim biš-ta-šovengi,
 how-much I-was thirteen years-old now I-am twenty-six
 avava biš-ta-šovengi.
 I-will-be twenty-six

¹⁴ *Amari Šib* (‘Our language’), edited by Lambert Scherp, published by Skriptor AG and the National Swedish Board of Education, Stockholm 1979.

- c. No traisardam **kothe**, sas ame kher, muro dad puterdas
well we-lived there was us house my father opened
kirčima.
pub
- d. Aj či čálilas es o them aj phendas ‘romale aven, ame
and not pleased him the land and said people come we
tradas akana ande Amerika’.
we-go now in America
- e. Kadilas peska familá, tradam ane Amerika.
assembled his family we-went in America
- f. **Kothe** si muro papu, mure nanura, mure bibjá, but familja
there is my grandfather my cousins my aunts much family
si ma **kothe**.
is me there
- g. Bešlam šov berš **kothe**, ande Amerika.
we-live six years there in America
- h. Pala **kodo** phendas muro dad ke či biril pe ande Amerika,
after that said my father that not can REFL in America
- i. Ke te kames te trais ande Amerika si te aves
because if you-want that you-live in America is that you-become
sar te phenav tuke, Amerikano, ke kade či biris o
how that I-say to-you American because so not you-can the
trajo.
life
- j. Taj kade avilam parpale **kathe** ando Njamco.
and so we-came back here in Germany
- k. Atunči puterdas muro dad/ sas les biljardo.
then opened my father was him billiard
- l. Aj **kodo** akana pale phandadas ke či žalas mišto.
and that now again closed because not went well
- m. No ta akana traisaras **kathe** ando Njamco.
well and now we-live here in Germany
- a. We lived in Vienna, I don’t know until which year now,
b. how old was I thirteen, now I’m twenty-six, I’ll be turning twenty-six.
c. Anyway we lived there, we had a house, my father opened a pub.
d. And he didn’t like the country and [so] he said “come on people, we’re going
to America now”.
e. He gathered his family, we went to America.
f. There my grandfather lives, my cousins, my aunts, I have a lot of family
there.
g. We lived there for six years, in America.
h. After that my father said that he can’t get along in America.
i. Because if you want to live in America you have to become, how shall I put
it, American, otherwise you don’t get along.
j. And that’s how we came back here to Germany.

- k. Then my father opened/ he had a billiard-place.
- l. And he closed it again now because it wasn't going well.
- m. So now we live here in Germany.

The general, conceptual place deixis in *o-* (*kothe*) focuses on the most easily accessible conceptual representation of location established in the discourse context. In (3c) it points to *Beči* 'Vienna', mentioned in (3a). In (3f) it points to *ane Amerika* 'in America' of the preceding utterance, while in (3g) the location referred to is still the same, but referential distance motivates the use of an additional lexical specification, leading to a repetition of *ande Amerika*. Again the *o*-deixis is not inherently a marker of remoteness, although both Vienna and America are distant from speaker and hearer during the present interaction, but rather a reference to concepts established in the course of the narrative. On the other hand, the general *a*-deixis in *kathe* 'here' in (3j) and (3m) signals overlap with the speech situation and so with a demonstration space that is physically present. Notice in addition that *kodo* is used here too, in (3h) and (3l), as a reference to conceptualized or mental representations of information acquired through the linguistic discourse context.

4.2. Imaginary perception as a demonstration space

An indication of the possibilities of transposing the situation-bound reference through *kado* has already been provided by its usage in a text in example (3). Transposition into an imaginary setting which does not overlap with the real speech situation, but simulates one of its own, can be encountered in speech as well. Consider the following:

- (5) Te si kavres idea dikhasa vi leski idea, diskutujsarasa la te
 if is another idea we-will-see also his idea we-will-discuss it that
 arezas pa jekh punkto kaj savore so anklasa **kadka** šaj
 we-arrive at one point where all what we-will-exit hier can
 phenas 'bravo, **kadi** si muri organizacija sar so me kamavas la',
 we-say bravo this is my organization like what I I-wanted it
 anda čačo ilo.

from real heart

'If anybody else has an idea, we shall look at his idea as well, we shall discuss it in order to arrive at a point where all who leave here can say "Bravo, this is my organization [just] like I wanted it", whole-heartedly.'

The excerpt is taken from the same contribution at a conference as example (2) above. Here too, the speaker is encouraging debate on his proposals. *Kadka* is a reference to the immediate speech situation, as indicated by the *a*-component (the discreteness feature of the deixis shall be discussed below). But with the use of *kadi* the speaker is simulating an imaginary situation, inventing a quote. Taken as direct speech, the quote, however unreal, represents a speech situation, and so the *a*-component retains the same function as seen above, in real situations: it focuses on an

object of reference which is physically present. Transpositions into imaginary settings are quite common in narratives. In (6) and (7) the hearer is transposed into the setting established within the story itself. Here too the direct quotes simulate a speech situation within which the *a*-deixis is used to point to objects that are physically present and identifiable through direct perception:

- (6) a. Pušel jekhe gažes po drom: ‘Kasko si **kado** barvalimo sa **kado**?’
 asks one man on street whose is this wealth all this
- b. Dikhel o gažo pe leste, phenel leske:
 looks the man at him says to-him
 ‘Kan niet verstaan’.
 can not understand
- c. **Kodo** bišol pe pe gažikani: ‘Či xačarav tut’.
 this means REFL in gaže-language not I-understand you
- d. ‘Ah’, o raklo, ‘O gažo kasko si **kado** sa bišol “Kan niet verstaan”’.
 the boy the man whose is this all called
- a. ‘He asks a man on the street: “Who does all this wealth belong to, all that?”’
 b. The man looks at him, says to him: “Kan niet verstaan”’.
 c. This means in the non-Gypsy language: “I don’t understand you”’.
 d. “Oh”, the boy, “The man to whom all this belongs is called ‘Kan niet verstaan’”’.
- (7) a. Pašol karing leste jekh silveta, ()
 approaches towards him one shadow
- b. Sa parno, () sar jekh rašaj.
 all white like one priest
- c. A pašol.
 and approaches
- d. No ale sar vov avel, či avel ando pai, opral pa pai
 well but how he comes not comes in water above on water
 avel, karing leste.
 comes towards him
- e. ‘Dikh Devla Svunto, no **kado** si te avel vareso kesavo
 look God Holy well this is that come something such
 svunto manuš!’
 holy person
- a. ‘A shadow is approaching him, ()’
 b. All in white, () like a priest.
 c. And he’s approaching.
 d. But how is he coming, he’s not walking in the water, he’s walking above the water, towards him.
 e. “Why, Holy God, this must be some holy person!”’

The quotes reflect the perceptual domain of the actors cited within the story. In reconstructing the utterances the storyteller re-activates the orientation coordinates that form a situation-bound demonstration space in the original setting. Note that in

(6c) *kodo* is used for reference to the content of the quoted utterance. The instances of situational deixis in (5)–(7) resemble the occurrences on which Bühler (1934: 121–140) bases his notion of *Deixis am Phantasma*, where the *Origo* or center of orientation is transposed into an imaginary setting. In the case of direct quotes, the hearer is simply expected to adopt the orientation coordinates set by the actor who is quoted. The quotes themselves are usually either identified in the discourse through introductory remarks, or bracketed through intonation, the speaker limiting the scope of the *Origo*-transposition to the reconstructed original utterance. But there are also more complex occurrences where no overt demarcation of the quote is provided by the speaker, and where it is up to the hearer to reconstruct the coordinates that constitute the original situational demonstration space and to determine the scope of the *Origo*-transposition into the phantasy realm. Consider the use of indirect quotes in (8), taken from the continuation of the narrative presented in (1):

- (8) a. Aj kezindas te vorbil ando suno ke voj dikhel but but
und started that talk in dream that she sees many many
šavoren taj ke kado kher si škola.
children and that this house ist school
- b. No ame či žanasas.
well we not we-knew
- c. No kade gelas muri sokra te vorbil pe račate.
well so started my sister-in-law that speak in night
- d. Taj dikhlem le gažes aj pučelav/ pučav lestar, phenav: ‘So
and I-saw the man and I-ask I-ask from-him I-say what
sas kado kher?’ ke kesavo baro baro kher sas.
was this house because such big big house was
- e. Aj phenel vov ke kado sas varekana škola pe/ sar te
and says he that this was sometime school for how that
phenav tuke, eh/ Wirtschaft.
I-say to-you economics
- a. ‘And she started to talk in her sleep, [saying] that she sees many many children and that this house was a school.
- b. Mind you, we didn’t know [that].
- c. Anyway, so my sister-in-law started talking at night.
- d. And I met the man and I asked/ I ask him, I say: “What was this house?” because it was such a big, big house.
- e. And he says that this used to be a school for/ how shall I say uh/ *economics*.’

A straightforward direct quote which includes a perceptual deixis appears in (8d). But in (8a), as well as in (8e), it is the *a*-deixis itself that transposes the orientation coordinates to form an imaginary perceptual domain, based on the original setting of the story. The indirect quotes in (8a) and in (8e) would have equally allowed for the treatment of the referent ‘house’ from the perspective of the current speech situation, that is, as an entity introduced into the discourse via propositional acts. The choice, instead, of the situational deixis, is connected to the choice of the present tense (*voj*

dikhel ‘she sees’ in (8a), *phenel vov* ‘[and] he says’ in (8e)) and so to a preference for grammatical devices that allow the participants to re-experience the original situation and progression of events. This is part of a narrative strategy aiming at what is often regarded as vivid storytelling – an attempt to simulate sensual involvement and so to promote emotional involvement on the part of the hearer in reconstructed events and actions.

4.3. *Speech as a situational demonstration space*

Romani is primarily an oral language, although writing and publishing have become more widespread since the political transition in eastern Europe and the formation of dozens of new cultural and political initiatives. Occurrences of text deixis as demonstrated in example (3) are therefore plentiful. In this section I discuss what might be regarded as a transitional stage in terms of the expansion of functions which the language assumes within the community, and the consequent changes in the distribution of grammatical categories. Specifically, I deal here with the way speech is embedded into an institutionalized frame where turns are regulated by a strict arrangement of contributions agreed upon in advance, and topics are equally determined by a pre-set agenda. Example (9) is taken from a debate at a political conference, examples (10)–(11) from a lecture on Romani history delivered in front of an audience of several dozen people. In both cases we find occurrences of the situational/perceptual deixis in which it does not focus on a particular physical object present in the speech situation, but points to part of the discourse. Such usages of the *a*-deixis document reflection upon talk as an institutionalized, pre-structured event. In (9), the speaker is reacting to a series of contributions by other delegates who have called for unity and cooperation among Romani organizations:

- (9) a. Kana šunav sako jekhes, ke sako del vorba te keras khetane
 when I-hear each one for each gives word that we-do together
 te avas jekh, phralipe te avel.
 that we-become one brotherhood that comes
- b. **Kadala** vorbi me aba biš berš ašunav.
 these words I already twenty years I-hear
- a. ‘When I listen to each one, for everybody says we should cooperate and unite,
 that there should be brotherhood.
- b. I have been hearing these phrases for twenty years already.’

How can the demonstration space for *kadala vorbi* ‘these words/phrases’ be defined? I suggest that the perceptual deixis co-operates with the quote in order to extend perception back in time, thus enabling an in-depth evaluation of the present speech situation. Both the choice of lexical item and the plural of the noun in *kadala vorbi* ‘these words/phrases’ in (9b) suggest that the object of reference is not the propositional act ‘p’ performed by the speaker himself in the preceding utterance in (9a), but rather the series of propositional acts ‘q, r, ...’ reconstructed in the indirect quote. But if this is so, then why is the perceptual deixis used, and not the concep-

tual deixis, which would point to the propositions ‘q, r, ...’ as mental representations of processed and interpreted acts of speech? The speaker opens his utterance in (9a) by establishing a connection to the ongoing series of contributions by delegates. He is announcing his evaluation of an event – the plenary discussion – which is still in progress, and in which both he and the hearers are active participants. In other words, he is commenting on the actual reality ‘P’ of the speech situation. The quote enables him to retrieve propositional acts from a deeper component of this reality and to re-activate them, allowing an extension back in time of the speech situation. In applying the *a*-deixis to the propositional acts mentioned in the quote, the speaker is thus stretching the time component of the deictic *Origo*. The demonstration space in which *kadala* in (9b) operates is situational. It is centered around the current place and the current roles of the participants in the interaction. But it is also extended to include previous turns of talk in a series of which the current utterance is part.

A pre-requisite for this use of the perceptual deixis is the availability of a pre-structured discourse, or at least of an organized series of turns. The institutional framework of a conference with a pre-set agenda enables speaker and hearers to consider a fragment of current discourse as part of a structured whole. The situational deixis focuses on an event – here a speech event – that is perceivable by sensory means within the current speech situation. But the notion of speech situation is extended in time to include non-concurrent events, grouped together by a pre-defined conference program which the participants in the interaction follow. The use of the perceptual deixis in (9) thus depends on a shared perception of a series of speech acts as part of the speech situation, a perception which in turn derives from the participants’ knowledge of the conference program.

Let us now move on to the structuring of speech in a lecture. Lectures are pre-planned and pre-structured. Ehlich and Rehbein (1986: 81ff.) characterize them as a transfer of complex knowledge based on a strict overall propositional plan. Lectures require an audience which is interested in acquiring knowledge and prepared to integrate new knowledge into its own by processing a series of assertions. In addition, the speaker or lecturer is entrusted with the authority to design and structure the lecture. In example (10), the speaker is making the point that one should learn from history and be aware of patterns of social stigmatization, exclusion, and discrimination of groups and individuals. In an earlier part, reference had been made to the history and persecution of the Romani people in Germany during the Second World War.

- (10) a. Sako jekh amendar šaj avel vi mordenca, te mudarel
 every one from-us can becomes also murderer that kills
 varekas, aj šaj vi te avel **kodo** kas mudaren.
 somebody and can also that become this whom they-kill
- b. **Kado** maj anglal kamavas te phenav ke te xačaras
 this more before I-wanted that I-say that that we-understand
 so kerdžolas pe ando Njamco ando marimo.
 what was-done REFL in Germany in war
- a. ‘Every one of us can become both a murderer, can murder somebody, and he can also become the one who is being murdered.

- b. I had wanted to say this earlier, so that we could understand what was happening in Germany during the war.'

The use of the situational deixis in (10b) is intended to allow a retrospective re-arrangement of the order of actions and the placement of the statement made in (10a), retroactively, in the context of a previous chapter of the lecture. By using *kado* the speaker is pointing to an act of speech as part of the situational reality 'P', as a perceptual object that can be moved back and shifted into a more appropriate position. It is the temporal, and so situational placement of the statement as an act of speech, rather than processing a mental representation of the utterance content, which determines the choice of deixis. This situational reference to an utterance is made possible by the status of the speaker as a lecturer, who is licensed to provide the audience with a series of statements, to arrange and to re-arrange their ordering. (11) shows another example:

- (11) a. Antrego drom, antregi historija amari, si jekh:
entire way entire history ours is one
- b. E historija si jekh: Kon či kamel ame, e anglune faza si
the history is one who not want us the first phase is
te izolujin ame, e dujto faza si te našaven ame,
that they-isolate us the second phase is that they-deport us
aj e trito faza kana **kukola** duj či ankerde, si te
and the third phase when those two not they-succeeded is that
mudaren ame.
they-kill us
- c. Kade sas ande historija aj kade avla ande historija.
such was in history and such will-be in history
- d. Aj kon **kado** phandavel, či kamel te žanel, ke si les
and who this shuts not wants that knows because is him
kaver ka/ ginduri, **kodo** bikinel peske šavoren.
other thoughts this sells his-own children
- e. **Kodo** bistrel so kerdžilas pe leska familjasa.
this forgets what was-done REFL his family-with
- f. **Kodo** bistrel ke amari historija sikhadas. {8 sec.}
this forgets that our history showed
- g. Ando 45to berš žanas ke but amare phureNDAR kana
in 45th year we-know that many our elderly-from when
ankliste avri, kaj sas len e baxt te anklen avri,
they-came out where was them the luck that they-come out
xasarde but peske manušendar.
they-lost many their-own people-from
- h. Ame **kado** phenas sar ke šaj ginavas le gazeta: 'štar
we this we-say like that can we-read the newspaper four
manuš mu/ mandar mule'.
people die/ from-me they-died

- a. 'All along, our entire history, is the same:
- b. History is the same: Those who don't like us, the first stage is to isolate us, the second stage is to deport us, and the third stage, when these two have not been successful, is to murder us.
- c. Such has been our history and such will be our history.
- d. And whoever dismisses that, doesn't want to know, because he has other ideas, he is selling his own children.
- e. He has forgotten what was done to his family.
- f. He has forgotten what our history has shown. '8 sec.'
- g. In the year '45 we know that many of our elderly when they survived, those who were lucky to survive, they had lost many of their people.
- h. We say this as though we were reading the newspaper: "Four of my people died".'

In (9) and (10), the institutional embedding of talk makes it possible to regard single articulatory acts of speech (propositional acts) as situational events. This can be achieved either by extending the perception of the current situation in time, as in (9), or by re-arranging the order of acts of speech retrospectively, as in (10). In (11), reference is not made to speech events simply as articulatory acts, but to the abstract division of the lecture into pre-structured chapters, organized according to a concept or plan. By pointing to single subdivisions of talk, the speaker is sharing his plan for the lecture with the audience. This plan is promoted to a demonstration space in which single chapters are treated as perceivable objects. Thus, the *a*-deixis in (11d) points to the summary, as presented in (11a–c), of a chapter in the lecture, which we might entitle 'Continuity in history'. Focusing on the chapter enables the speaker to qualify it, and to review possible attitudes towards it and the consequences that they entail.

While activation of the underlying lecture plan is relevant to the use of the situational *a*-deixis in (11d), its use in segment (11h) is quite different. Here, the speaker is pointing to the illocutionary quality of his preceding utterance in (11g), analyzing and qualifying it. We thus encounter, in (9)–(11), altogether four types of situational reference to speech events: (a) pointing to a sequence of turns in an ongoing debate as an extended situation, (b) re-arranging the position of a statement in a structured lecture, (c) drawing on the plan of a pre-structured lecture for assessing a single chapter, and (d) commenting on, and in doing so, in effect reversing the illocutionary force of a statement. All these instances have to do with a reflection upon acts of speech, rather than with processing single propositional contents or linguistic-referential entities. In addition, they are all embedded in a discourse type in which turns are institutionalized and regulated by an overall plan which is explicit, arranged in advance, and formally accepted by the participants in the interaction. Speech deixis, by which I mean the use of the situational deixis to focus on elements of speech by analogy to perceivable objects, is thus a feature of newly-emerged conference discourse.

4.4. *Extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic deixis: A summary*

Let us summarize the discussion of the *o*- and the *a*-deixis. There are three points that merit particular attention: First, the vowel opposition between the two

forms is not directly related to physical distance. Rather, I suggest that a distinction between intra-linguistic deixis which points to processed propositional contents and extra-linguistic deixis which points to perceivable elements of the situation is formalized in the language. *Kodo* and its class express the former, *kado* and its cognates encode the latter. Second, the conventionalization of indexical reference to intra-linguistic entities and concepts occurs within the paradigm of deictic expressions, which is distinct from the class of anaphora (third person pronouns *vov/voj/von*) used for highly continuous reference to actors in discourse. Given the linguistic context dependency of *kodo* it is not surprising that the conceptual deixis in Romani occasionally overlaps with ‘genuine’ anaphora in other languages, as exemplified by the English translation of (11d–f). Nevertheless the *o*-deixis must be regarded as functionally distinct from anaphora. To put it somewhat bluntly, the *o*-deixis does things that anaphora cannot do. One of those is to focus on entire mental or conceptual representations that do not have coreferential expressions. While it is true that anaphora can also operate on an anticipational or presuppositional basis (Schön, 1993; Cornish, 1996), their operational scope in doing so is far more limited, and they cannot take over the focusing functions observed for the Romani *o*-deixis.¹⁵ On the other hand, the discourse deixis of the *kodo* type need not be considered as an ‘impure’ form, either. It does not exploit the extra-linguistic (situational) deixis for the purpose of intra-linguistic reference, but draws on intrinsic properties of its own, assigned to it as a subdivision of the deictic paradigm.

The final point pertains to ‘text deixis’ and ‘speech deixis’. These are particular occurrences of the situational, extra-linguistic deixis (*kado*). They establish part of the text or speech as a situational reality or ‘speaking world’, enabling the speaker to *comment* on them as single acts of speech. Text and speech deixis are connected to pre-structured, institutionalized and reflected talk (in the case of texts, the organizational pre-conditions are obvious). Since they highlight the situational aspects of selected linguistic material, their usage is perfectly in line with the prototypical functions of the situational deixis. Nevertheless, text and speech deixis are products of new types of discourse which are emerging in a changing society, where organizing texts and institutionalizing talk are relatively new and recent experiences.

5. Discreteness

There is agreement in descriptive literature on Romani that deictic expressions of the type classified above (Table 1) as ‘discrete’ appear rather rarely in narrative discourse, and are more difficult to define. I suggest in this section that the function of the reduplicated deixis *kakolkuko* is to reinforce the focusing power generally conveyed by plain deictic expressions, and so to isolate an object of reference from a group of potential referents.

¹⁵ Indeed, the special function of ‘antecedentless’ anaphora is found in both analyses to be based on the fact that anaphora usually do occur with coreferent expressions.

5.1. Exclusion of potential referents

Consider example (12), where the speaker uses metaphors to indicate first how dependent the Romani minority is upon the majority institutions, and how many Romani activists are not aware of this situation, and finally to describe how some people become disillusioned when it is already too late:

- (12) a. Ande lenge vast sam, ande lenge dand sar e čirikli.
 in their hands we-are in their teeth like the bird
 b. Taj ame xoxavas ame ke bešas pe patrin.
 and we we-deceive us that we-sit on leaf
 c. Pala **kodo** rovas, sar **kuko** kaj putrel parasolka pala brišind,
 after that we-cry like that which opens umbrella after rain
 kana kindžilas.
 when became-wet
 a. ‘We are in their hands, we are between their teeth like a bird.
 b. And we pretend that we are sitting on a leaf.
 c. Afterwards we cry, like the one who opens an umbrella after the rain, when he is already wet.’

Let us first establish the source of knowledge activated by *kuko* in (12c). The *o/u*-deixis points within the discourse context to the propositional content of the relative clause, where information about the identity of the referent is given. The specificity of the deixis helps retrieve background information from a conceptual repertoire of metaphors which is part of shared cultural knowledge: The hearer is expected to identify the referent by recalling the saying. Such retrieval of particular knowledge is typical of the use of the reduplicated deixis. It is the special effort needed to retrieve such specific knowledge that creates the impression of the distal meaning often associated with the reduplicated form. But in (12c) the effect created by the deixis is one of exclusion: the behavior of some people is claimed to constitute nothing but a parallel to that of the specific person in the saying. Consider the use of *kuki* in (13e):

- (13) a. Aha, aj kana našljatar/ šun, e Julia/
 and when fled listen the
 b. Ke Židovuri bešenas amensa ande **kodo** hotelo.
 because Jews they-lived with-us in that hotel
 c. Akana e Židovanka kiradas kesavo šabes, po šabes, pe
 mow the Jewess cooked such Sabbath for Sabbath for
 lengro/maše, kesavi židovicka.
 their fish such Jewish
 d. Aj šutas le e čori pe felastra te šudrol lake, ke
 and threw them the poor on window that cool for-her because
 paraštujine aven te xan o šabes.
 Friday they-come that they-eat the Sabbath

- e. Aj **kuki** kurvica e cikni Julia las **kodola** maše sa čordas
 and that whore the small took those fish all stole
 le, hačares.
 them you-understand
- a. ‘Aha, and when she ran away/ listen, [I mean] Julia/
 b. Because there were Jews living with us at that hotel.
 c. Now the Jewess had cooked this sort of Sabbath, for Sabbath, for their/ fish,
 this Jewish [food].
 d. And the poor woman placed them on the window to cool, because on Fri-
 days they come to have the Sabbath meal.
 e. And that little whore Julia took those fish and stole them, you understand.’

The speaker begins the part of the narrative in (13a) by re-establishing *Julia* as the prominent actor/topic. In what follows, background information is introduced, leading to a shift in topic from *Julia* to ‘the Jewess’ in (13c). The deixis in (13e) takes us back to the initial point of departure and the original topical role of *Julia* which, due to the interruption, needs to be re-established and kept distinct from the currently active actor/topic. Thus, *kuki* is used to prevent referential ambiguity and to distinguish an intended referent from another accessible potential referent. In (13), the impression is that *kuki* takes the hearer farther or deeper back in the discourse, and so it conveys a sense of remoteness. But compare (12)–(13) with the following example:

- (14) O dujto var kana simas akhardo pe **kadala** bučja, kongresuri,
 the second time when I-was invited to these things meetings
 sas **kako** rom kana kerdas, ando Bern fajma sas **kodo**, **kado**
 was this man when made in it-seems was that this
 berš, na, () vaj **kuko** berš, kana sas **kodo**?
 year no or that year when was that
 ‘The second time when I was invited to these things, meetings, was when this
 man organized it, I guess it was in Bern, this year, wasn’t it, () or last year,
 when was that?’

Let us first review the occurrences of the general deixis in the excerpt. The example is taken from a debate at a conference. *Kadala* in ‘these things’ points to the speech situation, and supports the analogy between the present meeting and the one the speaker is reporting on. Both instances of *kodo* refer within the discourse to the afore-mentioned event – the speakers’ second invitation to a meeting. *Kado* in *kado berš* ‘this year’ points to the specified period of time which overlaps with the moment of speech. We have once more a consistent situational/contextual opposition. Now what do the reduplicated forms convey? *kako rom* ‘this man’ picks one out of a crowd, as the speaker is pointing to a specific person who is seated in an audience of about thirty people. *Kuko berš* on the other hand is a lexicalized expression for ‘last year’. Again the deixis could be interpreted as conveying remoteness; but the effect of remoteness achieved here could easily be derived from an intrinsic property of the form which is apparent in its other occurrences as well: the redupli-

cated deixis singles out the referent from a group of potential referents. In the case of the previous year, the deixis draws on (a) a shared recollection of a specific period of time, and (b) a shared conceptualization of time. The first accounts for the choice of the discrete deixis, the second explains the choice of an *o/u-* or contextual deixis.

5.2. Demarcation

In the preceding examples the discrete deixis was seen to single out a referent from a group of potential referents, and so to exclude other accessible but unintended referents. This meaning of the discrete deixis is often drawn upon to convey a metaphorical demarcation of locations, persons, or events. Consider the following:

- (15) Mila lenge anda amende ale te na dikhen amari mila
 sorrow to-them from us but that not they-see our sorrow
 šuden ame **kudka** ande **kukola** thema kaj meras
 they-throw us there in those countries where we-die
 bokhatar, te na dikhen **kadka** ke sam bokhale.
 from-hunger that not they-see here that we-are hungry
 ‘They are sorry for us, but in order not to see our suffering they send us out there to those countries where we starve to death, so that they don’t witness right here how we are starving.’

The speaker is addressing deportations of eastern European Romani immigrants in the West. Note the use of reduplicated forms of the place deixis. While the first, *kudka*, points to a location specified explicitly in the discourse context, the second, *kadka*, conveys a counterpart location which overlaps with the speech situation. Here we can clearly see that discreteness is quite distinct from remoteness. Rather, it conveys that the object of reference is incongruent with another object of the same class or category. In (15), demarcation of locations represents the closure of the West and its reluctance to admit Romani immigrants from the East, a rhetorical exploitation of the properties of the discrete deixis. *Kukola thema* ‘those countries’ similarly symbolizes inaccessibility and the confinement of deported refugees to their countries of origin. In (16b), demarcation pertains to actors in a narrative:

- (16) a. Sas panglo jekh gažo, **kodo** kaj si te sičhol, pe-k
 was tied one man that REL is that learns on-one
 električno skamin, aj paša **kodola** elektritiki sas jekh gažo kaj
 electric chair and near those electricians was one man REL
 sičhavel les.
 teaches him
- b. No **kuko** kaj sičhavel či žanelas ke **kuko** kaj si **kudka**
 well that REL teaches not knew that that REL is there
 si artista.
 is actor

- a. ‘A man was tied, the one who is supposed to be tested, to an electric chair, and on the electric (controls) there was a man testing him.
- b. Now the one who is testing didn’t know that the one who is over there is an actor.’

Once again the meaning of the discrete deixis is exploited to convey separation and mutual inaccessibility of referents.

Among the lexicalized or semi-lexicalized functions of the discrete deixis we find reference pertaining explicitly to ‘other’ actors than those immediately accessible, as in (17b):

- (17) a. A: Kade kana sastilo/ sastilo, line/ taj von/ taj
 so when recovered recovered they-took/ and they/ and
 našle duj žene ando Čexo.
 they-fled two people in Czech
- b. B: Aj **kukola** kaj ašile?
 and those where they-stayed
- c. A: Ande Rumunija.
 in Rumania
- a. ‘A: So when he recovered/ he recovered, they took/ and they/ the two of them fled to Czech(oslovakia).
- b. B: And where did the others stay?
- c. A: In Rumania.’

A similar meaning can be found in (18c), where *kukola* ‘the others’ renders the separation of playmates into two rival camps, as part of a game:

- (18) a. Taj žasas ande veša taj rodasas, taj dikhasas,
 and we-went in woods and we-searched and we-looked
 khelasas ame halt, ne.
 we-played we no
- b. Taj arakhlam **kodi Höhle**. ()
 and we-found this cave
- c. Taj sa feri **kothe** našasas taj phenasas ke **kukola** si phurane
 and all only there we-fled and we-said that those are old
 Vikinga kaj mudarenas pe, ta phenasas jekhaveske
 Vikings who they-fought REFL and we-said to-one-another
Gruselgeschichten.
- a. ‘And we used to go into the woods and search, and looked around, we used to *just* play, *right*.
- b. And we found this *cave*. ()
- c. And we always used to go just there, and we used to pretend that the others were ancient Vikings fighting one another, and we told one another *horror stories*.’

5.3. The missing word

In sentence-oriented descriptive literature, deictic expressions are usually classified as expressions that can substitute lexical items. While the pragmatic approach taken here assumes a grammatical conventionalization of a reference gesture to be the underlying function of deictics, we do in fact encounter instances of actual, pragmatically motivated word substitution through deixis in the corpus. The discrete situational deixis *kako* may carry a semi-lexicalized meaning corresponding to English *whatchamacallit*, or German *Dings* or *Dingsbums*:

- (19) Les mukhlja ando/ ando/ ando **kako**, ando hotelo.
 him left in in in that in hotel
 'He left him at/ at/ at whatchamacallit, at the hotel.'
- (20) a. 'Dikh, a tu Rom san?' **Kako**, o rom pušel. ()
 look and you Romani you-are this the man asks
 b. Ale dikhel pe lehke punre, () si sar **kako**, It/ It/ Iti ...
 but looks at his feet is like this
 a. "Look there, so you're Romani?" This guy, the (Romani) man asks. ()¹⁶
 b. But he looks at his feet, they're like what's his name, E.T/ E.T/ E.T.. ()'

The salient feature of *kako* in these examples, however, more than its employment to substitute a lexical item, is the fact that it assumes its own illocutionary meaning: while syntactically representing the missing noun phrase, it is used to communicate difficulties encountered by the speaker in recalling the appropriate content-word, to announce a delay in the progression of the utterance, and finally to encourage the hearer to participate in the search for the relevant word or name. It is quite simple to reconstruct the properties of the discrete deixis that are exploited here: the missing word is a specific item, one which is difficult to access, and the process of retrieving it requires intense mental concentration and scanning of the linguistic repertoire for particular features. The missing word is thus separated from the class of potential lexical items that might fill the particular gap in the utterance. The gesture-like feature of the deixis is responsible for the transfer of focus to the hearer, which gives rise to the particular illocutionary flavor encountered in these examples, the speaker demanding the hearer's attention to compensate for an evident gap in speaker-competence and fluency. Finally, the situation-bound feature of the *a*-deixis is drawn upon here to substitute for the missing word as an element of the act of speech, whose unsuccessful retrieval delays the completion of the speech event as a situational occurrence.

5.4. Discreteness and markedness

Low accessibility was mentioned as one of the features of referents that are the object of the discrete deixis. The examples have shown that cognitive remoteness of

¹⁶ The word *rom* is used in Romani to denote both a person of Romani origin, and ethnic identity.

the type represented by the discrete deixis pertains to the mental effort needed in order to identify and recover the referent. The case of the place deixis *kadka* ‘right here’, where a discrete deixis points to a location that overlaps with the immediate and proximate deictic center, demonstrates that cognitive remoteness is not necessarily connected to, and in fact in this case is opposed to remote distance in space. Remoteness as such is therefore not considered here to be a feature that captures the semantic properties of the form. Rather, I suggested above that such features should take into account (a) the separation and demarcation of referents, and (b) the retrieval of particularizing features of the referent which are needed in order to identify it. The term ‘discreteness’ is taken to represent these features.

Discreteness, as discussed above, is a feature that accompanies the division into situation-bound and context-bound forms of the deictic paradigm in Romani. There are several reasons to posit the markedness of the discreteness feature within the system: structural complexity, semantic feature composition, frequency of distribution, and the tendency towards de-regularization. Structural complexity pertains to the formation of the deictic expressions. In the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect, as in most Vlach dialects, all deictic expressions consist of two syllables in the nominative singular, and three syllables in most inflected occurrences. The salient component is the initial *k-*, which can be regarded as the ‘active’ deictic root. The formation of the discrete deixis is based on a reduplication of this root, thus iconically representing the intensified effort needed to retrieve a discrete referent within the demonstration space. In other dialect groups, the structural complexity of the discrete deixis is manifested even more overtly by adjoining a prefix *a-* or *o-* to the general deictic expression.

In indicating the source of knowledge (discourse context vs. speech situation), the vowel roots of the deictic expression are competing forms that constitute a binary opposition. This opposition, however, pertains to the very nature of the feature, rather than its presence or absence. Thus, ‘+context/conception’ always means ‘–situation/perception’, and vice versa. It would therefore be quite awkward to represent the vowel opposition in terms of the +/- status of a feature. Moreover, it was illustrated that the vowel opposition guides the hearer to the relevant demonstration space within which reference is made, and so it qualifies the action component of the deictic procedure, rather than the nature of its object. Discreteness functions to a certain extent in a similar fashion: It qualifies the means of retrieving the referent in a given demonstration space, rather than attribute lasting properties to the object of reference itself. Yet one might argue that in contrasting potential referents the discrete deixis adds to the focus procedure the property of ‘+discrete’. Any counterpart property, such as the label ‘general’ employed in the discussion above and in Table 1, is a paraphrase of the explicit lack of discreteness and so of the feature ‘–discrete’. Hence the structural complexity of the discrete deixis can be taken to coincide with a semantic complexity and the presence of an additional semantic feature.

The low distribution frequency of the discrete deixis is mentioned in most studies of Romani dialects. Low frequency, attested in the corpus of this study as well, could be a product of the semantic complexity and the specialization of the discrete deixis. It might explain the gradual loss of the discrete deixis in some dialects. Finally,

while in the variety described here discrete deictic expressions are found to be productive, they nevertheless display a tendency to assume semi-lexicalized and even semi-illocutionary functions. These reserved usages of the discrete deixis indicate a marginal, though apparent de-regularization of the form within the deictic paradigm.

6. Conclusion

Let me summarize the main findings of the data analysis, before proceeding to the general implications which they entail. Romani, exemplified here by natural discourse in the Kelderaš/Lovari dialect, has a quadripartite system of deictic oppositions, which serves as the basis for the formation of pronominal and adjectival demonstratives and place adverbs. The first opposition line, represented by the vowel alternation *a/o* (with *-u-* as a variant of the latter) in the stem component, may be drawn between situational and contextual reference: The *a*-forms point to a perceivable element of the actual and immediate reality of the speech situation, hence their interpretation in structural descriptions as proximate. The *o*-forms point to an element of an imaginary reality established by processing the linguistic context of the discourse (either text or talk). This detachability from actual reality is evidently behind the notion of remoteness often associated with the forms. The *o*-deixis need not have an explicit coreferent expression or antecedent in the context, but can also be employed to focus on entire propositional chunks, or even on presuppositions relating to conclusions that are derived from the context. In other words, the *o*-deixis can have as its referent accumulated, abstract discourse knowledge, which makes it a typical textual deixis in Lyons' (1979) terms, or a discourse deixis following Levinson (1983: 85; cf. also Rehbein's (1995) discussion of abstract knowledge-focusing through *da*-compounds in German). This focal quality distinguishes deixis from anaphora (third person pronouns *vov*, *voj*, *von*). Alongside the prototypical usages of the *a*-deixis for situational pointing to actually perceivable, non-linguistic objects, we find occurrences in which it is employed to structure and organize talk as a situational event. Such usages correspond to what Ehlich (1979) defines as 'text deixis' and 'speech deixis', and partly to Levinson's (1983) use of the term 'discourse deixis', though it is important to note that in Romani a distinction is made between deictic reference to propositional and non-propositional aspects of talk. The *a*-deixis disregards the propositional content of utterances and is used instead to comment on their status as acts of speech.

The second dimension entails a distinction between general reference and its marked counterpart, discreteness. Discreteness is a highly specialized form of disambiguation applied in order to separate an intended referent from the class of two or more potential referents. Discrete forms are less frequent, hence the difficulty in defining their function within a structural framework. They may be characterized as intense, drawing attention to particular disambiguating features of the intended referent, and so often triggering a knowledge-scanning procedure aimed at retrieving particularizing information about it. Discreteness is not directly connected to spatial remoteness either, and indeed there are cases in which the two are directly opposed,

as in *kadka* ‘specifically here’ (cf. also Boretzky’s (1993: 48) definition of the demonstrative *kaka* as spatially and temporally nearest). Specialization, intensity, and semantic markedness lead to a partial de-regularization of the discrete deixis, in the sense that it is used to convey metaphorical, illocutionary, or even semi-lexicalized meanings.

There are two areas for which these facts of the Romani deictic system bear interesting implications: the first is the functional separation of deixis and anaphora, which in the literature has been related to the question of an analytical separation of speaking world and textual world in pragmatic theory (cf. Schiffrin, 1990). The second comprises methodological issues connected to the typological description of deictic systems and the posing of deictic primitives. The formal separation of functions in the Romani system suggests that universals of cognition and language-processing at least allow, and perhaps even promote, a mental separation of situation and context as distinct sources of shared knowledge in communication, although conventionalization of this distinction in the grammar is obviously language-specific. The functional overlap documented for various expressions in some languages may indeed indicate a counterpart tendency to deal with extra-linguistic and intra-linguistic realities as mutually constituent (see Schiffrin, 1990: 265), but this does not disclaim the cognitive ability to differentiate such realities, which ultimately may lead, as in Romani, to a corresponding codification in grammar.

A separate issue, however, is the distinction between deictic and anaphoric functions. The fact that in Romani reference within the linguistic context is formalized, but that the structures conveying this function constitute a sub-category of the deictic paradigm and are kept separate from anaphora (third person pronouns), suggests that there is more to the definition of anaphora than back-reference within the linguistic context. In fact, the *o*-deixis in Romani operates in what might be regarded as an autonomous domain, in which, as Cornish (1996: 38) puts it, deixis and anaphora are distinct in focal occurrences, but share a common indexical space. It is this area which Lyons (1979) calls ‘textual deixis’, and it is with reference to this functional domain that Rehbein (1995: 183) defines the deictic procedure as abstract movement aimed at the retrograde retrieval of an intensional fragment of knowledge.¹⁷ Thus, *o*-deixis and anaphora share reference to previously verbalized entities or to concepts that derive from them, but they differ in the function or procedure which they apply to their object of reference. Anaphora, to use Ehlich’s (1982: 329) terms, instructs the hearer to “treat a previously verbalized element as remaining in focus” and so to “sustain the previously obtained orientation of attention”. This is not, however, the function of the *o*-deixis, which conveys a transfer of focus. At the same time the differentiation of the deictic paradigm in Romani and the specialization of the *o*-deixis for contextual focus questions the inherent link which Ehlich (1979, 1982) postulates between deixis and situation, and suggests instead that source of knowledge, or referential or indexical space, ought to be separated analytically from referential func-

¹⁷ Cf. Rehbein (1995: 183): “... die Kategorie eines abstrakten Bewegens des retrograden Auffindens eines einschlägigen Wissenbezirks”.

tion or linguistic-mental procedure. This separation is of particular importance in discussing the 'grey area' of textual or discourse deixis.

This brings us to the issue of typological classification of indexical systems. One implication of the Romani arrangement of oppositions, as pointed out just above, is that deictic and anaphoric functions in the sense of focal occurrences (focus transfer vs. focus continuity) do not necessarily overlap neatly with the distinction between extra-linguistic reality and intra-linguistic context as indexical spaces. The extent to which each of these two dimensions is manifested structurally must be determined for each individual system (cf. Bolkestein et al., forthcoming). A second point pertains to the way in which a language chooses to disambiguate potential referents. In Romani, apart from specification of the source of knowledge about a referent, placing it in a pre-defined demonstration or indexical space, disambiguation stresses separation through specification and exclusion, labeled above 'discreteness'. Many languages evidently operate with an analogy to remoteness in actual space, and since spatial concepts are often assumed to model for more abstract relations, space is often taken as a deictic disambiguation primitive. Romani, with its highly differentiated system, shows that this is not universally the case, and that although one cannot exclude spatial analogies at an earlier stage in the evolution of the system, traces of such an analogy are not a necessary feature of a well-developed deictic paradigm.

References

- Anderson, Stephen and Edward Keenan, 1985. Deixis. In: T. Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. 3: Grammatical categories and the lexicon, 259–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blühdorn, Hardarik, 1995. Was ist Deixis? *Linguistische Berichte* 156: 109–142.
- Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, in print. Discourse organization and anaphora in Latin. In: S. Herring, P. van Reenen and L. Schoester, eds., *Textual parameters in older languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, M. Jocelyne Fernandez-Vest and Yaron Matras, forthcoming. Deixis and anaphora. In: G. Bernini, ed., *Pragmatic organization of discourse in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boretzky, Norbert, 1993. *Bugurdiž. Deskriptiver und historischer Abriß eines Romani-Dialekts*. Berlin and Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boretzky, Norbert, 1994. *Romani. Grammatik des Kalderaš-Dialekts mit Texten und Glossar*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Boretzky, Norbert, 1995. Interdialectal interference in Romani. In: Y. Matras, ed., *Romani in contact. The history, structure and sociology of a language*, 69–94. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Boretzky, Norbert and Birgit Iгла, 1994. *Wörterbuch Romani-Deutsch-Englisch. Mit einer Grammatik der Dialekt-Varianten*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule, 1983. *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brünner, Gisela and Gabriele Graefen, eds., 1994. *Texte und Diskurse. Methoden und Forschungsergebnisse der Funktionalen Pragmatik*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Bühler, Karl, 1934 [1982]. *Sprachtheorie*. Stuttgart: Fischer.
- Cornish, Francis, 1996. 'Antecedentless' anaphors: Deixis, anaphora, or what? Some evidence from English and French. *Linguistics* 32: 19–41.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1979. *Verwendungen der Deixis beim sprachlichen Handeln. Linguistisch-philologische Untersuchungen zum hebräischen deiktischen System*. Vol. I–II. Frankfurt: Lang.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1982. Anaphora and deixis: Same, similar, different? In: J.R. Jarvella and W. Klein, eds., *Speech, place and action*, 315–338. Chichester: Wiley.

- Ehlich, Konrad, 1983. Deixis und Anapher. In: G. Rauh, ed., *Essays on deixis*, 79–97. Tübingen: Narr.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1987. *So* – Überlegungen zum Verhältnis sprachlicher Formen und sprachlichen Handelns, allgemein und an einem widerspenstigen Beispiel. In: I. Rosengren, ed., *Sprache und Pragmatik (Lunder Symposium, 1986)*, 279–298. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell.
- Ehlich, Konrad, 1994. Funktionale Etymologie. In: G. Brunner and G. Graefen, eds., *Texte und Diskurse. Methoden und Forschungsergebnisse der Funktionalen Pragmatik*, 68–82. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Ehlich, Konrad and Jochen Rehbein, 1976. Halbinterpretative Arbeitstranskriptionen (HIAT). *Linguistische Berichte* 45: 21–46.
- Ehlich, Konrad and Jochen Rehbein, 1986. *Muster und Institution. Untersuchungen zur schulischen Kommunikation*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Ehlich, Konrad, J. Lachlan Mackenzie, Jochen Rehbein and Jan D. ten Thije, ed., 1994. *A German-Dutch-English glossary for work in functional pragmatics*. Ms., University of Amsterdam.
- Fillmore, Charles, 1972. Ansätze zu einer Theorie der Deixis. In: F. Kiefer, ed., *Semantik und generative Grammatik I*, 147–174. Frankfurt: Athenäum.
- Finck, Franz Nikolaus, 1903. *Lehrbuch des Dialekts der deutschen Zigeuner*. Marburg: Elwert.
- Fox, Barbara, 1987. *Discourse structure and anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, Angus, 1992. *The Gypsies*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Givón, Talmy, 1990. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Gjerdman, Olof and Erik Ljungberg, 1963. *The language of the Swedish coppersmith Gipsy Johan Dimitri Taikon*. Uppsala: Lundequist.
- Hübschmannová, Milena, Hana Šebková and Anna Žigová, 1991. *Romsko-Český a Česko-Romský kapesní slovník*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Kepeski, Krume and Šaip Jusuf, 1980. *Romani gramatika*. Skopje: Naša Kniga.
- Kirsner, Robert, 1979. Deixis in discourse: An explanatory quantitative study of the Modern Dutch demonstrative adjectives. In: T. Givón, ed., *Syntax and semantics*, Vol. 12: *Discourse and syntax*, 355–375. New York: Academic Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C., 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John, 1979. Deixis and anaphora. In: T. Myers, ed., *The development of conversation and discourse*, 88–103. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Matras, Yaron, 1994. *Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes. Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Miklosich, Franz, 1880. *Über die Mundarten und die Wanderungen der Zigeuner Europas XI: Wortbildungslehre der Zigeunermundarten*. Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- Poboźniak, Tadeusz, 1964. *Grammar of the Lovari dialect*. Kraków: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Rao, Aparna, 1975. Some Mānuš conceptions and attitudes. In: F. Rehfish, ed., *Gypsies, tinkers and other travellers*, 139–167. London: Academic Press.
- Redder, Angelika, 1990. *Grammatiktheorie und sprachliches Handeln: 'denn' und 'da'*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Rehbein, Jochen, 1977. *Komplexes Handeln. Elemente zur Handlungstheorie der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Rehbein, Jochen, 1995. Über zusammengesetzte Verweiswörter und ihre Rolle in argumentierender Rede. In: H. Wohlrapp, ed., *Wege der Argumentationsforschung*, 166–197. Frankfurt: Frommann-Holzboog.
- Sampson, John, 1926 [1968]. *The dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Schiffrin, Deborah, 1990. Between text and context: Deixis, anaphora, and the meaning of *then*. *Text* 10(3): 245–270.
- Schön, Gabriele, 1993. 'Aber er ist doch immer quer über die Rangiergleise gegangen'. Phorik in literarischen Erzählanfängen im Deutschen und Schwedischen. M.A.-dissertation, University of Hamburg.
- Smart, Bath C. and Thomas Henry Crofton, 1875. *The dialect of the English Gypsies*. London: Asher.
- Smith, John Charles, 1995. L'évolution sémantique et pragmatique des adverbs déictiques *ici, là et là-bas*. *Langue Française* 107: 43–57.
- Soravia, Giulio, 1977. *Dialetti degli Zingari Italiani. (Profilo dei dialetti italiani 22)*. Pisa: Pacini.

- Tálos, Endre, 1988. The language of Mihály Rostás. In: G. Grabócz and K. Kovalcsik, eds., *Mihály Rostás, a Gypsy Story-Teller*, 197–201. Budapest: MTA Néprajzi Kutató Csoport.
- Valet, Joseph, 1991. Grammatical sketch of Manouche. In: P. Bakker and M. Cortiade, eds., *In the margin of Romani. Gypsy languages in Contact (Studies in Language Contact 1)*, 106–131. Amsterdam: Institute for General Linguistics.
- Vries, Lourens de, 1995. Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in Wambon and some other Papuan languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24: 513–533.
- Wentzel, Tatjana, 1988. *Die Zigeunersprache*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.