

**Demonstratives (Dana Louagie, Uliège, F.R.S.-FNRS, KU Leuven & FWO Research Foundation Flanders)**

Louagie, Dana. 2023. Demonstratives. In Bower, Claire (ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Australian Languages*, 253-267. Oxford: OUP.

Postprint – author’s manuscript – [dana.louagie@uliege.be](mailto:dana.louagie@uliege.be)

## **1. Introduction**

This chapter<sup>1</sup> surveys demonstratives in Australian languages, discussing both their morphosyntax and semantic and pragmatic functions, with some notes on signs of grammaticalisation.

Demonstratives are deictic expressions that primarily serve to “focus the hearer’s attention on objects or locations in the speech situation” (Diessel 1999: 2), but may also have discourse-related functions like referent tracking. Demonstratives are universal (Diessel 1999, 2014), and Australian languages are no exception to this.

Demonstratives are mentioned or discussed in almost every grammatical description of an Australian language, but the available information ranges from a simple list of forms (especially in salvage grammars) to very detailed studies of forms, semantics and uses (e.g. Cutfield [2011] on Dalabon; Blythe et al. [2016] is a detailed study of gestures with direction-giving). There are no continent-wide surveys on demonstratives, apart from some short overviews in Dixon (2010 [1980]: 277; 2002: 68-70, 335-336), and in McGregor (2004: 125-126) on Kimberley languages. Louagie (2017) discusses adnominal demonstratives and other elements with determining functions from a syntactic viewpoint. Two seminal cross-linguistic studies on demonstratives, viz. Himmelmann (1996; see also 1997) and Diessel (1999), both include Australian data (Diessel has six Australian languages in a total sample of 85, and Himmelmann one in a text study of five languages).

This chapter is mainly based on my own data collection from the same 100-language sample used in my previous work (Louagie & Verstraete 2016; Louagie 2017, 2020); I have not done any detailed text studies on any of the languages. Overall, the focus will be on pronominal and adnominal demonstratives, while adverbial and identifying demonstratives will only be mentioned in passing (as I have not systematically collected data on these forms/contexts). The chapter does not include

---

<sup>1</sup> Work on this chapter was supported by project GOA/12/007 funded by the Research Council of the University of Leuven, and a postdoctoral grant from the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO). I want to thank the editor, Claire Bower, for her comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper.

discussion of other elements with spatial reference, like locationals ('up', 'side') or compass terms (but see e.g. Hoffmann 2017, in prep., *this volume*; Palmer et al. 2019).

The chapter is organised as follows: Section 2 covers the morphosyntax of demonstratives in Australian languages, discussing their form and use in nominal expressions, and section 3 focuses on their semantics and uses. Section 4 discusses some examples of potential grammaticalisation of demonstratives. Section 5 offers a short conclusion.

## 2. Morphosyntax

### 2.1. Free and bound forms

All languages in the sample have free-form demonstratives (there is no information for three languages). In a few languages, there is very minor evidence that some demonstratives sometimes behave like proclitics in adnominal use (although they are never transcribed or glossed as such). This evidence can be found in case marking patterns within nominal expressions: in these languages, case is only optionally marked on demonstratives, while the regular pattern predicts otherwise. For example, in Bardi, case is marked on the initial element of the nominal expression (as in (1a)), but when the demonstrative *jarrri* takes this initial position, the case marker can instead be expressed on the following noun (as in (1b)); this is only possible with ergative case (Bowern 2012: 347-350).<sup>2</sup>

(1) Bardi (Nyulnyulan; Bowern 2012: 348, 349)

- a. *Ginyinggi-nim aamba aarli i-n-am-boo-na.*  
 this-ERG man fish 3-TR-PST-poke-REM.PST<sup>3</sup>  
 'This man speared a fish.'
- b. *Jarri ngaarri-nim i-na-ng-gala=jarrmoordoo, anggi-nim... layoordoo-nim?*  
 this spirit-ERG 3-TR-PST=1M.DO what-ERG I.spirit-ERG  
 'What was this spirit came and visited us? Was it the what's-it? A layoordoo spirit?'

In addition to free forms, some languages also have bound forms with deictic and/or discourse-related functions. First, a few languages have purely deictic (exophoric) suffixes that can be added to

<sup>2</sup> Another potential analysis is that the demonstrative does not modify the noun in these sentences, but has an adverbial use; Bowern (2012: 350) is undecided between these two analyses.

<sup>3</sup> Glosses are based on the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie et al. 2015). Other abbreviations used are: I-IV noun classes, AMBIPH ambiphoric, ANAPH anaphoric, CATAPH cataphoric, CAUS causative verbalizer, CONTR contrastive focus, DEIC deictic suffix, DO direct object, EMPH emphatic, EP epenthetic morpheme, F father, FZ father's sister, H higher object, HABIT habitual, ID identifiable, INTENS intensifier, LIG possessor ligative, LL land gender, MF mother's father, MB mother's brother, MM mother's mother, NVIS non-visible, PRO personal pronoun, QUAL quality nominaliser, R/A realis/assertive, RDP reduplication, RECOG recognitional, REM.PST remote past, RESUM resumptive, SUBORD subordinate, UNF unfamiliar, UNM unmarked, VEG vegetable food, W celestial class.

nominals (and sometimes other elements). An example is Djinang, where a suffix *-ngu* can be added to demonstratives, nominals or verbs to “add extra deictic force” when pointing to an object or location, as illustrated in (2); it is frequently accompanied by lip-pointing (Waters 1989: 97). See sections 2.4 and 3.1 for other examples.

(2) Djinang (Yolngu; Waters 1989: 97)

*a mir ngunu gadjigarr-ngu ngurri-∅ kiri-mi,*  
 and like that.UNM [road-DEIC]NOM lie-PRS PROG-PRS  
*gadjigarr, nguli-gima*  
 [road.UNM that.LOC-EMPH]NOM  
 ‘Like that road situated there, the one right there.’

Second, several languages have one or more bound forms expressing endophoric relations like anaphoric or recognitional ones. These bound forms are usually added to demonstratives (see sections 3.3 and 3.4 for examples). Some languages also have specific forms to (re)introduce a referent in discourse (e.g. *-lha* in Diyari [Austin 1981: 186]; *=nene* in Emmi [Ford 1998: 115-120]). Finally, note that some languages have one or more bound forms expressing (in)definiteness or specificity. These are not further discussed here.

## 2.2. Distribution and categorial status

Demonstratives occur in four syntactic contexts (Diessel 1999: 57-92): as independent pronouns in argument positions (pronominal), as modifiers to nouns (adnominal), as locational adverbs (adverbial), and in copular or nonverbal clauses (identifying). If demonstratives with a specific distribution can also be formally distinguished, they belong to a separate category (demonstrative pronouns, determiners, adverbs and identifiers, respectively).

In almost all languages of the sample, the same form(s) can be used both pronominally and adnominally. In other words, there is only one category with multiple distributional possibilities. An example is Arrernte (Wilkins 1989: 111, examples), as illustrated in (3), where (3a) shows pronominal use of the proximal demonstrative *nhenhe*, and (3b) its adnominal use.

(3) Arrernte (Arandic; Wilkins 1989: 362, 167)

a. *Unte peke diabetes-kerte, nhenhe-le nge-nhe rlkerte mpware-tyeke.*  
 2SG.S maybe diabetes-PROP, this-ERG 2SG-ACC sick make-PURP  
 ‘If you have diabetes, then this is going to make you sick.’

b. *Ampe nhenhe-le nge-nhe ke-me/anperne-me ipmenhe-∅.*

child this-ERG 2SG-ACC cut-NPST.PROG/call(kin)-NPST.PROG granny(MM)-NOM  
 'This child calls you granny.'

In a handful of languages, however, pronominal and adnominal demonstratives only partly overlap, in the sense that some forms can be used both pronominally and adnominally, while others are restricted to one or other use. In Umpila, only one of the three pronominal demonstratives can be used adnominally too (and then loses its meaning in terms of deictic contrast with other forms; instead it functions as an anaphoric or recognitional determiner, see section 3.3) (Hill 2018: 133). In Bilinearra, the proximal and distal forms can function pronominally (as in (4a)) and adnominally (as in (4b)) (and adverbially), while the recognitional demonstrative can only function adnominally (as in (4c)) (and adverbially) (Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 169-185).

(4) Bilinearra (Ngumpin-Yapa; Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 172, 190, 178)

a. **Nyawa-nggu** na biyarrb yuwa-ni na.  
 this-ERG FOC report put-PST FOC

'This one reported (about the fight).'

b. *Ngana=warla nyawa munuwu?*  
 who=FOC this country

'What is the name of this country?' (Lit. Who is this country?)

c. **Nyanawu marluga, murlu-wu=rni=rla marru.**  
 RECOG old.man this-DAT=only=3OBL house

'You know that old man, the house is only for this one.'

Sometimes the split between pronominal and adnominal forms may not be very clear-cut synchronically, but it may have a diachronic basis. In Kuuk Thaayorre, there are two sets of demonstratives which can be used both in pronominal and in adnominal contexts. The diachronic and formal evidence suggests that they were originally each dedicated to one of the functions, but this split is no longer straightforward synchronically (Gaby 2017: 178). Gaby speculates that the 'pronominal' form *inh'nhul* 'this very one' may historically derive from the compounding of the 'adnominal' form *inh* and the third person singular *nhul*.

In a number of languages, the same (pronominal and adnominal) demonstrative forms can also be used adverbially. This is illustrated for Arrernte in (5); see (3) above for examples of other uses. In some languages, a locative or other locational case is (optionally or obligatorily) added for adverbial use. In Warrongo, for example, the pronominal/adnominal demonstrative can function adverbially in its bare form (as in (6a)), or in any of the locational cases (as in (6b)) (Tsunoda 2011: 180-181). Note

that ambiguity can arise for examples like (6a), which can also be interpreted as involving an adnominal use of the demonstrative; see the alternative translation in brackets.

(5) Arrernte (Arandic; Wilkins 1989: 111)

*Re re-nhe tyerre-ke nhenhe nthurre.*  
 3SG.A 3SG-ACC shoot-PST.COMPL here INTENS  
 ‘He shot it right here (at this place).’

(6) Warrongo (Maric; Tsunoda 2011: 161, 181)

a. *yari-∅ yarra nyina-n.*  
 kangaroo-NOM this,here sit-NFUT  
 ‘A kangaroo is sitting here’ (or ‘This kangaroo is sitting’)

b. *nyawa ngali-∅=goli yarro-n-da wonaja wona-n*  
 NEG 1DU-NOM=only this-LINK-LOC camping.out lie-NFUT  
 ‘No. Only we two are camping here.’

In many languages, demonstrative adverbs form a separate category, although they may be related to the pronominal/adnominal forms (e.g. using the same deictic stems). In some languages, this relation is transparent and one set clearly derives from the other. An example is Umpila (Hill 2018: 115-116), where pronominal/adnominal forms can be derived from demonstrative adverbs by adding the suffix *-lu* (glossed DM ‘demonstrative marker’). This is possible for four of the five forms; the fifth form is also neutral in terms of distance. (7a) shows an example with a demonstrative adverb and (7b) with a pronominal demonstrative. The opposite pattern is found in Paakantyi (Hercus 1982: 172-173), where adverbs are derived from pronominal/adnominal forms by adding the suffix *-ra* (which is restricted to this function), the suffix *-ga* (which is also used in locational adverbs), or one of the suffixes expressing movement towards/away from.

(7) Umpila (Middle Paman; Hill 2018: 116)

a. *ngatha ngachimu kalma-n ngungku kungka-lu*  
 1SG.GEN MF come-NFUT DEM.DIST2 north-ABL  
 ‘my grandfather come from there far, from the north-east’

b. *wa’ali-ngka ngungku-lu mayi ngawura apalpi-ngka*  
 dig.PROG-PRS.CONT DEM.DIST2-DM food plant.sp gather.PROG-PRS.CONT  
 ‘those ones over there (old women) were always digging (yams) and gathering the red fruit’

In other languages, the relation between adverbial and pronominal forms is less transparent. An example is Panyjima (Dench 1991: 160-162), which has separate sets of adverbial and pronominal/adnominal forms (next to a third set that allows all uses), all involving a three-way deictic



*Nyawa=ma warlagu ya-ni gamurr ngayiny-ja.*  
 this=TOP dog go-PST go.past 1MIN.DAT-LOC  
 ‘This is (a picture of) a dog walking past me.’

### 2.3. Inflectional possibilities

#### 2.3.1. Case

In the majority of languages, demonstratives can inflect for case. There are two sets of languages where they cannot (or only to a limited extent). One is the set of languages that have no core case marking overall and are often limited in possibilities for non-core case marking too (13 languages out of 100, see Louagie & Verstraete [2016: 70-71]). In only five of these languages is non-core case marking attested on demonstratives in pronominal use (Anindilyakwa [Van Egmond 2012: examples], Burarra [Green 1987: examples], Emmi [Ford 1998: 144], Ungarinyin [Spronck 2015: 33], Worrorra [Clendon 2014: examples]), and in only one (Anindilyakwa) also in adnominal use. The other set are seven languages in which (some or all) demonstratives never take case marking even though these languages are otherwise fully dependent-marking. Four of them are in Cape York (Kuuk Thaayorre adnominal forms [Gaby 2017: 187], Rimanggudinhma [Godman 1993: 64], Umpila [Hill 2018: 131, examples], Yir Yoront [Alpher 1973: 53]), and another two along the southeast coast (Duungidjawu some forms [Kite & Wurm 2004: 55-62], Gumbaynggir [Eades 1979: 289-290]). The last language is Alawa (one set [Sharpe 1972: 66-67]).

In languages with demonstratives capable of taking case markers, whether or not they effectively inflect for case in adnominal use of course in part depends on the language’s general case marking pattern in nominal expressions. First, 26 languages always have case on adnominal demonstratives: 24 have case on each element in the nominal expression, including the demonstrative (although in four languages, the case marker is optionally left out on the demonstrative)<sup>4</sup>, another language has a choice between word marking and case only on the modifiers (Ngarrindjeri [Yallop 1975: 29]), and the last language has a choice between word marking and right-edge marking, with the demonstrative always constituting the final element of a nominal expression (Wajarri [Douglas 1981: 240-244]). Second, in 4 languages, demonstratives are inherently capable of taking case markers, but in adnominal use they never do because this is incompatible with the regular case marking pattern.

---

<sup>4</sup> 26 languages have word marking (Louagie & Verstraete 2016: 69-70), but demonstratives in Gumbaynggir do not inflect (see above), and there is no information for Wathawurrung.

For example, in Dalabon, nominal expressions show head marking, so adnominal demonstratives do not inflect for case, as in (12a), while demonstratives in pronominal use do, as in (12b).

(12) Dalabon (Gunwinyguan; Cutfield 2011: 122, 88)

- a. *kowk-dih-kun marlaworr-yih kanh yil-* --  
 house-PRIV-DAT leaf-INS DEM.ID (1PL>3)(trunc)  
 ‘without houses, with (only!) those leaves we --’
- b. *kanh-kun balah-durr-inj kanh-kun bulu-ngan nah-ngan*  
 DEM.ID-DAT 3PL-R/A-argue-PST.IPFV DEM.ID-DAT father-1SG.POSS mother-1SG.POSS  
 ‘they would fight each other about that (one) my father and mother (and aunt: MZ) for that (reason)’

Third, in 41 languages, adnominal demonstratives only sometimes inflect for case, and sometimes not. For example, Arrernte has right-edge case marking (Wilkins 1989: 102), so only when the demonstrative is in final position does it inflect for case, as in (13a); compare with (13b) where it is the final pronoun that is inflected for case.

(13) Arrernte (Arandic; Wilkins 1989: 188, 111)

- a. *Ampe-nge-ntyele ayenge tnengkerre nhenhe-ke kaltye.*  
 child-ABL-ONWARDS 1SG.S Dreamtime.story this-DAT know  
 ‘I’ve known this Dreamtime story since childhood.’
- b. *Artwe kngerre nhenhe re kere aherre tyerre-ke.*  
 man big this 3SG.A game kangaroo shoot-PST.COMPL  
 ‘This big man shot a kangaroo.’

Another example is Oykangand, which usually has right-edge marking (14a), but when the nominal expression consists of a demonstrative plus a noun, case can also be marked on the left element (14b) or on both elements (14c) (Hamilton 1996: 20).

(14) Oykangand (Southwest Paman; Hamilton 1996: 20; cited in Louagie & Verstraete 2106: 44)

- a. *aber unggul-gh uw*  
 woman DEM.DIST-PURP give  
 ‘Give it to that woman there.’
- b. *aber-agh unggul uw*  
 woman-PURP DEM.DIST give
- c. *aber-agh unggul-gh uw*  
 woman-PURP DEM.DIST-PURP give



A final example is Yankunytjatjara, which interestingly allows the demonstrative to be either inside or outside the (right-edge) case marker. When it is inside case marking, it has a restrictive meaning (as in 15a), while it has a non-restrictive meaning outside case marking, in which case it merely “adds the comment *you know the one*” (as in 15b) (Goddard 1985: 55-56).

(15) Yankunytjatjara (Wati; Goddard 1985: 55)

- a. ***punu nyara apara pulka-ngka nyina-kati-ngu***  
 tree over.there river-gum big-LOC sit-PROCESS-PST  
 ‘(It) landed on/stopped near that big river-gum tree over there.’
- b. ***kungka-ngku wati-ngka panya tjapi-nu***  
 woman-ERG man-LOC ANAPH ask-PST  
 ‘The woman asked the man, you know the one.’

Two final notes are in order. The first is on case allomorphs: while some languages use regular case allomorphs with demonstratives (e.g. Jaminjung [Schultze-Berndt 2000: 54, examples]), some have separate allomorphs (e.g. Djambarrpuyngu has distinct suffixes for certain cases [Wilkinson 1991: 227-228]; Yuwaalaraay has suppletive demonstrative forms [Giacon 2014: 165, 170]), or can only attach the regular case allomorphs to a suppletive demonstrative form (e.g. Bilinarra, esp. senior speakers [Meakins & Nordlinger 2013: 169-172]). The second note is on case alignment in languages with split systems (see also Dixon 2010 [1980]: 277). In some languages demonstratives pattern with nominals in ergative alignment (e.g. Guugu Yimidhirr [Haviland 1979: 28, 73], Warrongo [Tsunoda 2011: 1, 173]) and in others with personal pronouns in accusative alignment (e.g. Wajarri [Marmion 1996: 34, 72]). In several languages they form a separate class with a tripartite system, as in Yidiny (Dixon 1977: 2) or Wambaya (Nordlinger 1998: 2, 107).

### 2.3.2. Noun class

In most languages that have systems of noun class marking, demonstratives also inflect for noun class (viz. 26 out of 33 [Louagie 2020: 48-60]; in Alawa only particular sets). This is illustrated in (16) from Mawng, where the adnominal demonstrative *tuka* agrees with the head noun ‘tooth’ for land gender (gloss LL).

(16) Mawng (Iwaidjan; Singer 2006: 31)

- Tuka ta nga-yigi nganng-arajpu-n.***  
 DEM.P.LL ART 1SG-tooth 3GEN/1SG-feel.pain-NPST  
 ‘This tooth of mine is hurting.’

In two of these languages, demonstratives only optionally show noun class agreement with the head noun, viz. Marrithiyel (Green 1997) and Ngan’gityemerri (Reid 1997). This is a general characteristic of the classification system rather than a special feature of the demonstrative: example (17) shows how the (free-form) noun class marker/classifier<sup>5</sup> is optional overall.

(17) Ngan’gityemerri (Southern Daly; Reid 1997: 177)

<b>(tyin)</b>	<b>gan’gun</b>	<b>(tyin)</b>	<b>kinyi</b>	<i>nganam-garri-fulirr-ngirim</i>
WOOMERA	fish.spear.woomera	WOOMERA	this	1SG.S:AUX-leg-rub-1SG.S:sit
	<i>gugarra</i>			
	red.ochre			

‘I am rubbing ochre into the length of this fish spear-type woomera.’

Eight languages do not have noun class marking on demonstratives, but only on adjectives and/or personal pronouns modifying the head noun. See Skilton (*this volume*) on noun class systems more generally.

### 2.3.3. Number

In roughly half of the languages, demonstratives can inflect for number. In many languages, number marking is overall limited in two ways: it can be restricted to referents higher on the animacy hierarchy (e.g. only for human referents), and/or it can be optional (see Louagie 2020: 90-99). In a few languages, the plural form of demonstratives is only available in absolutive case (e.g. Guugu Yimidhurr [Haviland 1979: 74], Kuku Yalanji [Patz 2002: 84]). Number marking is obligatory in a number of languages, e.g. when it is part of the gender paradigm (e.g. Ungarinyin [Spronck 2015: 33]), but also in some other languages, like Yankunytjatjara (Goddard 1985: 53).

### 2.3.4. Person

In a few (non-Pama-Nyungan) languages, it seems that demonstratives can carry pronominal prefixes. In Dalabon, this is only possible when they serve as predicate, as illustrated in (18). In Anindilyakwa, this is also possible in non-predicate functions: the demonstratives can be used in apposition to a free pronoun (19a), or “alone with human reference instead of a pronoun” (19b) (van Egmond 2012: 88); this is also possible in Burarra (Green 1987: 12-13, examples). Note that some

---

<sup>5</sup> The classification system in these languages shows characteristics of both noun class and classifier systems (Green 1997; Reid 1997).

other languages also use pronominal prefixes on non-verbal predicates, but it is often unclear whether this includes demonstrative predicates.<sup>6</sup>

(18) Dalabon (Gunwinyguan; Cutfield 2011: 112)

*ka-h-nunda*

3SG-R/A-DEM.here

'This is it/the one'

(19) Anindilyakwa (Gunwinyguan; van Egmond 2012: 88)

a. ***Nungkuwa nvngk-akina akwalya.***

2.PRO            2-that            NEUT.fish

'you are a fish'

b. ***kvm-angkv-rna            mvnhvnga            nvngk-akina***

IRR.2/VEG-fetch-NPST2    VEG.burrawang    2-that

'you will fetch the burrawang'

#### 2.4. Relation to third person pronouns

In a relatively small number of languages, the boundary between demonstratives and personal pronouns is blurry (see also Louagie & Verstraete [2015: 162-163]). First, three of the Karnic languages, viz. Diyari, Pitta-Pitta and Yandruwandha, have no distinct demonstrative pronouns or modifiers, but they have sets of deictic suffixes which can be added to third person pronouns, when used alone or adnominally (Austin 2013 [1981]: 65-68; Blake 1979: 193-194; Breen 2004: 94).<sup>7</sup> This is illustrated in (20a) from Diyari, where a third person pronoun with deictic suffix functions as a modifier of the noun *mankarra* 'girl'; compare with (20b), which shows a similar structure but without a deictic suffix. Note that some of the deictic suffixes in Diyari can also be added to nominals and demonstrative adverbs (some of which can also be used adnominally), as illustrated in (20c). The use of these suffixes is optional in all three languages, but in Pitta-Pitta they are almost always used, and the mid-distance suffix also serves as the 'unmarked' choice, indicating definiteness (Blake 1979: 193-194, p.c.).

(20) Diyari (Karnic; Austin 2013 [1981]: 114, 107, 59)

---

<sup>6</sup> Bowern (2012: 402-409, p.c.) notes that the attachment of predicate pronouns (e.g. =*ngay* 1MIN) to the demonstrative *jarrri* is the historical source of a second predicate pronoun set (e.g. =*jarrngay* 1MIN), which is used only in contexts of topicality.

<sup>7</sup> The fourth Karnic language in the sample, Arabana/Wangkangurru, has demonstratives which are clearly separate from third person pronouns (Hercus 1994: 110-114, 119-126).

- a. *nhani-ya*            *mankarra*    *ngumu*    *marla*  
 3SGF.NOM-near    girl.NOM        good        very  
 ‘This girl is very good’
- b. *nhani*            *mankarra*    *nhintha*    *pani*  
 3SGF.NOM        girl.NOM        shame        none  
 ‘The girl is shameless.’
- c. *thana*            *kupa*            *ngama-yi*    *nhaka-ya*        *ngura-nhi-ya*  
 3PL.NOM        child.NOM        sit-PRS        there-LOC-near    camp-LOC-near  
 ‘The children are sitting there in the camp’

Second, in at least another 10 languages, there are no free third person pronouns (or only plural ones) and demonstratives seem to fill the gap(s). The extent to which these forms are integrated in the pronominal system varies. In Yindjibarndi, for example, the demonstratives seem well-integrated, and are actually described as third person forms showing a three-way deictic contrast. There are singular, dual and plural forms, and the dual contrasts same-generation and opposite-generation (as do the first and second dual pronouns) (Wordick 1982: 71-76). Mangarrayi also shows signs of integration: not all third person forms show a deictic contrast (e.g. genitive and dative/purposive forms do not), and the forms inflect like pronouns do (Merlan 1989: 52-53). An example where the demonstratives are less well-integrated in the pronominal system is Nhandu. In this language, a deictic contrast is found in singular, dual and plural number, and the forms “function as discourse pronouns”, but they inflect like nominals (ergative alignment and other nominal inflections) and not like first and second person pronouns (accusative alignment) (Blevins 2001: 72-74). Martuthunira has a third person plural pronoun (which has a very restricted use), and in addition a set of demonstratives which can be also marked for plural number (Dench 1994: 100, 103, 109-112). Some of these observations may be related to a typologically frequent grammaticalisation pathway leading from demonstratives to third person pronouns (see e.g. Himmelmann 1997: 30; Diessel 1999: 119-120); see also section 4.

## 2.5. Use in nominal expressions

### 2.5.1. Word order tendencies

Adnominal demonstratives show a general tendency to precede the head of the nominal expression.<sup>8</sup> Of the 25 languages in the sample that have a fixed position for demonstratives, 15 have it preceding

---

<sup>8</sup> There is no information for 7 languages.

the head. Of the 68 languages that have a flexible position for demonstratives, 33 show a moderate to strong tendency for a position preceding the head, and only 6 for a position following the head (the other 29 show no clear preference).

In addition, demonstratives overall tend to occur at the edge of a nominal expression (in the languages for which we have information on the relative order of modifiers). If they do not occur at the edge, it is almost always other determining elements (like personal or possessive pronouns) that do, as illustrated in (21) for Anguthimri. This tendency for edge position for determiners is explained by Rijkhoff (2002: 313) in terms of a Principle of Scope: “modifiers tend to occur next to the part of the expression that they have in their scope,” and since determiners have the broadest scope of all types of modifiers, they occur at the edges. Non-edge position for determining elements is attested in only eight languages (see Louagie 2020: 234-236). This is illustrated in (22) for Jaminjung, which allows demonstratives to occur between the head and a following modifier. A few grammars give examples of the mirror pattern, where the demonstrative occurs between the head and a preceding modifier, as illustrated in (23). However, these examples are mostly given in isolation, so it is uncertain whether they are truly nominal expressions, or could alternatively be analysed as verbless clauses (‘that water is sweet’).

(21) Anguthimri (Northern Paman; Crowley 1981: 177)

*lu druʔa yedji dre:ni-geni-ni*  
 he.S this wind.S different-INCH-PST  
 ‘The wind has changed (= is now different).’

(22) Jaminjung (Mindi; Schultze-Berndt 2000: 45)

*ngayin=gun thanthu burrb gani-bida ngarrgina\*  
 meat=CONTR DEM finish 3SG>3SG-FUT:eat 1SG.POSS...  
**wirib thanthu mangurrb-bari**  
 dog DEM black-QUAL  
 ‘it will eat up that meat of mine ... that black dog’

(23) Muruwari (Muruwari; Oates 1988: 87)

*pitara ngaRa ngapa*  
 good that water  
 ‘sweet water’

These observations are also generally in line with the cross-linguistic tendencies for word order in nominal expressions as observed by Dryer (2007: 111-113; 2018). For example, when a demonstrative and an adjective both precede the head, the demonstrative is in initial position. When they both follow, the demonstrative is usually in final position, but not always. (See also Greenberg's universal 20 [1966: 87].) This means that non-edge position of demonstratives following the head (as in (22) above) are not unexpected cross-linguistically. Examples like (23), however, with adjective-demonstrative-noun order are not attested in Dryer's (2018) sample (although, as mentioned above, these examples should be treated with care).

### 2.5.2. Determiner slots

In Louagie (2017), I argued that a quarter to half of the languages in the 100-language sample have determiner slots, viz. a dedicated position in the nominal expression for determiners, which mark the identifiability status of the referent (see also [chapter 25\[NP\]](#)). In all of these languages, demonstratives can occur in such a determiner slot (for a few languages no information is available on the position of adnominal demonstratives). An example is found in (24) for Martuthunira, with (24a) showing the template for noun phrases, and (24b) an example of a demonstrative occurring in the Determiner slot. It is common for multiple elements to co-occur in a single determiner slot. For example, demonstratives frequently co-occur with possessive pronouns (as in (25a)) or personal pronouns (as in (25b), and (21) above) (see Louagie [2017] for more examples and discussion). Note, however, that determiners are largely optional in Australian languages (with only a few exceptions), in the sense that nominal expressions without determiners can be interpreted as definite or indefinite, or specific or non-specific.

(24) Martuthunira (Ngayarta; Dench 1994: 189, 191)

a. NP template:

(Determiner) (Quantifier) (Classifier) Entity (Qualifier(s))

b. *Kampa-rninyji-rru ngurnaa marli-ngka-a ngamari-i.*

burn-FUT-NOW that.ACC paper-LOC-ACC tobacco-ACC

'Now light that 'paper-rolled tobacco' (a cigarette as opposed to a plug of chewing tobacco).'

(25)a. Yalarnnga (Kalkatungic; Breen & Blake 2007: 30)

*Nhangu-ta nhawa nhina-ma tjarru-nguta ngatha-langki-ya mutu-ngka.*

what-PURP 2SG remain-PRS this-LOC 1SG-LIG-LOC camp-LOC

'Why are you in my camp?'

b. Mawng (Iwaidjan; Forrester 2015: 61)

*naka-pa*                      *yanat-apa*                      *wurakak*    *awuni-arrikpa-n*  
DEM:DIST.M-EMPH      3M.PRON-EMPH      crow              3M>3PL-ruin-NPST  
'That crow ruined them.'

Interestingly, in a few languages, demonstratives may also occur in a non-determiner position in the nominal expression, in which case the location of the referent is simply provided as an attribute. An example is given in (26) for Gooniyandi, where the demonstrative occurs in the position for qualifiers (following the head noun). It is used in a pointing context.

(26)Gooniyandi (Bunuban; McGregor 1990: 268)

*ngoonyjoo*    *ngirndaji*    *waranggila*    *dina-yawoo*  
tobacco      this              I:hold:it              dinner-ALL  
'I keep this tobacco until dinner-time.' (accompanied by lip-pointing at the actual object)

For the rest of the languages, no dedicated determiner slot was identified, because there was evidence against such an analysis (25 languages), because the evidence was mixed (13 languages), or because there was simply no sufficient information available either way (for example because there is no or insufficient information on the ordering of particular elements within the nominal expression) (13 languages).

### 3. Semantics and use

#### 3.1. Exophoric function: spatial (and non-spatial) deixis

Exophoric demonstratives refer to entities in the speech situation and (usually) locate them in the real world (e.g. Diessel 1999: 6), for example by invoking a deictic contrast or encoding features like visibility and location with respect to the geographical surroundings. Australian languages generally have exophoric demonstratives expressing a two- to four-way deictic contrast (cf. also Dixon 2002: 335).<sup>9</sup> A two-way contrast is most common in the sample, and a three-way contrast almost equally common. A four-way contrast only occurs in a handful of languages. Languages may have multiple sets of demonstratives, which need not all involve the same contrast. An example was given in (9) above for Kuuk Thaayorre, where the adverbial and adnominal demonstratives have three contrastive forms, while the pronominal ones only have two.

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that for quite a few languages (especially in salvage grammars), only a list of forms accompanied by a translation is given; it is not always clear what their semantics and functions precisely are.

Deictic contrast is often based on distance from the deictic centre, i.e. the speaker or the immediately surrounding space. An example of a three-way system based on distance is found in Nhanda; (27) shows the basic forms. An example of a four-way system is Paakantyi (28). For Wadjiginy, the distance contrast is described in terms of what is ‘tangible’, ‘audible’ or ‘visible’ (Ford 1990: 104). In Worrorra, the deictic contrast is organised slightly differently: in addition to the proximal (=n) and distal (=rno) forms, used for referents in the immediate vicinity of the deictic centre and beyond it respectively, there is a ‘lateral’ form =rru for referents “that are both beyond the immediate vicinity of the speech event, and at the side of, or behind its participants” (Clendon 2014: 161, Fig. 7.1). Another interesting example is Emmi, for which Ford (1998: 143) argues that not the speaker, but the addressee forms the deictic centre.

(27)Nhanda (Nhanda; Blevins 2001: 72)

- inya* ‘this’ (closest to speaker)
- ala* ‘that’ (medium distance from speaker)
- anha* ‘that.dist’ (farthest distance from speaker)

(28)Paakantyi (Paakantyi; Hercus 1982: 121)

- giigi/gidu* ‘this’ (right here)
- gaŋa* ‘this’ (round about here)
- giŋa* ‘that’ (some distance away)
- yuna/nuna* ‘that’ (far away)

A handful of languages have derived or related forms to express vagueness or imprecision with respect to the location. For example, Martuthunira basic demonstrative adverbs involve a two-way contrast between *yilangu* ‘here’ and *ngulangu* ‘there’; the related forms *yilarla* and *ngularla* express non-specific locations (‘somewhere here’, ‘somewhere there’) (Dench 1994: 124). A related phenomenon is found in Arrernte, which makes a distinction between two demonstrative series in terms of certainty: “whether or not a person is asserting that they are ‘certain’ that something is in a particular location or whether or not they are just guessing that it is there” (Wilkins 1989: 111). These series are listed in (29). Wilkins notes that young speakers only use the ‘certain’ series.

(29)Arrernte (Arandic; Wilkins 1989: 111)

- a. “certain”:        *nhenhe* (proximal);        *yanhe* (medial);        *nhakwe* (distal)
- b. “uncertain”:    *nhengekenhe* (proximal);    *yalange* (medial);    *nhawerne* (distal)

Deictic contrast needn’t always involve distance, however. For example, Cutfield (2011: 9, 234-242) argues that for Dalabon it is not distance that plays a role, but rather what is construed as being



in the ‘here-space’ (which is only specified for location and not for distance; see also Enfield [2003]). Note that there is also no symmetry between this form and the form referring to the ‘there-space’ (which is not often used). Another example is Umpila, which has a demonstrative adverbial *kuuna* that is not part of the distance-series. It expresses “the maintenance or persistence of a location by the entity that the demonstrative anchors”; this is typologically unusual (Hill 2018: 140). A few other languages have a so-called person-oriented system, where three contrastive elements do not only take the deictic centre as reference point, but also the location of the addressee. An example is Tiwi; the basic demonstrative forms are given in (30).

(30)Tiwi (Tiwi; Lee 1987: 117)

- na(n)ki* ‘close to the speaker’
- niyi* ‘close to the addressee’
- nayi* ‘distant from the speaker and addressee’

Several languages also have a form that is specifically used when pointing to a referent or location (in addition to forms indicating distance). In Arrernte, for example, *alartekwenhe* refers to an entity that is not close to the speaker or addressee, and is always accompanied by a gesture like pointing; it is used exophorically only (in contrast to the forms expressing distance from the deictic centre) (Wilkins 1989: 113-114). Similarly, in Mangarrayi, *apu* refers to ‘that, there; as indicated by gesture’ (Green 1989: 391). (Compare also to the bound form in Djinang, as illustrated in (2).)

Visibility is another type of feature that may be encoded. A handful of languages have a single form which is used for referents that are invisible, next to a series of two or three other forms expressing distance or person-oriented deixis. An example is Walmajarri, which has the form *yala(rti)* ‘that not visible’ in addition to the forms *minya(rti)* ‘this’, *mula(rti)* ‘this’ and *nyana(rti)* ‘that’ (Richards 1979: 106). In addition, four or five other languages have not one, but a series of invisible forms (cross-cutting the feature of distance). Panyjima, for instance, has two invisible forms, listed in (30a), in addition to three forms that are neutral with respect to visibility (30b); see also example (8b) above. (In)visibility is understood from the perspective of the speaker (it can be visible to the hearer, audible or remembered), which could explain why there is no addressee-proximate invisible form (Dench 1991: 161). The list of demonstratives given for Kala Lagaw Ya suggests that the ‘invisible’ forms are derived from the ‘visible’ demonstratives by adding a suffix *-bi* (Ford & Ober 1991: 137): for example, the proximal, ‘in view’ form (masc.) is *in*, and the ‘not in view’ form is *inubi*; the distal, ‘in view’ form (masc.) is *senaw*, and the ‘not in view’ form is *senawbi*.

(31)Panyjima (Ngayarta; Dench 1991: 161)

- a. *nyinyji* ‘near me (invis)’; *ngunyji* ‘far (invis)’

- b. *nyiya* ‘near me’; *panha* ‘near you’; *ngunha* ‘far’

Another set of features that may be encoded have to do with geographical surroundings and other spatial relations. Overall, it seems uncommon for these types of features to be encoded in demonstratives, and they are more commonly expressed in a separate set of locationals (although the boundary between the two is not always clear). The best-known example is the bound forms in Dyirbal which can be added to demonstratives, and refer to entities ‘downhill’ or ‘uphill’ (each with a three-way contrast for distance), ‘downriver’ or ‘upriver’ (two forms contrastive for distance each), ‘across the river’, ‘up’, ‘down’, etc. (Dixon 1972: 48). Ngiyambaa also has some bound forms, including ones expressing ‘up’ and ‘down’, which can only be added to the distal demonstrative (Donaldson 1980: 139-143). An example is given in (32). A final example is Wardaman, which has three adverbial demonstratives *dan.guyugun*, *nan.guyugun* and *dangguyugun* for ‘immediate: this side’, ‘proximate: that side’, and ‘remote: yonder side’ respectively; they are built on the same stems as the pronominal/adnominal forms expressing distance but the rest of the form is not transparent (Merlan 1994: 144-145).

(32) Ngiyambaa (Central New South Wales; Donaldson 1980: 141)

*bala*      *ŋalu-dhar=na*      *balan-ga*      *waŋa-nha*  
 head.ABS    that.INS-down=3ABS    head-LOC    stand-PRS  
 ‘She is standing head downwards, on (her) head.’

A few languages also have forms that encode a quality or type. Yidiny (Dixon 1977: 197-199) is a good example: it has a demonstrative series *yinŋarinj* ‘this kind of’, as illustrated in (33).<sup>10</sup> In Martuthunira, the predicative demonstrative *yimpala* is used “to refer to a known property of some participant in the text” (Dench 1994: 126); it can also be used adnominally, as in (34). Finally, in Guugu Yimidhirr, the plural forms of the demonstratives can also be interpreted as indicating a quality (*yinharrin* ‘these, this kind’ and *nhanharrin* ‘those, that kind’; they only occur in the absolutive) (Haviland 1979: 74).

(33) Yidiny (Yimidhirr-Yalanji-Yidinic; Dixon 1977: 197)

*ŋayu*    *dubu:rđi*                      *mayim*      *yinŋarimu*      *buga-:đi-ŋum*  
 1.S/A    stomach.COM.ABS    food.CAUS    this.sort.CAUS    eat-:đi-CAUS.SUBORD  
 ‘I’m full from eating this sort of food.’

(34) Martuthunira (Ngayarta; Dench 1994: 126)

<sup>10</sup> Note that it also has an interrogative form *waŋđarinj* ‘what kind of’.

*Ngana ngunhaa wartirra thurlamanta? Ngayu mir.ta wiru*  
 who that.NOM woman nose 1SG.NOM not like  
***yimpala-ngara-a wartirra-ngara-a.***  
 like.that-PL-ACC woman-PL-ACC

'Who is that nose woman? I don't like women who are like that.'

A number of languages (all non-Pama-Nyungan) have 'dynamic' forms in addition to 'static' ones, i.e. forms expressing not mere location but movement towards or from a location. For example, Anindilyakwa has a demonstrative *-bukaya* meaning 'this one approaching speaker and addressee' (van Egmond 2012: 389). Warray has two directional adverbials *kutta* 'this way' (movement towards the speaker) and *njipa* 'that way' (movement away from or lateral to the speaker) (Harvey 1986: 101, 106-107). Example (35) shows how the directional *kutta* is combined with a non-directional demonstrative *angilak* and a locational *letpal* 'close'. A final example is Marra (Heath 1981: 143-144, 152-154), which can also express a contrast between 'centripetal' and 'non-centripetal' motion by means of suffixes (*-ñingar* and *-ñindi* resp.) that are added to pronominal/adnominal or adverbial demonstratives.

(35)Warray (Gunwinyguan; Harvey 1986: 106)

*yanj kutta angilak letpal njek:-u-lik*  
 come.IMP this.way over.here close 1SG-OBL-LOC

'Come this way over here and (sit) close to me.'

Finally, there are a few forms expressing non-spatial relations (or combined spatial and non-spatial ones); they often have both exophoric and endophoric uses.<sup>11</sup> For example, Jaminjung (Schultze-Berndt 2000: 49) has a form *JanJu* (adnominal) /*JanJiya* (adverbial) specifically for establishing a referent that is present in the speech situation; the same form is also used anaphorically. Garrwa (Mushin 2012: 127-128) has a suffix *-ma* which can be added to the distal demonstrative to express the same function; it is illustrated in (36) in exophoric use. Similarly, Dalabon has a demonstrative that expresses identifiability (from presence in the speech situation, or from previous mention or assumed shared knowledge), as illustrated in (37) in exophoric use, accompanied by a pointing gesture (Cutfield 2011: 308-310, 377; see also section 3.3). It seems that at least some of these demonstratives are grammaticalising into a general identifiability marker (e.g. Schultze-Berndt 2000: 49; see section 4); note that these forms needn't be accompanied by a gesture (contrary to the 'pointing' forms discussed above).

<sup>11</sup> There are of course many forms having both uses, as described in the following sections. The forms discussed in this paragraph are forms that in exophoric use have a non-spatial meaning specifically.

(36)Garrwa (Garrwan; Mushin 2012: 128)

*wanya nana-ma kulabajarra*

what that-ID hat

'What's that hat?' (that is visible on table in front of speaker)

(37)Dalabon (Gunwinyguan; Cutfield 2011: 309)

*kanh ka-h-yu dalifon-ngu njing-kun*

DEM.ID 3SG-R/A-lie.PRS telephone-2SG.POSS 2SG-POSS

'Is that one lying (there) your telephone?' [index finger point with RH at referent a few metres away]

### 3.2. Anaphoric, cataphoric and discourse deictic functions

Apart from exophoric deixis, demonstratives can also express anaphoric relations (i.e. to indicate that the referent should be identifiable because it has been mentioned before) and/or discourse deictic ones (i.e. to refer back to a stretch of text).<sup>12</sup> At least 35 languages have one or more dedicated forms for this (in eight, this form also has a recognitional meaning, see section 3.3), and in at least 30 languages some or all of the forms used for spatial deixis also have anaphoric or discourse deictic uses. Note that about a dozen of these languages have both dedicated and non-dedicated forms. (Additionally, at least five languages use adnominal personal pronouns for anaphoric relations, three of which along with demonstrative forms; these are not further discussed here, but see Louagie & Verstraete [2015: 176-178]).

Of the dedicated anaphoric forms, at least eight are bound. These anaphoric affixes or clitics are added to one or all demonstratives, as illustrated in (38) for the Worrorra suffix *-<sup>b</sup>wali* (Clendon 2014: 439-442), and in a few languages also to nouns or other stems, as illustrated in (39) for the Wardaman suffix *-marlang* (Merlan 1994: 96). Wilkinson (1991: 248) mentions that the Djambarrpuyngu suffix *-thi/-yi* in some examples behaves more like an emphatic marker, although its main use is anaphoric (note that the other two Yolngu languages in the sample have related anaphoric forms: *-tji(ni)* in Djinang [Waters 1989: 99-100] and *=dhi* in Ritharrngu [Heath 1980: 55]). The languages with bound forms not yet mentioned are Mangarrayi ('anaphoric' prefix *gi-* only to the distal demonstrative *-gayi* and optionally with a focus clitic *=bayeri* added [Merlan 1989: 43-45, 108]),

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that there is no information on anaphoric usage of demonstratives for almost half the sample.

Ngiyambaa (suffix *-la* to demonstratives [Donaldson 1980: 138]), and Wadjiginy (focus clitic particle =*kak* only on the audible form [Ford 1990: 104]).

(38)Worrorra (Worrorran; Clendon 2014: 440)

(Resumption of the main theme in a narrative after a digression.)

***nyinbalinya***<sup>13</sup> ***jilinya***            *jandu*        *nyiN<sup>b</sup>warr-nya=ma-nga*    *joonba-nyini-ya*  
 3F.RESUM        spirit.woman    perform    3F-3PL-EP=get-PST        ceremony-ENDPOINT-3PL  
 ‘They used to perform ceremonies about that spirit-woman.’

(39)Wardaman (Wardaman; Merlan 1994: 96)

(In a story about a fight between brolga and emu, in which both had previously been introduced, but emu had not been mentioned for some time.)

***gumurrinji-marlang*** *bagbag*        *ø-bu-ndi*    *yi-warli*        *bag*  
 emu-ANAPH            break        3-AUX-PST    YI-arm.ABS        break  
*yi-bam*        *darang*        *wayana*  
 YI-head.ABS    rump.ABS        and.all  
 ‘He broke the arm of that emu, broke his head and rump and all.’

The other languages with dedicated anaphoric demonstratives have free forms. In nine of them, there is only one dedicated form and this is the only demonstrative that is used anaphorically; four of these forms also have a recognitional sense (see also section 3.3). An example is Ngan’gityemerri, which has an anaphoric demonstrative *nyin(nin)* that indicates the speaker thinks the addressee can identify the appropriate referent “based on the shared understanding that the intended referent is either currently topical, or is sufficiently well established within the discourse that its restatement would be superfluous” (Reid 1990: 387). Note that Ngan’gityemerri has another demonstrative with a specific discourse function, viz. *yaga*, which establishes a new referent in discourse as topic (often in the context of a surprising topic change) (ibid.). The other languages with dedicated anaphoric demonstratives have multiple forms and/or one or more non-dedicated (i.e. spatial) forms at their disposal; cf. below for more discussion.

At least 30 languages use one or several exophoric forms also for anaphoric reference; in one of them, Mawng (Singer 2006: 32), an emphatic clitic marking topicality can optionally be added to reinforce the anaphoric reading (compare with the focal clitics described for Mangarrayi and Wadjiginy above). In eleven of these 30 languages, anaphoric use is possible for all spatial forms (in

---

<sup>13</sup> The form *nyina* is a proximal demonstrative that also serves as a definite article (Clendon 2014: 160); see section 4.

Arrernte with the exception of the 'pointing' form, see section 3.1), in six for only two forms, and in 14 only for one. If only one spatial form can be used anaphorically, it is usually the mid-distance or distal form; the exception is Yankunytjatjara, where it is the proximal form (Goddard 1985: 53). However, most of these 14 languages in addition have one or more dedicated form(s); only in six languages is there but one form for anaphoric reference.

When languages have several (dedicated or non-dedicated) demonstratives for anaphoric reference, their use is sometimes related to their position in discourse. In some languages, the spatial distance relation is metaphorically extended: the proximal form is used for more recently mentioned referents and the distal form for referents mentioned a while ago. This is for example the case in Wambaya (Nordlinger 1998: 116) and Bilinarra (Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 179-181). In other languages, the proximal form rather serves to (re)introduce a participant (i.e. a cataphoric rather than an anaphoric function), while the distal keeps track of the referent throughout the further discourse, like for example in Kuku Yalanyji (Patz 2002: 204) and Nyangumarta (Sharp 2004: 261). Sometimes, the importance of a participant in discourse also plays a role. For example, in Martuthunira (Dench 1994: 112-117), the spatial proximal *nhiyu* and distal *ngunhu* can be used to introduce and track a participant in discourse respectively, while the dedicated proximal and distal forms *nhiyaa* and *ngunhaa* are specifically used to track participants which are somehow singled out, e.g. because they "have the greatest bearing on the unfolding of events in the narrative" (ibid.: 114). The proximal is actually only used rarely, when a focal participant is also close to the speaker (i.e. there is an exophoric flavour to this form as well). Finally, Mawng has a dedicated form for discourse deixis, which "refers to previous events, speech or thought" (Singer 2006: 33); anaphoric reference can be made via the use of the regular spatial forms.

Finally, some languages also have forms with specific discourse-related functions apart from anaphoricity and discourse deixis, like forms specifically used for the introduction of participants in discourse. Some examples were already given in the course of this section (and in section 2.1 for bound forms), but four more will be given here. First, Bininj Kunwok (Evans 2003: 290-313) has a demonstrative to introduce new participants without an assumption that the referent is easily identifiable (*nabehne* 'turning now to, as for'; this is a metaphorical extension of a dynamic spatial form '(this one) coming this way from there', see section 3.1). This is not the only demonstrative which can be used endophorically: the recognitional demonstrative *nawu* is also used for first (re)mentions of participants, but the difference with *nabehne* is that the participants "should be readily identifiable once linguistic identification is made through naming" (ibid.: 297; see section 3.3); in addition, there are also three demonstratives for anaphoric use (*namege* 'that aforementioned', *nakka* 'the one just mentioned', *namekke* 'exactly the one just mentioned now'), and one for

reference to e.g. successive places in a journey narrative (*nani(h)* ‘this/that in a series’). Second, Jingulu also has a demonstrative *jiyi* which can be used to introduce a new topic; it “indicate[s] a participant which is new to the discourse or event, or to foreground a previously backgrounded (and possibly forgotten about) participant” (Pensalfini 2003: 138). This is illustrated in (40); from the example it seems that there is no assumption the referent is identifiable by the hearer (contrary to recognitional forms, see section 3.3).

(40)Jingulu (Mindi; Pensalfini 2003: 139)

*Nyamba-nama nyambala karriyaku-nama kaburkaburrji jiyi-rni*  
 what-time that(N) different(N)-time brown(N) CATAPH-FOC  
*ijjurnminji-rni.*  
 butcherbird-FOC

‘Now there's a different one that is brown, that's the butcher bird called *ijjurnminji*.’

Another example is Dalabon, which has a demonstrative *nunh* ‘unfamiliar’ that can serve both exophoric and endophoric functions; it generally “index[es] a referent as contrary to expectations (...); not yet grounded in discourse (...); something the speaker has no affinity with” (Cutfield 2011: 305). It is also used for example in contexts where there is a “coordination problem” between the intended referent and the referent understood by the addressee (*ibid.*), as illustrated in (41), where the speaker asked the addressee to pick up a ball and the addressee has picked up the wrong one. Similarly, the ‘ambiphoric’ pronouns in Ungarinyin can be used adnominally to “(re-)introduce a discourse referent, whose identity the speaker does not necessarily assume the addressee is yet able to identify.” (Spronck 2015: 166). Its meaning is also be described as the following: ‘I assume that within this stretch of discourse *D* referent *x* is not yet identifiable to you’ (*ibid.*: 167); this is illustrated in (42).

(41)Dalabon (Gunwinyguan; Cutfield 2011: 306)

*nunh da-h-warrkah-mey \ /*  
 DEM.UNF 2SG>3-R/A-wrongly-get.PST.PFV (fall-rise)  
 ‘you got that one erroneously’  
*ngûrrûmiyi*  
 red  
 ‘(you should have got) the red one’  
*kilirri da-h-mang*  
 yellow 2SG>3-R/A-get.PRS  
 ‘you got the yellow one (instead)’

(42)Ungarinyin (Worroran; Spronck 2015: 165)

**andu orroli liny-nga nya<sub>2</sub>-y<sub>1</sub>ila-n**  
M.AMBIPH dingo see-EMPH 3F.SG.O:3SG.S-hold-PRS  
'This dingo is just watching her.'

### 3.3. Recognitional function

Recognitional demonstratives indicate that a referent is identifiable through specific shared knowledge, or, as Diessel puts it: they “mark information that is *discourse new* and *hearer old*” (1999: 106). Himmelmann (1996: 231-234) notes that several Australian languages (Arrernte, Nunggubuyu and Yankunytjatjara) have a dedicated form for this function. I can add a few observations based on the sample, although it is important to stress that this is only based on descriptions in grammars, so it is not always clear whether a form is recognitional, anaphoric, purely definite, or a combination of these.

First, six languages in the sample have grammars that describe a demonstrative dedicated to a recognitional function. For example, the Bilinearra demonstrative *nyanawu* “signals knowledge shared between the speaker and the hearer. It is often used when the speaker mentions a referent, usually a person or place, and then checks with the hearer that they know what s/he is referring to” (Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 183), as illustrated in (43). Similarly, Gooniyandi (McGregor 1990: 145-146) has a form *ginharndi* which “indicates that, in the speaker’s estimation, the hearer is able to identify the entity being referred to, it being known to him or her. The fact that it is explicitly stated as being shared knowledge is the only clue that is given to the hearer to help him/her identify it.” The others are Bininj Kunwok (*nawu* [Evans 2003: 297]; see also section 3.2), Nyangumarta (*nyarra* [Sharp 2004: 266-268]), Yankunytjatjara (*panya* [Goddard 1985: 54-55]) and perhaps Warlpiri (*yangka* [Hale 1995: 46]). In addition, at least one language has a bound form, viz. Martuthunira, where a clitic *-wa* ‘you know’ can be added to demonstratives and pronouns (Dench 1994: 182-183).

(43)Bilinearra (Ngumpin-Yapa; Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 178)

**Nyanawu marluga, murlu-wu=rni=rla marru.**  
RECOG old.man this-DAT=ONLY=3OBL house  
'You know that old man, the house is only for this one.' (Uttered to Nordlinger in reference to the station manager)



For another six or seven languages, it seems that a demonstrative has a dedicated form for anaphoric and recognitional use. Note that for one of them, Arrernte *nhenge* (Wilkins 1989: 121-122), Himmelmann (1996: 232) argues that it is a purely recognitional form. The other languages are Bardi (*jarri* [Bowern 2012: 323]), Dhuwal (*ngunhi* [Wilkinson 1991: 254]), Jaru (*jangu* [Tsunoda 1981: 63]), Umpila (*nga'alu* in adnominal function [Hill 2018: 133]; see also section 2.2), Wangkajunga (*yangka* [Jones 2011: 118]), and perhaps Worrorra (= *kwaya* [Clendon 2014: 165]). For example, for the Jaru form *jangu*, Tsunoda (1981: 63) argues that it “is used to refer to something/someone about which/whom the speaker and hearer (often, to the exclusion of other people) share certain common knowledge. The referent(s) of *jangu* might have been mentioned before, or might be talked about every day.”

Additionally, there are a few languages for which it is explicitly mentioned that spatial or other exophoric demonstratives can also serve a recognitional use. For example, *kanh/kanunh* is the only demonstrative in Dalabon that may have recognitional uses, in addition to its non-spatial exophoric use (see section 3.1, example (37)) and anaphoric use (Cutfield 2011: 348-356). Other examples are Kuuk Thaayorre (Gaby 2017: 193-194), Martuthunira (proximal *nhiyu* [Dench 1994: 113]; see also section 3.2), and Wajarri (distal *banha* [Marmion 1996: 71]).

Finally, a note on the syntactic context in which recognitional demonstratives are used. Diessel (1999: 105, 165) argues that one of the defining characteristics of recognitional demonstratives is that they are restricted to adnominal use, with the potential exception of Nunggubuyu. However, in at least two languages in the sample recognitional demonstratives are attested in pronominal use. For example, in Dalabon, *kanh* is attested mostly in adnominal use, but also a few times in pronominal use (Cutfield 2011: 348). This is illustrated in (44), where *kanh* refers to the practice of chanting while digging for water; the chanting has not been mentioned before but has been evoked in the previous discourse on digging for water and is thus considered to be identifiable to the addressee. Similarly, adverbial use of the recognitional is attested in Bilinarra (Meakins & Nordlinger 2014: 184, example 473).

(44) Dalabon (Gunwinyguan; Cutfield 2011: 353)

*bulu-ngan o kardak-ngan mahki djongok-ngan bula-h-yinHyin-inj*  
 F-1SG.POSS or MB-1SG.POSS as.well FZ-1SG.POSS 3PL>3-R/A-say.RDP-PST.IPFV  
 ‘my father or my uncle and aunt would say’

*bulu=nga-h-wonawonan-inj mahkih **kanh** bala-h-yinHyi-ninj*  
 3PL=1SG-R/A-listen.RDP-PST.IPFV as.well deM.ID 3PL-R/A -say.RDP-PST.IPFV  
 ‘I would listen to them and (also) that’s (what) they’d say’

*namululu*                      *ka-h-wah-don*  
 uninitiated.boy              3SG-R/A -water-die.PRS  
 ‘‘*namululu kah-wah-don*’ (the young boy is dying of thirst)’

#### 4. Signs of grammaticalisation

Overall, there is only little diachronic information available for the languages of the sample, but quite a few descriptions mention (first signs of) grammaticalisation of demonstratives into definite markers, personal pronouns or relative pronouns; see Diessel (1999: 115-155) and Himmelmann (1997) for more details on these grammaticalisation pathways generally.

At least nine grammars mention the use of one of the demonstratives as a general definite marker. This is usually but not always the distal form, for which anaphoric use is often mentioned as well (which is in line with the fact that definite articles may arise out of anaphoric demonstratives [Diessel 1999: 128-129]). For example, the Yawuru distal (and anaphoric) *kamba* ‘‘may further perform [...] a function like a definite article’’ (Hosokawa 1991: 475), although interestingly, it is more often than not discontinuous from the nominal head (ibid.: 490). Dench (1994: 114) argues for the plain distal *ngunhu* in Martuthunira that it is

‘‘[i]n many ways [...] similar to the English definite article ‘the’. It indicates that a referent satisfying a description (if the demonstrative is part of a noun phrase) or satisfying the grammatical role of subject or object or whatever (if the demonstrative is the head of a noun phrase) exists and can be found by the addressee. The identity of the referent is assumed to be retrievable from linguistic context, not by strict syntactic rule but by inference.’’

Similar statements can be found for the Duungidjawa distal form *man(a)* (Kite & Wurm 2004: 58), the Gumbaynggir distal *yarang* (Eades 1979: 289), the Jaminjung ‘contextually given’ demonstrative *JanJu* (Schultze-Berndt 2000: 49; see section 3.1), the Marra definite demonstrative *-yimar* (Heath 1981: 155), the Pitta-Pitta mid-distance suffix *-ka* (Blake 1979: 193-194; see section 2.4), and the Wardaman middle form *nana* (Merlan 1994: 138).

In Worrorra, the grammaticalisation seems to have gone one step further, and the proximal demonstrative *=n* is most frequently used as a marker of definiteness (and is actually also glossed as such): ‘‘[t]he main and most frequent function of *=n* in Worrorra appears to be to grammaticize identifiability (cf Lyons 1999: 278); in Lyons’ terms, *=n* occupies a structural position activating definiteness in the NP in which it occurs’’ (Clendon 2014: 160). Interestingly, while the ‘bare’ form can still be used exophorically, the general definite sense seems to be so prevalent that a

reduplicated form can be used as a “purely proximal” demonstrative to “disentangle” the two senses (ibid.). Example (45) shows how a reduplicated and simple form can both occur in the same noun phrase, where the former indicates proximity and the latter definiteness.

(45)Worrorra (Worrorran; Clendon 2014: 160)

*inja-inja inja i=rnurnu warndi ØN-Ø-ngka=bwu-na lalai*  
 3M.DEF-RDP 3M.DEF 3M=hand make 3W-3-SUBJ=hit-PST dreamtime  
 ‘This one [Wandjina] painted his hands in the dreamtime.’

Signs of grammaticalisation towards third person pronouns were discussed in section 2.4. On other grammaticalisation pathways I can only make a few short observations. Some demonstratives may be used as relative pronouns or other markers of subordinate clause combining. For example, in Bininj Kunwok, the recognitional demonstrative *nawu* (masculine) can also be used as a relative pronoun (Evans 2003: 642-646), as illustrated in (46). Similarly, in the two Wati languages Wangkajunga (Jones 2011: 287-289) and Yankunytjatjara (Goddard 1985: 79), the recognitional demonstratives may also introduce a relative clause, and the same is true of the Dalabon demonstrative *kanh/kanunh* (which is also the only demonstrative that can be used in recognitional use) (Cutfield 2011: 135-138). McConvell (2006) investigates this phenomenon in Ngumpin-Yapa languages, and argues that languages in the west (e.g. Walmajarri, Jaru) have different demonstratives functioning as complementisers (often co-occurring with other complementisers), whereas languages in the east (e.g. Bilinarra, Warlpiri) have just one complementiser (usually from an anaphoric or recognitional demonstrative). Finally, Cutfield (2011: 150-153) further mentions the grammaticalised use of *nunh* as conjunction for conditional or consequential clauses.

(46)Bininj Kunwok (Gunwinyguan; Evans 2003: 643)

*Na-mege bininj ga-m-re, na-wu gogok bi-yame-ng.*  
 MA-that man 3-hither-go.NPST MA-REL brother 3/3H.PST-spear-PST.PFV  
 ‘The man is coming, whom your brother speared.’

## 5. Conclusion

This chapter has provided an initial survey of demonstratives in Australian languages. In the majority of these languages, the same forms are used both adnominally and pronominally; they are also regularly used adverbially, but many languages also have separate demonstrative adverbials. Adnominal demonstratives coalesce with other determining elements in a determiner slot in half of the languages, but they are never obligatory (nor are other determiners, with a few exceptions).

Interestingly, for a few languages it has been argued that they allow demonstratives not only to occur as determiners, but also as qualifiers; whether this is possible in more languages, in which contexts, and how this interacts with specific demonstrative semantics are questions which require further investigation.

While some Australian languages have simple systems of merely two or three demonstratives which can be used in a range of contexts, others have very complex and intricate systems, with a range of demonstratives each having specific spatial, non-spatial, anaphoric, recognitional and/or other senses. Quite a few languages have separate forms for specific discourse functions like referent tracking, introduction of participants without an assumption of identifiability and (re)introduction of participants with an assumption of identifiability. Overall, more discourse-based analysis is needed to further tease apart the specific semantics and discourse uses of different demonstratives, and how they interact with other types of determiners in the nominal expression (see also [chapter \[NP\]](#)).

One topic that was only mentioned in passing is the relation between, and co-occurrence of, demonstratives and gestures (like pointing). Although several grammars comment on the use of pointing or add some notes on gestures with text examples, our knowledge on this topic is overall limited. One detailed study is Blythe et al. (2016) on Murrinhpatha, which confirms that this is a question much in need of more detailed analysis, because, as the authors point out: “co-speech pointing gestures accompanying demonstratives are not merely helpful additions but are a necessary part of spatial deixis, and presumably this holds true with all languages” (ibid.: 155).

## References

- Alpher, Barry. 1973. *Son of ergative: The Yir Yoront language of northeast Australia*. Cornell University PhD Dissertation.
- Austin, Peter. 1981. *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Austin, Peter. 2013. *A grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.  
[https://www.academia.edu/2491078/A\\_Grammar\\_of\\_Diyari\\_South\\_Australia](https://www.academia.edu/2491078/A_Grammar_of_Diyari_South_Australia).
- Blake, Barry. 1979. Pitta-Pitta. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 1*, 182–242. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Blevins, Juliette. 2001. *Nhanda: An Aboriginal language of Western Australia*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Blythe, Joe, Kinngirri Carmelita Mardigan, Mawurt Ernest Perdjert & Hywel Stoakes. 2016. Pointing out directions in Murrinhpatha. *Open Linguistics* 2(1). 132–159.
- Bowern, Claire. 2012. *A grammar of Bardi*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Breen, Gavan. 2004. *Innamincka talk: A grammar of the Innamincka dialect of Yandruwandha with notes on other dialects*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Breen, Gavan & Barry Blake. 2007. *The grammar of Yalarnnga: A language of Western Queensland*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Clendon, Mark. 2014. *Worrorra: A language of the north-west Kimberley coast*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, Martin Haspelmath & Balthasar Bickel. 2015. Leipzig Glossing Rules. <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/pdf/Glossing-Rules.pdf> (26 July 2019).
- Crowley, Terry. 1981. Mpakwithi dialect of Anguthimri. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 2*, 146–194. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Cutfield, Sarah. 2011. *Demonstratives in Dalabon: A language of southwestern Arnhem Land*. Melbourne: University of Melbourne PhD Dissertation.
- Dench, Alan. 1991. Panyjima. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 4*, 124–243. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dench, Alan. 1994. *Martuthunira: A language of the Pilbara region of Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 2014. Demonstratives, frames of reference, and semantic universals of space. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(3). 116–132.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1977. *A grammar of Yidiny*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 1980. *The languages of Australia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2002. *Australian languages: Their nature and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Donaldson, Tamsin. 1980. *Ngiyambaa: The language of the Wangaaybuwan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Douglas, Wilfrid. 1981. Watjarri. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 2*, 197–272. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2018. On the order of demonstrative, numeral, adjective, and noun. *Language* 94(4). 2018.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Word order. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume I: Clause structure*, 61–131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Eades, Diana. 1979. Gumbaynggir. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 1*, 244–361. Canberra: Australian National University Press.
- Egmond, Marie-Elaine van. 2012. *Enindhilyakwa phonology, morphosyntax and genetic position*. University of Sydney dissertation.
- Enfield, Nick. 2003. Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79(1). 82–117.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2003. *Bininj Gun-wok: A pan-dialectal grammar of Mayali, Kunwinjku and Kune*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Ford, Kevin & Dana Ober. 1991. A sketch of Kalaw Kawaw Ya. In Suzanne Romaine (ed.), *Language in Australia*, 118–142. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ford, Lysbeth. 1990. *The phonology and morphology of Bachamal (Wogait)*. Australian National University MA thesis.
- Ford, Lysbeth. 1998. *A description of the Emmi language of the Northern Territory of Australia*. Australian National University PhD Dissertation.
- Forrester, Katerina. 2015. *The internal structure of the Mawng noun phrase*. University of Melbourne BA Hons thesis.
- Gaby, Alice R. 2017. *A Grammar of Kuuk Thaayorre*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goddard, Cliff. 1985. *A grammar of Yankunytjatjara*. Alice Springs: Institute for Aboriginal Development.
- Godman, Irene. 1993. *A sketch grammar of Rimanggudinhma: A language of the Princess Charlotte Bay region of Cape York Peninsula*. University of Queensland BA Hons thesis.
- Green, Ian. 1989. *Marrithiyel: A language of the Daly River region of Australia's Northern Territory*. Australian National University PhD Dissertation.
- Green, Ian. 1997. Nominal Classification in Marrithiyel. In Mark Harvey & Nicholas Reid (eds.), *Nominal Classification in Aboriginal Australia*, 229–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Green, Rebecca. 1987. *A sketch grammar of Burarra*. Australian National University BA Hons thesis.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of language*, 73–113. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hale, Ken. 1995. *An elementary Warlpiri dictionary*. Revised edition. Alice Springs: IAD Press.
- Hamilton, Philip. 1996. Oykangand sketch grammar. Manuscript.
- Harvey, Mark. 1986. *Ngoni Waray Amungal-yang: The Waray language from Adelaide River*. Canberra: Australian National University MA thesis.
- Haviland, John. 1979. Guugu Yimidhirr. In R. M. W. Dixon & Barry Blake (eds.), *Handbook of Australian Languages. Volume 1*, 27–180. Canberra: Australian National University.

- Heath, Jeffrey. 1980. *Basic materials in Ritharngu: Grammar, texts and dictionary*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1981. *Basic materials in Mara: Grammar, texts and dictionary*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hercus, Luise. 1982. *The Baagandji language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hercus, Luise. 1994. *A grammar of the Arabana-Wangkangurru language, Lake Eyre basin, South Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hill, Clair. 2018. *Person reference and interaction in Umpila/Kuuku Ya'u narrative*. Radboud Universiteit and KU Leuven.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hoffman, Dorothea. 2017. Systems of Absolute Frames of Reference in Australia: A preliminary survey. Presented at ALT 12, Canberra. Available at: [https://www.academia.edu/35472088/Systems\\_of\\_Absolute\\_Frames\\_of\\_Reference\\_in\\_Australia\\_A\\_preliminary\\_survey](https://www.academia.edu/35472088/Systems_of_Absolute_Frames_of_Reference_in_Australia_A_preliminary_survey).
- Hoffmann, Dorothea. In prep. Systems of Absolute Frames of Reference in Australia: A typology. In Bill Palmer, Jonathan Schlossberg, Jonathon Lum and Alice Gaby (eds.), *Sociotopography: the interplay of language, culture and environment*. Proposed Special Issue in *Glossa* [in prep].
- Hosokawa, Komei. 1991. *The Yawuru language of West Kimberley: A meaning-based description*. Canberra: Australian National University PhD Dissertation.
- Jones, Barbara. 2011. *A grammar of Wangkajunga: A language of the Great Sandy Desert of North Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Kite, Suzanne & Stephen Wurm. 2004. *The Duungidjawa language of southeast Queensland: Grammar, texts and vocabulary*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Lee, Jennifer. 1987. *Tiwi today: A study of language change in a contact situation*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Louagie, Dana. 2017. The status of determining elements in Australian languages. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 37(2). 182–218.
- Louagie, Dana. forthcoming. *Noun phrases in Australian languages: A typological study*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Louagie, Dana & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2015. Personal pronouns with determining functions in Australian languages. *Studies in Language* 39. 158–197.

- Louagie, Dana & Jean-Christophe Verstraete. 2016. Noun phrase constituency in Australian languages: A typological study. *Linguistic Typology* 20. 25–80.
- Marmion, Douglas. 1996. *A description of the morphology of Wajarri*. University of New England BA Hons thesis.
- McConvell, Patrick. 2006. Grammaticalization of demonstratives as subordinate complementizers in Ngumpin-Yapa. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 1. 107–137.
- McGregor, William. 1990. *A functional grammar of Gooniyandi*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- McGregor, William. 2004. *The languages of the Kimberley, Western Australia*. London: RoutledgeCurzon.
- Meakins, Felicity & Rachel Nordlinger. 2014. *A grammar of Bilinarra: An Australian Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1989. *Mangarayi*. London: Routledge.
- Merlan, Francesca. 1994. *A grammar of Wardaman: A language of the Northern Territory of Australia*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mushin, Ilana. 2012. *A grammar of (Western) Garrwa*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 1998. *A grammar of Wambaya, Northern Territory (Australia)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Oates, Lynette. 1988. *The Muruwari Language*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.
- Patz, Elisabeth. 2002. *A grammar of the Kuku Yalanji language of north Queensland*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Palmer, Bill, Joe Blythe, Alice Gaby, Dorothea Hoffmann & Maïa Ponsonnet. 2019. Geospatial Natural Language in Indigenous Australia: Research Priorities. In Kristin Stock, Christopher Jones & Thora Tenbrink (eds.), *Speaking of Location 2019*, 11. Regensburg, Germany: CEUR-WS.org.
- Pensalfini, Robert. 2003. *A grammar of Jingulu: An Aboriginal language of the Northern Territory*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Reid, Nicholas. 1990. *Ngan'gityemerri: A language of the Daly River region, Northern Territory of Australia*. Australian National University PhD Dissertation.
- Reid, Nicholas. 1997. Class and classifier in Ngan'gityemerri. In Mark Harvey & Nicholas Reid (eds.), *Nominal Classification in Aboriginal Australia*, 165–228. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Richards, Eirlys. 1979. The Walmatjari noun phrase. In Christine A. Kilham (ed.), *Four grammatical sketches: From phrase to paragraph*, vol. 3, 93–128. Darwin: Summer Institute of Linguistics - Australian Aborigines Branch.
- Rijkhoff, Jan. 2002. *The noun phrase*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva. 2000. *Simple and complex verbs in Jaminjung: A study of event categorisation in an Australian language*. Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen PhD Dissertation.



- Sharp, Janet. 2004. *Nyangumarta: A language of the Pilbara region of Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Sharpe, Margaret. 1972. *Alawa phonology and grammar*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Singer, Ruth. 2006. *Agreement in Mawng: Productive and lexicalised uses of agreement in an Australian language*. University of Melbourne PhD Dissertation.
- Spronck, Stef. 2015. *Reported speech in Ungarinyin: [["..."] -ma- ]: Grammar and social cognition in a language of the Kimberley region, Western Australia*. Australian National University dissertation.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. *The Djaru language of Kimberley, Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 2011. *A grammar of Warrongo*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Waters, Bruce. 1989. *Djinang and Djinba: A grammatical and historical perspective*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Wilkins, David. 1989. *Mparntwe Arrernte (Aranda): Studies in the structure and semantics of grammar*. Australian National University PhD Dissertation.
- Wilkinson, Melanie. 1991. *Djambarrpuyngu: A Yolngu variety of Northern Australia*. University of Sydney PhD Dissertation.
- Wordick, Frank. 1982. *The Yindjibarndi language*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Yallop, Colin. 1975. The Narinjari language 1864-1964. In A. P. Elkin (ed.), *Narinjari: An outline of the language studied by George Taplin, with Taplin's notes and comparative table*, 1–109. Sydney: University of Sydney.