1 Introduction

This paper is a study of the frequency and distribution of deictic demonstratives in an Okanagan text, *The Golden Woman: The Colville Narrative of Peter J. Seymour* (Mattina 1985). I classify the environments in which demonstratives are used according to syntactic and semantic properties of the demonstratives, and investigate the relative frequency of different types of demonstratives within this classification. It will be seen that Okanagan demonstratives fulfill a wide variety of syntactic and semantic roles. The overall goal of this paper, then, is to gain a clearer understanding of these diverse roles.

Central questions which I address include the following: (1) What is the relative frequency of simple demonstratives versus demonstrative adverbs in this text?; (2) Are the frequencies and uses of proximal versus distal forms comparable?; and (3) Is there a straightforward explanation for any differences? My discussion will focus primarily on the more common simple demonstratives.

The outline of the paper is as follows: In section 2, I give a brief background on the Okanagan language and *The Golden Woman* text. In Section 3, I introduce the Okanagan demonstrative paradigm. In section 4, I present the basic frequency and distribution of the demonstratives in this text. Section 5 goes into more detail, and will focus on an interesting contrast between the prevalence of proximal and distal forms in DP-adjacent environments. In Section 6, I will discuss some of the various discourse functions which non-DP-adjacent demonstratives characteristically exhibit. Section 7 concludes, and presents some further questions raised by this paper.

2 Background: The Okanagan Language and *The Golden Woman*

The Southern Interior branch of Salish consists of 4 languages: Colville-Okanagan, Moses-Columbian, Coeur d’Alene, and the dialect continuum of Spokane-Kalispel-Flathead. Colville-Okanagan (henceforth Okanagan), is severely endangered and is presently spoken by only a few hundred elders in south-central British Columbia and northern Washington State. The heart of their traditional territory extends along the Okanagan Valley, from Enderby B.C. in the north, southward to Kelowna, Penticton and Osoyoos B.C., continuing through Omak and Okanogan, WA.

Linguistic work on Okanagan may be said to have originated with James Teit, but not until the late 1960’s did intensive research on the language begin with Anthony Mattina’s work. His 1973 dissertation *Colville*
Grammatical Structures focuses primarily on the phonology and morphology of the language. Among his other works is the invaluable Colville-Okanagan Dictionary (1987). The Golden Woman: The Colville Narrative of Peter J. Seymour is a transcription of a Colville-Okanagan text originally recorded by Mattina in 1968. The recording was translated by Mattina and Madeline deSautel. The transcription was later edited by Mattina and published by the University of Arizona Press in 1985.

3 Okanagan Demonstratives

Okanagan demonstratives distinguish whether a referent is near to (proximal) or far away from (distal) the speaker. The paradigm also distinguishes simple demonstratives on the one hand, and demonstrative adverbs on the other (Table 1). Proximal demonstratives are immediately identifiable as those with /a/ vowels, whereas distal demonstratives all have /i/ vowels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple Demonstratives</th>
<th>Demonstrative Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proximal</strong></td>
<td>axáʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distal</strong></td>
<td>ixíʔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Okanagan Demonstratives and Demonstrative Adverbs

The simple demonstratives axáʔ and ixíʔ are the rough equivalents of English *this* and *that* respectively, and may directly refer to both physical objects and animate discourse referents in a discourse situation. Examples of axáʔ and ixíʔ are shown below in (1):

(1) waý ixíʔ uł s-n-kxn-ıls-t-s axáʔ
      AFF DEM CONJ NOM-n-follow-want.to-DIR-3.ERG DEM
      [iʔ stʔiwtx],…
      DET youngest one

And he wanted to go along the youngest one, … (GW:463)

axáʔ in (1) is associated with the following DP *iʔ stʔiwtx* ‘the youngest one’, although the English translation does not include ‘this’. By contrast, ixíʔ in (1) is not associated with any DP, and it is not clear if there is any discourse entity being referred to in this case. ixíʔ has functions which do not involve spatial deixis. Some of these functions will be discussed at length.

The demonstrative adverbs aláʔ and ilíʔ are roughly equivalent to *here* and *there*, respectively. They fix the location of an object relative to the speaker. The directional demonstratives (atláʔ / itlíʔ and ak’láʔ / ik’líʔ) are similar to the locative demonstrative adverbs (aláʔ / ilíʔ), but also encode movement towards or away from the speaker. An example use of the locative demonstrative adverb ilíʔ is shown in (2):
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Basically, iliʔ places the location of the ‘staying on the horse’ event at a non-proximal distance from the speaker.

4 Basic Frequency and Distribution

The text consists of a total of 925 stanzas (cf Figure 1). The length of a stanza can vary from a simple sentence consisting of a few words, to a long, multi-clausal sentence. 704 stanzas comprise the main body of the text, while the remaining 221 stanzas are from the appendices, which are ‘retellings’ of specific portions of the main text.1 Out of a total of 925 stanzas, 633 (68%) stanzas have at least 1 simple demonstrative or demonstrative adverb (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. Percent of Stanzas with at least 1 Demonstrative](image)

There are a total of 1258 demonstratives in the text. The number of demonstratives per stanza varies from 0 to 9.2 The total text therefore averages about 1.36 demonstratives per stanza, and for those 68% of stanzas with demonstratives, there is an average of about 2 demonstratives per stanza.

Of these 1258 demonstratives, 1025 are simple demonstratives (81.5%), and 233 are demonstrative adverbs (18.5%) (cf Figure 2).

---

1 The content of these retold portions duplicate, or expands upon, content introduced in the main body of the text, but this does not imply that the sentence structure of the retold stanzas in any way duplicates the corresponding stanza in the main body. As such, including the appendices in this study is desirable, since it increases the data base.

2 See stanza 527 for an example with 9 demonstratives.
The distribution of demonstrative adverbs may be further analyzed according to specific type (Figure 3). Figures 2 and 3 both show that simple demonstratives are much more common than demonstrative adverbs.

Of the demonstrative adverbs, it can be seen from Figure 3 that the locational demonstrative adverbs *aláʔ* and *iliʔ* are more common than all of the other demonstrative adverbs combined. The rarest are the source demonstrative adverbs, of which there are only 6 instances in the text. Of these 6 occurrences, all are of the distal *itiʔ* form. This fact is reflective of a more general distribution: distals are more common than proximals, for both simple and adverbiale demonstratives. Out of the total number of 1258 demonstratives, 496 are proximal (39.4%), and 762 are distal (60.6%). This is shown in Figure 4:
Focusing in on the 1025 simple demonstratives and 233 demonstrative adverbs (Figure 5), it can be seen that the disparity in numbers between proximal simple versus adverbial demonstratives is greater than the disparity between distal simple versus adverbial demonstratives. These facts in and of themselves are perhaps not very noteworthy, since it might be expected that other languages such as English would pattern roughly the same with regards to overall frequency of proximal versus distal forms.

The next sections investigate more closely the distributions of proximal and distal simple demonstratives. Differences in both the syntactic distribution and semantic roles of proximal versus distal forms show that there is more to the proximal/distal asymmetry shown in Figure 4 than just numerical frequency.
5 Distributional considerations: DP-adjacent Demonstratives

For the purposes of this paper, I will consider the DP in Okanagan to be a syntactic phrase headed by the determiner *iʔ*, which selects as its complement either (1) a bare nominal, or (2) a relative clause. Demonstratives may directly precede either type of DP. In these cases, the demonstrative seems to fix the referent of a nominal DP, or the referent of the head of a relative clause, within a deictic space. There is a class (3), whose members might in principle have been included in the previous two classes, but which I have instead classified separately since the demonstratives, in these cases, are syntactic predicates.

I will discuss these three classes presently: demonstrative + nominal DP sequences (5.1), demonstrative + relative clause DP sequences (5.2), and instances involving predicative demonstratives (5.3). In section 5.4, I discuss sandhi effects, and then summarize the results in 5.5.

Before discussing specific examples, however, it is worthwhile to note the difference in frequency of proximal versus distal simple demonstratives preceding determiners. This striking imbalance is shown by Figure 6.

![Figure 6. Demonstratives Next to Overt Determiners](image)

There are two sandhi environments relevant to this study, in which the determiner *iʔ* often undergoes reduction. The first environment is before 1st and 2nd person possessive morphemes *in-* and *an-* (N. Mattina 2006:113). The second is after the demonstrative *ixiʔ*. These will be discussed in section 5.4, and the numbers in Figure 6 adjusted to reflect the fact that not all DPs in Okanagan contain overt determiners.

5.1 Demonstratives adjacent to Nominal DPs

Examples (3) and (4) below show demonstratives which directly precede a nominal DP. In (4), the proximal demonstrative *axáʔ* is translated into English
as *this*, though (3) illustrates that this translation does not always come through. (DPs following demonstratives are enclosed in square brackets.)

(3) wa̓y ti t̕aq-səlx axáʔ [iʔ pəptwinaxʷ].

They just waved to the old lady. (GW:106)

(4) uɬ cəm t̕i sic axáʔ my-p-nún-t-əm

And just as soon as she finds out this boy... (GW:169)

The demonstratives in these examples fix the deictic distance of the referent of the following DP with respect to either the narrator, or a character in the story.

### 5.2 Demonstratives adjacent to Relative Clause DPs

Demonstratives also directly precede relative clause DPs (cf Kroeber 1999:345). Examples are shown in (5) and (6). In (5), *axáʔ* presumably refers to the thing that *was told*, while in (6), *ixíʔ* refers to the thing that *was sent for*. These demonstratives are extracted oblique arguments of the relativized predicates.

(5) nɬíptm-nt-xʷ axáʔ [iʔ [cún-t-s-ən]],

If you forget what I told you, all of you will die. (GW:50)

(6) uc ixíʔ axáʔ iʔ an-əmínk, axáʔ iʔ kʷəkʷr̓ít

Is this what you wanted, the Golden Woman, what you sent me for? (GW:387)

(7) involves a relativized predicate nominal kʷu asqʷsqʷaʔsiyaʔ ‘We are your children’, from which the possessor subject has presumably been extracted in the form of *axáʔ*. Note that *axáʔ* here is also the object of the main clause, ‘us’.

(7) stuʔtíwaʔ-st-xʷ axáʔ [iʔ [kʷu a-sqʷsqʷaʔsiyaʔ]].

You baby us around, we who are your children. (GW:778)
5.3 Demonstratives as Main Predicates

Demonstratives may, by default, be assumed to be the main predicate in certain sentences. Unlike examples (3-7), in (8-11) below, there are no other candidate predicates besides the demonstrative outside the syntactic domain of the determiner:

(8) təxʷ ixiʔ [iʔ [c-маʔ-xt-wíxʷ-əlx]]...
   EVID DEM DET CUST-talk-DITR-RCPR-3PL.ERG
   That’s what they’re talking about... (GW:651)

(9) ixiʔ ul axaʔ [iʔ [kʷu cəxʷc̕xʷ-nt-ís in-kəwáp]]
   DEM CONJ DEM DET 1SG.ABS instruct-DIR-3ERG 1SG.GEN-horse
   And he told me what to do, my horse. (GW:334)

(10) nʔəɬnaʔ-sqilxʷtn 1 siwɬkʷ, ixiʔ [iʔ təmxʷulaʔxʷ-s]
   man-eater LOC water DEM DET country-3 SG.GEN
   She's a man-eater in the water, that’s her country. (GW:342)

(11) axáʔ iʔ [kən ec-m̓ ayʔ-ncút].
   DEM DET 1SG.ABS CUST-to.tell-RFLX
   And that’s why I’m telling the story. (GW:855)

In (8), ixiʔ presumably refers to what is being talked about, and as such is the extracted, oblique theme argument of the reciprocal relative. It is not likely that evidential təxʷ could be the predicate, since it belongs to a class of pre-predicative clitics that includes modals, question particles, and other elements. (9) is another case of a demonstrative head functioning as the extracted oblique argument of a relative clause. kʷu cəxʷc̕xʷ-əntís inkəwáp is itself a grammatical sentence meaning My horse instructed me, and is unusual since both core arguments are overtly realized internal to the clause.

The second clause of (10) shows ixiʔ in an equational environment. In English, a copula is used to relate two elements equationally. In Okanagan however, equational structures consist simply of two juxtaposed DPs, or in this case, a demonstrative and a DP.

Finally, in (11) the demonstrative refers to the reason why the speaker is ‘telling a story’. Here, axáʔ is at the same time an extracted oblique argument, and the main predicate. One generalization to be made from data in 5.2 and 5.3 is that predicative demonstratives, as well as non-predicative demonstratives serving as the heads of relative clauses, are often extracted oblique arguments.

Out of the 45 clearly DP-adjacent instances of distal ixiʔ, nearly half (44%) are either predicative or precede relative clause DPs. 56% of determiner-adjacent instances of ixiʔ introduce nominal DPs (see Figure 7). Compare this to the fact that 84% DP-adjacent instances of axáʔ introduce nominal DPs.
Figure 7. Demonstratives Next to Overt Determiners: Nominal DPs, Predicative Demonstratives, and Relative Clause DPs

5.4 Correcting for Sandhi Effects

Two sandhi effects must now be taken into account: First, the determiner \( iʔ \) is regularly dropped before 1\(^{st} \) and 2\(^{nd} \) person possessive morphemes in- and an-. For simplicity, I consider all occurrences of simple demonstratives followed directly by in- or an- to involve determiner reduction. Second, the phonological equivalence of the second syllable of the distal demonstrative \( ixíʔ \) and the determiner \( iʔ \) often results in a reduction of the determiner. To illustrate, a sequence like \( ixíʔ iʔ citxʷ \) “that house” will usually be shortened to \( ixíʔ citxʷ \). I have also assumed that demonstrative – bare nominal sequences contain underlying determiners. (12) and (13a) exemplify the second sandhi effect. The first clause of (13a) also exemplifies the first sandhi effect.

(12) cun-t-əm, “[axaʔ ʔáy̓ min] kʷ i-s-cʔukʷ-ɬt-m.”
  say-DIR-PASS DEM letter 2SG.ABS 1SG.GEN-NOM-bring-TR-MID
  He told them: “This letter I’m bringing you.” (GW:185)

(13)a. ...nliptm-n (iʔ) i-səxʷənc̕íw̓ m, [ixiʔ tətwit].
  forget-(dir)-1SG.ERG (DET) 1SG.GEN-dish.washer DEM boy
  ...I forgot my dish washer, the boy. (GW:747)

b. ul nakʷəm [ixiʔ iʔ tətwit] iʔ cawt-s.
  CONJ EVID DEM DET boy DET doing-3SG.GEN
  And indeed that's what the boy did. (GW:613)

\[^{3} \] \( iʔ \) is present before nominals inflected with 3\(^{rd} \) person genitive –s.
Contrasting the bracketed string of (13a) with that of (13b), we see that for the same post-demonstrative nominal *tətwit* ‘boy’, a determiner may or may not occur (cf also (4)). Semantic and syntactic differences need to be established between the bracketed strings in examples like (13a) and (13b) before the string in (13a) can definitively be said to include or exclude a determiner, but right now it seems like a reasonable hypothesis to assume that it does.

By adding demonstrative + 1st and 2nd person possessor sequences (n=24 proximals and n=28 distals) and demonstrative + bare nominal sequences (n=33 proximals and n=28 distals) to the distribution represented by figure 6 above, the result is Figure 8 below:

![Figure 8. Demonstratives Next to Overt and Reduced Determiners](chart_image)

The proportion of demonstratives which may be considered DP-adjacent rises by around 10% for distals, and by around 14% for proximals after including cases involving probable sandhi effects.

Many of the demonstratives preceding 1st and 2nd person possessives are simultaneously default main predicates and extracted arguments of the relative clause structures which they head. In these cases, the embedded possessor is the subject of the entire sentence. This is not the case with demonstratives preceding bare nominals, where the entire demonstrative-nominal complex will usually be interpreted as an argument of a higher predicate.

---

4 (13b) may actually be more complicated, since *ixiʔ* in *ixiʔ iʔ *tətwit iʔ cawts* might better be analyzed as the main predicate: *the thing that was the boy’s doing*. Similar sequences with *axäʔ* are usually less ambiguously associated with the nominal, e.g. (3) and (4). This could, however, pose a problem for my distributional analysis, if a large number of *ixiʔ* - *determiner-nominal* sequences involve demonstratives that actually form discontinuous constituents with later material, but the number of examples similar to (13b) is relatively small.

5 This excludes cases of nominal predicates in identificational structures, with argument demonstratives. Normally in these cases the demonstrative follows the nominal predicate, e.g. *citxʷ ixîʔ* ‘That is a house’.
predicative distal demonstratives rises considerably (from 15 to 34) as a result of adding these possessor cases.

Figure 9. Demonstratives Next to Overt and Reduced Determiners: Nominal DPs, Predicative Demonstratives, and Relative Clause DPs

5.5 Summary

The large majority of occurrences of proximal demonstrative axáʔ may be considered to be linearly adjacent to a DP (77.9%), with or without a phonetically-realized determiner (cf figure 8). In contrast, the large majority of occurrences of distal demonstrative ixìʔ are not adjacent to a DP (82.8%). Of those DP-adjacent proximal demonstratives, very few are predicative (8.2%) (cf figure 9). Of those DP-adjacent distal demonstratives, many are predicative (33.6%). Why is it that proximal and distal demonstratives have such different distributions, and why are proximal demonstratives so much more common next to DPs? Investigating demonstratives in clearly non-DP associated environments may shed some light on these questions.

6 Distributional considerations: Non-DP-adjacent Demonstratives

This section attempts to provide some answers to the following question: What roles are the remaining 82.8% of distal ixìʔ demonstratives and 22.1% of proximal axáʔ demonstratives playing? In these remaining cases, the demonstrative is not adjacent to a determiner or a 1st or 2nd person possessed nominal. In the following sections, I will survey the major non-DP associated uses of demonstratives in this text, and include data which exemplify these uses.
6.1 Demonstratives + Predicates

Examples like (14) and (15) might, in principle, be considered cases of demonstratives that head relative clauses (cf section 5.2), where for some reason, the clauses are not introduced by a determiner.

(14) ul axaʔ ůmink-nt-p,...
CONJ DEM want-DIR-2PL.ERG
And this is what you want... (GW:011)

(15) ul axaʔ xʷuy-st-s iʔ sqʷsqʷaʔsiyaʔ-s k̓əl sənttəmtəmtə;...
CONJ DEM go-CAUS-3ERG DET children-3SG.GEN LOC store; ...
And then he took his children to get clothes;... (GW:451)

Despite the fact that the English translation of (14) includes a relative clause, I assume that a relative clause structure is not present in such cases. Firstly, there are only 23 instances of proximal demonstrative-headed relatives introduced by an overt determiner (figure 7), which makes them relatively rare. Secondly, I have independent evidence that suggests that determiners (or oblique markers) must introduce relative clauses in Okanagan in non-sandhi environments, and because iʔ is usually present after axáʔ before a nominal, it might also be considered likely to be overt in (14), if it were in fact underlying. Thirdly, argument demonstratives can easily front in Okanagan, so (14) might reasonably be a derivate of ůminkəntp axáʔ ‘You all want this’. Finally, similar strings like (15) clearly do not contain relative clauses.6

---

6 Basically, I assume that sandhi 1 applies to determiners before nominals as well as before predicates, but that sandhi 2 applies only optionally to determiners before nominals, not predicates. Sandhi 2 is also clearly more likely to apply after ixíʔ than axáʔ. The reader may object that if these are purely phonological processes, then there would be no reason to expect predicates to pattern differently than nominals, and that therefore sandhi 2 should also apply to predicates, and (14) should be understood as having a reduced determiner.

The difference is that a demonstrative preceding a nominal will nearly always be semantically associated with that nominal, and so there is no harm in assuming an underlying determiner, and by extension, a complex DP structure (so long as the nominal is not predicative). For demonstratives preceding predicates, however, the relation is not always clear, as can be seen by contrasting (14) and (15). The following seems reasonable: Given (1) that there are 250 cases of ixíʔ preceding predicates (not sandhi 1 predicates), but only 50 cases of axáʔ in the same environment (cf 14), and (2) that the vast majority of total axáʔ occurrences are associated with overt determiners, that (3) positning a reduced determiner when there is already doubt about the grammatical relation is unwarranted. Note also that many of the 250 cases of ixíʔ preceding a predicate are ‘discourse’ uses of the demonstrative, unassociated with any relative clause structure (cf 27,28). The 20 cases of sandhi 1 ixíʔ + predicate sequences, and 5 cases of axáʔ in the same environment were included in figure 9 because iʔ almost always reduces for sandhi 1 nominal DPs.

In other words, sandhi 1 is a stronger effect than sandhi 2. This is because the determiner is redundant within a dem – det – nominal sequence, but is not redundant
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There are questions concerning status of the demonstrative in (15): First, since SVO in Okanagan is unmarked, axáʔ might refer to the 3rd person subject, which also receives ergative marking on the predicate. Recall example (7), where the demonstrative has a human referent. Secondly, axáʔ could form a discontinuous constituent with the object DP iʔ sqʷsqʷaʔsiyaʔs ‘his children’. Finally, it is possible that axáʔ may be a temporal adverbial, functioning similarly to and then... in English. Fieldwork will hopefully help clarify the true status of the demonstratives in (14) and (15).

6.2 Demonstratives and the Pre-predicative Clitic String

In Okanagan, pre-predicative clitics serve a range of semantic functions, including modality and evidentiality. Demonstratives, too, may occur interspersed within this string. In syntactic contexts such as those in (16) and (17), they do not appear to be clearly associated with any deictic referent.

(16) axáʔ caḿ t̕ i k̕ w̕ k̕ ŋ̕ m̕ tiw̕ s, m̕ ĭl k̕ ĭn nw̕ is̕ l̕ x̕ ;
DEM EPIS PT 2SG.ABS mount.horse, CONJ 1SG.ABS go.high;
As soon as you get on the horse, I will go in the air;... (GW:491)

(17) uɬ ixiʔ nãkʷəm ixiʔ c-k-cah-m-ncút
CONJ DEM EVID DEM CUST-take.turns-RFLX
iʔ sãnʔəmʔímaʔst-s;
DET grandchildren-3 SG.GEN
They were on the wrong side her grandchildren;... (GW:577)

(17) shows two instances of ixiʔ, one on each side of the evidential nãkʷəm. The sequence of the first ixiʔ along with the following conjunction, is commonly translated into English as and then, suggesting that perhaps the demonstrative is functioning as a temporal adverbial. Often, ixiʔ precedes the conjunction, with a similar effect. I discuss these cases in the next section.

6.3 Demonstratives and “And” Fronting

“And” fronting is the name of a particular focus structure discussed by Kroeber (1999:366). It consists of a fronted constituent in focus position (in this case, a demonstrative), and a residue which is introduced by a coordinating particle (in this case, uɬ). In the text, there are 64 instances of “and” fronting where the focused constituent is ixiʔ (from a total of 91 pre-conjunction demonstrative occurrences). Notably, there are no such occurrences of axáʔ.

---

when it is present before a clause, since it unambiguously signals a relative. It nevertheless will reduce before a 1st or 2nd person possessor relative.

7 This function seems usually to be reserved for ixiʔ, as we shall see.
(18) | ixíʔ | uɬ | way̓ | mʔán,...
| DEM | CONJ | already | noon
It was past noon,... (GW:348)

(19) | ixíʔ | uɬ | kʷ | s-nʕacùs-m-s
| DEM | CONJ | 2SG.ABS | NOM-trap-MID-3SG.GEN
| | | ks-púl-st-m-s;... | FUT-kill-CAUS-2SG.ACC-3SG.ERG;...
But she’s baiting you to kill you; ... (GW:503)

(20) | ixíʔ | uɬ | ?aḵəl-m-n cút,...
| DEM | CONJ | do.like-MID-RFLX
And he turned around, ... (GW:719)

The fronted demonstrative in these examples may be functioning to denote temporal subsequence of events within the discourse. At the very least, the English translations are consistent with such a function.

It is possible that a class of focused demonstratives not associated with any discourse referent (16-20) may be delimited from a class of pre-predicative demonstratives which are associated with discourse referents (14,15), but fieldwork is needed to establish this.

In any case, because there are structures like ‘and’ fronting which involve distal but not proximal demonstratives, the question of why proximal and distal demonstratives have such different distributions has the beginnings of an answer.

6.4 Double Demonstratives

Demonstratives may also directly precede other demonstratives. A sequence of two simple demonstratives is possible (21), or a sequence of a simple demonstrative followed by a demonstrative adverb (22).

(21) | way̓ | ixíʔ | axáʔ | a-s-c-qʷəlqʷílt.
| AFF | DEM | DEM | 2SG.GEN-NOM-CUST-speak
“That’s what you said.” (GW:251)

(22) | way̓ | məɬ | ixíʔ | itlíʔ | s-n-xt̕s-iws-m-s.
| AFF | CONJ | DEM | DEM | NOM-to.go.on-middle-MID-3SG.GEN
And then he went on. (GW:812)

Notably, there are no occurrences of a demonstrative adverb - simple demonstrative sequence: the reverse order must obtain. My fieldwork offers corroborating evidence that this logical possibility is ungrammatical. It is also notable that in cases like (21), a distal demonstrative almost always precedes the proximal demonstrative. While there are 11 occurrences of the string ixíʔ axáʔ (cf also (25) below), there is only 1 occurrence of the string axáʔ ixíʔ.
6.5 Clause Final Demonstratives

There are 8 occurrences of simple demonstratives in sentence final position. These may be syntactic arguments of predicates (23), or perhaps appositive (24):

(23) cùs-əlx: “tanm̓ ùs ixiʔ; ...
say-(DIR)-3PL.ERG of.no.concern DEM
They said: “That's nothing;...” (GW:754)

(24) waʔ ixiʔ sic kʔəmtíws axáʔ; ...
AFF DEM new riding.horse DEM
They’re already on their horses; ... (GW:670)

6.6 Demonstratives and Independent Pronouns

There are a few occurrences of demonstratives which precede independent pronouns, as in (25) and (26):

(25) axáʔ anwíʔ [kʷ s-xʔítx],
DEM 2SG.INDEP 2SG.ABS NOM-oldest
ixíʔ axáʔ tík̕nt-s-n;
DEM DEM provide.with.food-DIR-2SG.ACC-1SG.ERG
“You are the oldest one, this is for your lunch;” (GW:794)

(26) waʔ ixiʔ incáʔ nakʷəm kʷu ec-m̓ ayʔ-st-ís.
AFF DEM 1SG.INDEP EVID 1SG.ABS STAT-tell story-CAUS-3ERG
“That's me he's telling a story about.” (GW:857)

The bracketed string in (25) is itself equivalent to the given English translation *You are the oldest one*, making the preceding demonstrative + independent pronoun extraneous to the core proposition. These could be included for emphatic effect. In (26), the demonstrative + independent pronoun sequence is clearly in focus position, since it precedes the pre-predicative evidential nakʷəm.

6.7 way̓ ixíʔ

To end this survey of non-DP-adjacent demonstrative environments, I will discuss the sequence *way̓ ixíʔ*. Its most common translation is one of temporal subsequence, similar to both the ‘and’ fronting structures discussed in 6.3, as well as the sequence *ul ixiʔ* illustrated by (17).

(27) way̓ ixiʔ [l̕xʷp̓-ám axáʔ iʔ səxʷkʷúlm];
AFF DEM run.out-MID DEM DET worker
“That then he ran out the working man” (GW:450)
It is not clear if wayixíʔ contributes a temporal semantics to the proposition, or simply affirms previous content⁸, or perhaps both. (29) is an ‘and’ fronting case of wayixíʔ. Assuming that only two elements of one identical type can be conjoined, (29) might be construed as evidence that wayixíʔ stands-in for an entire proposition. Such an analysis could potentially be extended to all cases of ‘and’ fronting.

(29) …; [wayixíʔ] uɬ [n-kxn-íls axáʔ iʔ tkɬmílxʷ].
AFF DEM CONJ follow-want.to DEM DET woman
...; but she wanted to go too the Woman. (GW:667)

It is not always the case that the demonstrative in the sequences wayixíʔ and wayaxáʔ have no deictic referents. In (30) and (31), I infer that the demonstrative has a discourse referent, and is not functioning as a temporal adverbial. In (32), the referent is clearly the following nominal DP.

(30) cù-s “way axáʔ siws-nt-xʷ,...
say-(TR)-3.ERG AFF DEM drink-DIR-2SG.ERG
She told him: “Drink this,... (GW:643)

(31) wayixíʔ mət iʔ silxʷaʔ siwlkʷ.
AFF DEM EPIS DET big water
That must be the big ocean. (GW:276)

(32) wayaxáʔ [iʔ tətw ̓ it] t'í
AFF DEM DET boy PT
ixíʔ my-p-nù-s…
DEM to.know-INCH-manage.to-3ERG
Well this boy as soon as he realized that... (GW:626)

(31) is important because it suggests that a demonstrative within the pre-predicative clitic string is not automatically precluded from having a deictic referent.

On the whole, wayixíʔ is much more common than wayaxáʔ. There are 107 occurrences of wayixíʔ, with 70 of these (65.4%) directly preceding predicates. This contrasts with wayaxáʔ, which occurs only 20 times, and only 5 of these (25%) precede predicates. Example (30) is one of these 5.

⁸ This is expected since wayi is the usual way to say ‘yes’ in the language.
6.8 Summary of Non-DP-adjacent demonstratives

This section has presented examples of the major non-DP-adjacent demonstrative environments in this text. The relative frequency of proximals and distals for each class is represented by figures 10 and 11, respectively:

**Figure 10.** Distribution of Non-DP-adjacent axáʔ Proximals (% of n=97)

**Figure 11.** Distribution of Non-DP-adjacent ixíʔ Distals (% of n=486)

In comparing figures 10 and 11, a couple of important generalizations emerge. Firstly, approximately 50% of both non-DP-adjacent distals and proximals occur

---

9 The “other” category in Figure 11 contains miscellaneous uses of *ixíʔ* which did not easily fit into other categories, for instance preceding quantifiers and complementizers.
before predicates. Secondly, only distal demonstratives occur before conjunctions, and the number (n=91) is not insignificant. Aside from these exceptions, and overlooking the fact that non-DP-adjacent distals are five times more common than their proximal counterparts, the internal relative distribution of non-DP-adjacent proximal and distal demonstratives is remarkably similar.

7 Conclusions and Further Questions

By incorporating the distribution data from section 5’s DP-adjacent demonstratives into figures 10 and 11, we can represent the total distribution of proximal and distal demonstratives by type, in figures 12 and 13 below. The most striking difference between proximals and distals is the relative proportion of DP-adjacent demonstratives in each category. I conclude from this study that the proximal demonstrative *axáʔ* is much more tied to the DP/nominal domain than is the distal demonstrative *ixíʔ*, at least with regards to the narrative style of this particular speaker. The ultimate reasons for this are beyond the scope of this paper, but I conjecture that it is related to the frequent use of *ixíʔ* as a temporal deictic (as discussed in section 6) in structures like ‘and’ fronting, and its common interspersion within the pre-predicative clitic string. It is possible that there is a deep distinction in Okanagan, where entities are perceived as being more ‘tangible’ than events, and thus more likely to be referred to with a proximal demonstrative. It is also possible that *ixíʔ* refers to longer temporal spans than *axáʔ*. These hypotheses must be tested.

**Figure 12.** Total Proximal (*axáʔ*) Uses (n=438)
Finally there is the question of whether a discontinuous demonstrative – DP constituency is possible. Comparing examples such as (33) and (34) suggests that this is a possibility:

(33) $ixiʔ$ xʷíčɬt-xʷ,…
DEM give-TR-2SG.ERG
This you give to him,… (GW:127)

(34) $ixiʔ$ xʷíčɬt-xʷ iʔ qə́y̕ mín;
DEM give-TR-2SG.ERG DET paper
Give him this paper. (GW:605)

If $ixiʔ$ in (34) has been separated from its constituent DP $iʔ qə́y̕ mín ‘the paper’, then it is possible that the number of demonstratives which can be considered DP-adjacent is greater than figure 13 indicates. The question would nevertheless remain as to why $ixiʔ$ allows discontinuous constituency more often than $axáʔ$. I leave these questions for future research.
Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>INCH</td>
<td>inchoative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb</td>
<td>INDEP</td>
<td>independent pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative transitivizer</td>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUST</td>
<td>customary</td>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DET</td>
<td>determiner</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIR</td>
<td>directive transitivizer</td>
<td>RFLX</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DITR</td>
<td>ditransitivizer</td>
<td>RCPR</td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIS</td>
<td>epistemic modal</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
<td>STAT</td>
<td>stative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVID</td>
<td>evidential</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitivizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>YNQ</td>
<td>yes-no question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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