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Social deixis/honorification is diverse in grammatical form:

- Respect vocabularies
  Javanese
- Respect morphemes
  Japanese, Korean
- **Skewing** -- respect conveyed by manipulating morphosyntactic feature values
  Person: $2 > 3$ -- European T/V, $2 > 1\text{INCL}$ -- Ainu
  Number: $\text{SG} > \text{DU}$ -- Yagua (Payne 1985)
Social deixis/honorification is diverse in grammatical form:

- Respect vocabularies
  - Javanese

- Respect morphemes
  - Japanese, Korean

- **Skewing** -- respect conveyed by manipulating morphosyntactic feature values
  - Person: 2 > 3 -- European T/V, 2 > 1INCL -- Ainu
  - Number: SG > DU -- Yagua (Payne 1985)

Ticuna: social deixis conveyed by skewing **noun class** (and only noun class)
(Errington 1988; Fleming 2016, 2017)
Introduction

Social deixis is also diverse in meaning
- What is indexed
  - Absolute status (genderlects) vs. relation
Social deixis is also diverse in meaning

- **What is indexed**
  - Absolute status (genderlects) vs. relation

- **When indexing a relation:**
  - Nature of the relation -- more specific ('mother-in-law languages') to more vague (T/V pronouns)
  - Origo of the relation (who owes respect)
  - Target of the relation (who receives respect)
Introduction

Social deixis is also diverse in meaning

- What is indexed
  - Absolute status (genderlects) vs. relation
- When indexing a relation:
  - Nature of the relation -- more specific ('mother-in-law languages') to more vague (T/V pronouns)
  - Origo of the relation (who owes respect)
  - Target of the relation (who receives respect)

Ticuna: relative social deixis encoding respect; flexible origo but fixed target
(Haviland 1979; Agha 1993; Fleming 2012, 2014)
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Background
Background on Ticuna

Isolate/orphan (Carvalho 2009) spoken by 41,500-69,000 people in Colombia, Brazil, and Peru
Spoken by all ages in Peru (~7k) and Brazil (34.5-60k), somewhat endangered in Colombia (2k?) (Montes 2004; Santos 2004)
Background on Ticuna

- Mixed head and dependent-marking characteristics
- Nominative alignment
- Minimal clause is only verb
- Tone important both at lexical and at grammatical level
  - 8 possible tones on monosyllables ($^1 = $superlow, $^5 = $superhigh)
  - Extensive grammatical tone, especially in noun class system
Data background

Data here from 8 months of my fieldwork in/around town of Cushillocococha, Peru (pop. ~3,000), 2015-2017.

Data sources:
- Audio/video recordings of conversations (and other everyday talk)
- Overheard speech
- Elicitation -- to complete noun class paradigms

Also common in politeness/honorification research: questionnaires, introspection. I did not use these
Section 3

Noun class
Noun class system in overview

5 noun classes, labeled with Roman numerals I-V. 3/5 contain animates and inanimates, 1 only inanimates, 1 only animates.
5 noun classes, labeled with Roman numerals I-V. 3/5 contain animates and inanimates, 1 only inanimates, 1 only animates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Class I</th>
<th>Class II</th>
<th>Class III</th>
<th>Class IV</th>
<th>Class V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animates</td>
<td>yes (1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inanimates</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Noun class assignment for animates *absent* social deixis

- **Class I:** $te^{1}e^{5}$ 'who?/someone'

Humannounsthatdon'tdenotesocialgender,e.g. $ɟa^{4}gṵ^{1}ã^{1}$ 'oldperson,'cantakeII,IV,orVagreementdependingon socialgenderofreferent
Noun class assignment for animates *absent* social deixis

- **Class I:** `te¹ʔe⁵` 'who?/someone'
- **Class II:** human men/boys

Humans that don't denote social gender, e.g. `ɟa⁴³gṵ¹ã̰¹` 'old person,' can take II, IV, or V agreement depending on social gender of referent.
Noun class assignment for animates *absent* social deixis

- **Class I:** te¹ʔe⁵ 'who?/someone'
- **Class II:** human men/boys
- **Class III:** n/a, no animates
Noun class assignment for animates absent social deixis

- Class I: te⁴ʔe⁵ 'who?/someone'
- Class II: human men/boys
- Class III: n/a, no animates
- Class IV: humans of any gender
  Also: first and second person pronouns
Noun class assignment for animates *absent* social deixis

- **Class I**: \(te^1?e^5\) 'who?/someone'
- **Class II**: human men/boys
- **Class III**: n/a, no animates
- **Class IV**: humans of any gender
  
  *Also: first and second person pronouns*
- **Class V**: human women/girls

Human nouns that don't denote social gender, e.g. \(ja^{43}gy^1\tilde{a}^1\) 'old person,' can take II, IV, or V agreement depending on social gender of referent.
Noun class assignment for inanimates

Class I: sweet fruit; many metal objects
\( di^3\tilde{e}^3ru^1 \) 'money' (\(<\) Iberian), \( wo^3ru^3a^1 \) 'mirror' (\(<\) Tupi-Guaraní)
Noun class assignment for inanimates

- **Class I:** sweet fruit; many metal objects
  \[\text{\textit{di}^3\text{\textepsilon}^3\textit{ru}}^1 \ 'money' (\textless Iberian), \textit{wo}^3\textit{ru}^3a^1 \ 'mirror' (\textless Tupi-Guaraní)

- **Class II:** all palms; artefacts traditionally made from palms
  \[\text{\textit{j}u}^3\textit{ra}^1 \ 'Iriartea deltoidea; floor' (\textless Tupi-Guaraní), \textit{pe}^4\textit{t}fi^1 \ 'basket'
Noun class assignment for inanimates

- **Class I:** sweet fruit; many metal objects
  
  \[d\ddot{e}^3ru^1\ 'money' (< Iberian), \ wo^3ru^3a^1\ 'mirror' (< Tupi-Guaraní)

- **Class II:** all palms; artefacts traditionally made from palms
  
  \[ju^3ra^1\ 'Iriartea deltoidea; floor' (< Tupi-Guaraní), \ pe^4?tfi^1\ 'basket'

- **Class III:** all dicot trees; artefacts traditionally made from dicot trees
  
  Thus \[\eta u^3\tilde{e}^3\ 'boat' \ (narrowly: 'canoe') \rightarrow \text{all vehicles}
  
  \[\ddot{r}^4\tilde{e}^3\ 'house' \rightarrow \text{all buildings}

Noun class assignment for inanimates

- **Class I**: sweet fruit; many metal objects
  \(di³ær³ru¹\) 'money' (< Iberian), \(wo³ru³a¹\) 'mirror' (< Tupi-Guaraní)

- **Class II**: all palms; artefacts traditionally made from palms
  \(ju³ra¹\) 'Iriartea deltoidea; floor' (< Tupi-Guaraní), \(pe⁴ʔtfi¹\) 'basket'

- **Class III**: all dicot trees; artefacts traditionally made from dicot trees
  Thus \(ju³le³\) 'boat' (narrowly: 'canoe') \(→\) all vehicles
  \(ʔ4³\) 'house' \(→\) all buildings

- **Class IV**: default noun class -- all inanimate nouns not assigned to Class I-III
  \(ta³ra⁵\) 'machete,' \(u³i¹\) 'toasted manioc' (< Tupi-Guaraní)
Noun class assignment for inanimates

- **Class I:** sweet fruit; many metal objects  
  \(di³ê³ru¹\) 'money' (< Iberian), \(wo³ru³a¹\) 'mirror' (< Tupi-Guaraní)

- **Class II:** all palms; artefacts traditionally made from palms  
  \(ju³ra¹\) 'Iriartea deltoidea; floor' (< Tupi-Guaraní), \(pe⁴tfi¹\) 'basket'

- **Class III:** all dicot trees; artefacts traditionally made from dicot trees  
  Thus \(nu³le³\) 'boat' (narrowly: 'canoe') \(\rightarrow\) all vehicles  
  \(i⁴³\) 'house' \(\rightarrow\) all buildings

- **Class IV:** default noun class -- all inanimate nouns not assigned to Class I-III  
  \(ta³ra⁵\) 'machete,' \(u³i¹\) 'toasted manioc' (< Tupi-Guaraní)

- **Class V:** n/a, no inanimates for most speakers
Targets of noun class agreement

✗ Nouns themselves
Targets of noun class agreement

- Nouns themselves
- All other noun phrase constituents
  - Quantifiers
  - Relative clauses (~ adjectives)
  - Demonstratives (6 sets)
  - Pronouns
  - Linkers -- introduce all nouns in certain syntactic environments (2 sets, only 1 agrees)
Targets of noun class agreement

- Nouns themselves
- All other noun phrase constituents
  - Quantifiers
  - Relative clauses (~ adjectives)
  - Demonstratives (6 sets)
  - Pronouns
  - Linkers -- introduce all nouns in certain syntactic environments (2 sets, only 1 agrees)
- Some verb phrase constituents
  - Subject proclitics (2 sets x 3 verb classes)
  - Third person object proclitics (2 sets)
  - Existential verb
Targets of noun class agreement

Exemplifying non class agreement with quantifiers:

(1) Class I: \( mu^1e^3 \ ja^4 \ pe^3ti^4ka^2 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mu}^4 &= e^3 \ ja^4 \ pe^3ti^4ka^2 \\
\text{many} &= \text{NMLZ(I) LNK(I/II) marble(I)}
\end{align*}
\]

'many marbles'

(2) Class II: \( mu^1ki^3 \ ja^4 \ tfe^3ra^1 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mu}^4 &= ki^3 \ ja^4 \ pe^3ti^4ka^2 \\
\text{many} &= \text{NMLZ(II) LNK(I/II) handsaw(II)}
\end{align*}
\]

'many handsaws'

Animate Class II is same: \( mu^1ki^3 \ ja^4 \ \eta e^1?ti^1?i^3ki^3 \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mu}^4 &= ki^3 \ ja^4 \ \eta e^1?ti^1?i^3ki^3 \\
\text{many} &= \text{NMLZ(II) LNK(I/II) young.man(II)}
\end{align*}
\]

'many young men'
Targets of noun class agreement

More quantifiers:

(3) Class III: \( mu^1?i^5ne^1 ja^1 \eta u^{31}e^3 \)

\( mu^4 = ?i^5ne^1 ja^1 \eta u^{31}e^3 \)
many = NMLZ(III) LNK(III) canoe(III)
'many canoes'

(4) Class IV: \( mu^1?i^4i^4 ta^3ra^5 \)

\( mu^4 = ?i^4 i^4 ta^3ra^5 \)
many = NMLZ(IV) LNK(IV) machete(IV)
'many machetes'
Targets of noun class agreement

More quantifiers:

(6) Class III: \( mu^1\tilde{n}e^1 ja^1 \eta u^{31}e^3 \)

\[ mu^4 = \tilde{n}e^1 \ja^1 \eta u^{31}e^3 \]

many = NMLZ(III) LNK(III) canoe(III)

'many canoes'

(7) Class IV: \( mu^1\tilde{i}^4 i^4 ta^3ra^5 \)

\[ mu^4 = \tilde{i}^4 i^4 ta^3ra^5 \]

many = NMLZ(IV) LNK(IV) machete(IV)

'many machetes'

(8) Class V: \( mu^4ki^3 i^2 pa^4ki^3 \)

\[ mu^4 = ki^3 i^2 pa^4ki^3 \]

many = NMLZ(V) LNK(V) young.woman(V)

'many young women'
Discourse prominence of noun class agreement

Notionally possible to use a noun without any noun class marking...
Discourse prominence of noun class agreement

Notionally possible to use a noun without any noun class marking...
But only in very limited syntactic environments:

- Not if the noun is a subject or object
- Not if the noun is quantified or modified by a demonstrative
- Not under anaphora
- Not if the noun is head of a relative clause / extracted in a focus construction
- Not if the noun follows the main predicate

→ Virtually all nouns in connected discourse trigger some noun class agreement
Section 4

Social deixis
Form of socially deictic noun class

Steps to social deixis:

1. Take a nominal referring to a human -- any nominal except a 1/2 pronoun
2. Give it Class I agreement on all agreement targets
3. You have now conveyed respect toward the referent of the noun
Form of socially deictic noun class

Steps to social deixis:

1. Take a nominal referring to a human -- any nominal except a 1/2 pronoun
2. Give it Class I agreement on all agreement targets
3. You have now conveyed respect toward the referent of the noun

...which cannot be Spkr or Adr

I will not unpack what 'respect' means. Between people who know each other, it tracks kinship
Form of socially deictic noun class

(9) Speaker on a man contemporary with his parents
\[ tî³¹ma³ma¹ra³i³ja⁴ \text{Vergilio}_ja⁴ ni⁴¹î⁴⁴ "vi³ri³ri⁵, vi³ri³ri⁵, vi³ri³ri⁵."

\[ tî³¹ma³ = ma¹ra³i³ja⁴ \text{Vergilio}_ja⁴ ni⁴¹î⁴⁴ \]
\[ 3(I) = \text{nose} \quad \text{LNK(I)} \quad \text{V} \quad \text{LNK(I)} \quad \text{FOC} \]
\[ vi³ri³ri⁵ \]
\[ \text{sound.symbolism:snoring} \]

'\text{Vergilio}_{\text{hon}}, \text{his}_{\text{hon}} \text{nose went } "\text{vi³ri³ri⁵ vi³ri³ri⁵ vi³ri³ri⁵}"
\text{(as he}_{\text{hon} \text{ snored}).'}
Meaning of socially deictic noun class

Grammatical system of noun class constrains the target of honorification: always $\text{Ref} \neq \text{Spkr} \neq \text{Adr}$.

What about the origo? Notional possibilities:

- Speaker
- Addressee
- Bystanders
- Other referents in the discourse

For any $X$ above, to find unambiguous examples of $X$-Ref social deixis, we need situations where $X$ and only $X$ owes respect to the Ref.
At my request M and A are discussing a construction project on S' house, where M is temporarily living.

- S is not present
- M owes respect to S due to a classificatory kin relationship
- A and me (behind camera) are not involved in any respect relations with M or S

First (non-repair) exchange in the recording is (10)
Speaker as origo

(10)  
a. **A:** \(da^{31}a^{1} i^{43} ri^{1} ma^{3}ri^{3} na^{4} \eta au^{1}\)  
  \(da^{31}a^{1} \quad i^{43} \quad ri^{1} \quad ma^{3}ri^{3} na^{4} = \eta au^{1}\)  
  DNOM1(III) house(III) TOP PERF 3 = be.worn.out  
  'This house has gotten worn out.'

b. **M:** \(ma^{3}ri^{3} na^{4} \eta au^{1} ki^{5}i^{3}, ni^{41}i^{4}\)  
  \(ma^{3}ri^{3} na^{4} = \eta au^{1} \quad ki^{5}i^{3} \quad ni^{41}i^{4}\)  
  PERF 3 = be.worn.out DM FOC  
  'You bet, it IS worn out'

c. **M:** \(\eta e^{3}ma^{2}ka^{1} wa^{31}i^{5} ni^{41}i^{4} ta^{1} na^{3} me^{43} \tilde{e}^{4} \tilde{e}^{2} i^{3} ri^{4}\)  
  \(\eta e^{3}ma^{2} = ka^{1} \quad wa^{31}i^{5} \quad ni^{41}i^{4} \quad ta^{1} = na^{3} = me^{43}\)  
  DNOM5(IV) = PURP hedge FOC 3(I) = 3.OBJ = good  
  -\(\tilde{e}^{4} \tilde{e}^{3} = ?i^{4} \quad e^{3}ri^{4}\)  
  -CAUS = SUB DM  
  'THAT'S WHY um he_{hon} (S) is fixing it'
Addressee as origo

R, R's husband, R's daughter-in-law, and 2 kids (one R's, one Daughter-in-Law's) are visiting R's father D. D's wife is weaving behind the house. I am not present

- Everyone else owes respect to D and his wife due to kin relations
- D and his wife don't owe respect to anyone else
- Husband-wife is not a respect relationship, e.g. D does not use honorificiation to refer to his wife when talking to me
Addressee as origo

R, R's husband, R's daughter-in-law, and 2 kids (one R's, one Daughter-in-Law's) are visiting R's father D. D's wife is weaving behind the house. I am not present

- Everyone else owes respect to D and his wife due to kin relations
- D and his wife don't owe respect to anyone else
- Husband-wife is not a respect relationship, e.g. D does not use honorification to refer to his wife when talking to me

R's kid shows up with a digital camera and begins snapping photos of R and D to much hilarity. Several seconds of laughter, then D says to R's kid (11).
Addressee as origo

(11)  ka⁴, no³¹ʔẽ⁵ ti³¹ʔi³ a³jau²ʔti⁴ki¹ʔi³na¹, ti³¹ma²a¹ri³ ã³ki⁵ʔi⁴ i⁵ta¹ʔi²ʔi⁴wa⁵

ka⁴ no³¹ʔẽ⁵ ti³¹ =ʔi³ a³ = jau²?
look! grandmother 3(I) = ACC IMP + AM = take
= tʃi⁴ki¹ʔi³na¹ ti³¹ma²a¹ri³ ã³ki⁴ =ʔi⁴ i⁵ =
= NI:picture 3(I).AL.POSS HESIT = NMLZ(IV) IMPF =
ta¹ = i² =ʔi⁴ = wa⁵
3(I) = make = SUB = ALL

'Hey, as for Grandma, go and take a picture of her hon, where she hon is making her hon whatsitcalled'
Other referents as origos

Totem Fields Storyboards 'Chore Girl' - elicitation tool for circumstantial modality

Mary
Other referents as origos

(12) \( da^{31}e^2 ti^{41} \tilde{r}^4 ja^4 Bi^3tu^5 a^1ri^3 ma^3ma^5 ri^1 ni^{31}ma^2 i^4 Bi^3tu^5. \)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{da}^{31}{\text{?e}}^{2} & \quad \text{ti}^{41} = \text{\texttilde{r}}^{4} \quad \text{ja}^{4} \quad \text{Bi}^{3}\text{tu}^{5} = a^{1}\text{ri}^{3} \\
\text{DNOM1(1)} & \quad 3(1) = \text{COP} \quad \text{LNK(1)} \quad \text{B} = \text{AL.POSS} \\
\text{ma}^{3}\text{ma}^{5} & \quad \text{ri}^{1} \quad \text{ni}^{31}\text{ma}^{2} \quad i^{4} \quad \text{Bi}^{3}\text{tu}^{5} \\
\text{mother(I) and 3(IV)} & \quad \text{LNK(IV)} \quad \text{B}
\end{align*}
\]

'This\textit{hon} is\textit{hon} Victoria's mother\textit{hon} and Victoria\textit{non—hon}.'
An ambiguous example

Compare the above with a case where the origo is ambiguous

(13) Mother$_i$ is telling adult daughter about what Cushillococochocha was like when she$_i$ was a child. Mother says to daughter,

\[ \text{je}^4 \text{ma}^4 \text{we}^5 \text{na}^1 \text{ri}^1, \text{tau}^5 e^2 \text{ta}^2 \text{q}^1 i^5 \text{ri}^1 \text{tʃo}^{31} \text{ʔ}^3 \text{Lima} = \text{wa}^5 \text{ta}^4 \text{mu}^2 \]

\[ \text{je}^4 \text{ma}^4 = \text{we}^5 \text{na}^1 \text{ri}^1 \text{tau}^5 e^2 \text{ta}^2 \text{q}^1 i^5 \text{ri}^1 \]

DNOM6(IV) = after TOP deceased(I) grandfather TOP tʃo$^{31} = ?^3$ Lima = wa$^5$ ta$^4 = \text{mu}^2$

1SG = ACC L = ALL 3(I) = send

'After that, (my) late$_{hon}$ grandfather, he$_{hon}$ sent me to Lima.' (ECG, ebu 4:30)
Possible origos

Out of the notional possibilities:

- ✓ Speaker as origo (10)
- ✓ Addressee as origo (11)
- ✓ Another referent as origo (12)
- ? Ratified bystander as origo -- no unambiguous examples

Speaker's metalinguistic comments focus on speaker as origo -- but their actual usage shows that any discourse participant or salient discourse referent can be origo
Are other languages different?

In more familiar languages, origo of social deixis assumed to be a property of the form:

- **English**
  Firstname vs. Title + Lastname: origo is Spkr, target is Ref

- **Romance, Germanic other than English**
  T/V pronouns: origo is Spkr, target is Adr = Ref

- **Japanese**
  Object honorifics: origo is Ref₁, target is Ref₂

But there are addressee effects even in these systems: honorific 'raising/lowering'.

Why not analyze them as flexible origo as well: origo can be any discourse participant?
(English - Murphy 1988, Tongan - Bott 1981)
Conclusion 1: Noun class

Every part of the grammar and lexicon can potentially convey social deixis

- Familiar: vocabularies, lexical items, skewing $2 \succ 3$
- Less familiar: skewing number $\text{Sg} \succ \text{Pl}$
- New today: skewing gender

Not the only case of skewing gender -- analogues in Kambaata, Shona, Lak (Treis 2007; Corbett 1991; Déchaine et al. 2014)
Conclusion 2: Social deixis

Substantive
- Origo of social deixis is **not always speaker**
- Origo is also **not always fixed**: can range over set of discourse participants and referents

Methods
- Speakers' intuitions about social deixis may not reflect their production
  - Problem for questionnaire/introspection-based studies of politeness
  - Alternatives: observation, more controlled questionnaires (Murphy 1988)
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