Form and Qualitative Features of Demonstratives in Ethiosemitic Languages

Elizabeth Minae Kassaye

Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Linguistics and Philology, College of Humanities, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
Email: minasselizabeth@gmail.com

Desalegn Hagos Asfawwesen

Assistant Professor of Linguistics, Department of Linguistics and Philology, College of Humanities, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia
Email: dezeseze16@gmail.com

Abstract---Based on the cross-linguistic typological observations in Himmelmann (1996), Diessel (1999), and Dixon (2003, 2010), this study is concerned with the basic form and qualitative functions of demonstratives in Ethiosemitic languages. Ethiosemitic languages use various deictic elements in communication. There are two main demonstrative bases. Regarding the qualitative features, demonstratives can express information about whether the referent is female or male; a single entity or plural; or human or non-human; however, significant variation has been observed in the demonstrative systems among the given languages. Like the basic form, the independent third-person pronoun form also provides some qualitative information about the referent.

Keywords---Ethiosemitic, demonstrative, basic form, qualitative features, referent.

Introduction

This paper discuss the **form** and **qualitative features** of demonstratives in five Ethiosemitic languages (Tigrinya, Amharic, Harari, Ezha, and Kistane). The reason why the five languages were selected is that it is impossible to attest to all Ethiosemitic languages of demonstrative types in terms of the limitations of resources and time. In addition, excluding Amharic, the selected languages are the least studied. The selection is made at random from the major branches of Ethiosemitic languages. The paper was couched based on the cross-linguistic typological demonstrative works Diessel (1999), and Dixon (2003, 2010).

General Overview Of Ethiosemitic Languages

Ethiosemitic languages are the branch of the Semitic languages. They are spoken in Ethiopia and present day of Eritrea. Hetzron (1972; 1975) classified Ethiosemitic languages into two major groups: North Ethiosemitic and South Ethiosemitic. This division mainly focused on the characteristics of the verbal systems of the languages. As a result, North Ethiosemitic languages involving Ge'ez, Tigre, and **Tigrinya** and South Ethiosemitic languages, with two branches: transversal South Ethiosemitic and outer South Ethiosemitic.

Transversal South Ethiosemitic is divided into two sub-families: central (**Amharic** and Argoba) and eastern (**Harari** and Eastern Gurage languages (Silt'e,Wolane and Zay). The outer South Ethiosemitic is further subdivided into three branches: Gafat, Northern Gurage languages (**Kistane** and Dobbi), and Western Gurage languages. The Western Gurage languages included Mesqan, Central Western Gurage languages, and peripheral Western Gurage languages. The Central Western Gurage languages comprised Chaha, Gumer, **Ezha,** and Gura. The peripheral Western Gurage languages also included Gyeto, Inor, Ener, and Endegagn.

Most Ethiosemitic languages have a seven-vowel system. Such as the mid central vowel *ä*, the high back vowel *u*, the high front vowel *i,* the low central vowel *a*, the mid front vowel *e,* the high central vowel *ɨ,* and the mid back vowel o, but some languages, such as Western Gurage, have the open vowels. The long vowels are represented by doubling the short vowel, and the geminate consonants are marked by doubling the consonants. Most Ethiosemitic languages use the vowel *ɨ* as epenthetic, excluding Harari. Harari used *i* as epenthetic (Rose (1997), Demeke (2003)). Glottal or ejective consonants are expressed by the consonant with an apostrophe. Alphasyllabary, also called abugida, is a script used in the Ethiosemitic languages that primarily represents consonantvowel sequences.

Most Ethiosemitic roots are tri-radical (Yimam 1987 E.C.), (Leslau 1992, 1995, 1997), (Hetzron 1997), and (Rose 1996, 1997). These roots are classified mostly into three

types (type A, type B, and type C). The classification is based on the presence or absence of the lengthening of the penultimate radical and on the quality of vowels that are inserted between the radicals to show grammatical properties like aspect and mood. In terms of aspect, Ethiosemitic verbs marked distinct morphologies for perfective and imperfective forms, which may or may not appear with the tense markers Hetzron (1968), Leslau (1981), and Rose (1996, 1997).

In most cases, tense is marked by verbal auxiliaries, which in the present are cliticized to the lexical verb, and in the past are independent verbs. In addition, in most Ethiosemitic languages, the perfective verb form has a past tense reading, but the imperfective verb has two readings (progressive and habitual). Suffixes are used as subject agreement markers in the perfective verb form, whereas prefixes or prefix-suffix combinations are used for imperative and jussive verb forms. Some Ethiosemitic languages (Muher, Kistane, and Dobbi) show main verb markers (MVM). Negation is encoded by the pre-verbal and post-verbal negative markers, and subjectobject-Verb (SOV) is the unmarked word order in a simple clause and object shift for topicalization in Ethiosemitic languages.

Statement of the Problem

There are some dedicated works on demonstratives in Semitic languages in general, as Hasselbach (2007), and in particular in Ethiosemitic languages, as Getatchew (1967), Sindu (2014) on Amharic, and Diriba (2013) on Zay. Hasselbach (2007), in his article provides the analysis of Semitic demonstratives from a crosslinguistics and diachronic perspective, and he reconstructed the Semitic demonstratives.

Hasselbach presents the data only from the Northern Ethiosemitic languages (Ge'ez, Tigre, and Tigrinya), leaving aside the South Ethiosemitic language evidences (which have shown different qualitative features). Besides, Hasselbach (2007) primarily focused on pronominal and adnominal demonstratives but less focused on adverbial demonstratives in his analysis. Finally, he concluded that demonstratives in Semitic provide a good example of a situation where language typology can aid in language reconstruction.

In his seminar work, Getachew (1967) presents "Demonstrative pronouns in Amharic". This work presents Amharic use of the third-person pronoun form as a demonstrative, which indicates an entity proximal to the hearer but far distance from the speaker. In addition, Amharic has a pair of demonstrative bases: **proximal**—an entity proximal for the speaker but distal from the hearer— and **distal**—an entity distal from both. Sindu (2014) presented a description of Amharic demonstratives in her MA thesis. She has categorized Amharic demonstratives based on Dixon's (2003) typological work. According to her, Amharic has two demonstrative pronouns to refer to distal or proximal entities, considering the speaker as a deictic center.

Diriba (2013) introduced deixis in Zay. According to Diriba (2013), deictic expressions in Zay are treated as simple and complex, and demonstratives in Zay are treated as a simple morphological composition that indicates two degrees of distance: distal vs. proximal. In addition, demonstratives in Zay are functioning as pronominal or adnominal, i.e., they can occur alone (as pronoun functions) or they can co-occur with nouns (as modifiers to a head noun). In both positions, they use suffixes that indicate the gender and number of their referents.

In addition, there are several studies on the Ethiosemitic languages, including grammatical comparative works like Hetzron (1977, 1997); Meyer (2011); and Tsehay (2008). There are also grammatical-descriptive works on individual Ethiosemitic languages. But, in the previous works, there are sub-sections that discuss morphological and syntactic descriptions of demonstratives. However, when we look at these works and try to apply the findings to the demonstratives provided, for instance, by general typological works like Diessel (1999), Dixon (2003, 2010), and Himmelmann (1996), we understand that there are many issues that have been left untouched or have not been treated in depth. For example, there is a lack of agreement on the number of spatial demonstratives in Ezha, Tigrinya, and Kistane. A detailed description of the deictic and qualitative features of demonstratives in Tigrinya, Amharic, Ezha, Kistane, and Harari is lacking. In general, the previous studies mainly dealt with specific morphological or morphosyntactic aspects but neglected the semantic aspects of deictic expressions. Besides, there are no comparative studies in demonstratives on the Ethiosemitic languages.

Thus, the main objective of this study is to give a comparative analysis of demonstrative constructions in Ethiosemitic languages. Specifically, this study attempts: to describe the basic form of demonstratives in Tigrinya, Amharic, Ezha, Kistane, and Harari, to identify the qualitative features of demonstratives and to compare how related and distinct these languages are in terms of morphological structures and qualitative features of their demonstratives.

Methodology

This research collects data from two sources. One is from native-speaking informants, and the other is from secondary sources, i.e., written narratives and texts (published and unpublished PhD dissertations and M.A. theses). My approach is descriptive and comparative. Thus, I will draw on comparative evidence from the selected languages. These will provide greater insight into how the languages are related and distinct with respect to the form and semantic features of demonstratives and how the issues themselves will be best analyzed. The collected data were presented in a fourlevel format. The first line presents the informant's actual utterance; the data is separated into morphemes in the second line; the third line is the morpheme-by-morpheme gloss; and the fourth line is the translation.

Conceptual Framework

Demonstratives and personal pronouns are deictic elements in a language. First- and second-person pronouns refer to the speech participants, while demonstratives establish a new focus of attention or contrast two previously established referents, and this shifting reference is related to spatial location (Dixon 2003: 61-62). Diessel (1999:36) defines demonstratives based on three features: syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic.

Diessel (1999) suggests that demonstratives are deictic expressions that serve specific syntactic functions. According to Diessel (1999), demonstratives have two different syntactical statuses, namely, a distributional status and a categorical status.

From a distributional perspective, demonstratives may occur in the following four different syntactic contexts: (I). Pronominal demonstratives, which make up independent NP (as pronoun function) in the argument position of verbs and adpositions (in English, e.g., "*This* is the house," (II). Adnominal demonstratives, which occur in an NP with a noun (e.g., '*this* house"). (III). Adverbial demonstratives, which can function as verb modifiers (in English, e.g., "I put your pen *here*"), (IV) identificational demonstratives, which occur in copula and nonverbal clauses (e.g., "Your pen is *this* or *here'),* (Diessel 1999:57). According to Diessel (1999), the distributional status of demonstratives is a language-universal property.

Whereas the categorical status of demonstrative is a combination of certain distributions and forms of demonstratives as well as language-specific properties. If demonstrative might differ in form in different syntactic contexts, then they belong to four different categorical statuses (grammatical categories), namely: demonstrative pronouns; demonstrative determiners; demonstrative adverbs; and demonstrative identifiers.The distinction between the two demonstrative statuses is important. Because some languages use demonstratives of the same grammatical category (the same form) in more than one syntactic context, other languages employ formally distinct demonstratives in each position.

Dixon (2003:65–72) suggests three main types of demonstratives based on their syntactic function, as opposed to Diessel's (1999) four categories: nominal, adverbial, and verbal. According to Dixon (2003), nominal demonstratives included subsuming Diessel's (1999) categories of demonstrative determiners and demonstrative pronouns.

At the semantic level, demonstratives indicate the relative distance of an object, location, or person vis-à-vis the deictic center (also called the *origo),* which is usually associated with the location of the speaker (Lyons 1977: 648). In the majority of languages Demonstratives are deictically contrastive at; typically, a distal demonstrative indicates a certain relative distance from the deictic center, whereas a proximal

demonstrative indicates proximity to the center. The *origo* or deictic center may include the speaker only, the addressee only, both of them, or it may be transposed to an imaginary indexical ground (Ashmore 2009:41). Lyons (1977:638) and Levinsin (1983:64) state that if the speaker is the central person in an utterance, then the time that the speaker makes a speech act is the central time, and the speaker's location during the speech act is the central place.

Pragmatically, demonstratives are used to focus on interlocutor's attention on objects or locations in the speech situation (Diessel 1999:93). Himmelmann (1996) has categorized demonstratives into four types based on their use, namely: situational use, discourse deictic use, tracking (often called anaphoric or co-referential) use, and recognitional use. The situational use of demonstratives establishes an entity present at the time of utterance. However, in discourse use, demonstratives refer to an entire utterance or proposition. The tracking use of demonstratives establishes a reference to participants that helps the hearer keep track of what is happening to whom in a given discourse. Demonstratives in the recognitional use of referred entities represent common or shared knowledge between the participants (out of a given discourse) (Himmelmann 1996:219–239).

Data Presentation and Discussion

In this section, I first describe the basic form of the demonstratives in the selected languages. Then, I illustrate the qualitative features of demonstratives in the languages. These descriptions are based on Diessel (1999), which is a detailed study of demonstratives in a large variety of languages. The purpose of these descriptions is to illustrate the extent of the formal variation and similarity of demonstrative construction among the languages.

6.1. **Basic form of demonstratives in Ethiosemitic**
As shown in Table 1, Amharic *Harari Ezha Kistane* and *Tigrinya* have two basic demonstrative forms.

Table 1: Basic form of demonstratives in Amharic Harari Ezha Kistane and Tigrinya.

Languages	Demonstratives	Gloss
Amharic	*jih* (PROX)	'this'
	ja (DIS)	'that'
Harari	ji (PROX)	'this'
	jäʔ (DIS)	'that'
Ezha	*zi(h)* (PROX)	'this/these'
	za(h) (DIS)	'that/those'
Kistane	zi (PROX)	'this/these'
	za (DIS)	'that/those'

Languages	Demonstratives	Gloss
Tigrinya	ʔizi (PROX)	'this'
	ʔiti (DIS)	'that'

Table 1 reveals that the Ethiosemitic languages distinguish two series of demonstratives: the proximal (PROX) demonstratives ("this, these") and the distal (DIS) demonstratives ("that, those"). This distinction can be established for each language only on the same root morpheme, but different with affixes. The opposition, *i (h)/i,* distinguishes the proximal demonstrative a/ *äʔ* for the distal in Amharic, Harari, Ezha, and Kistane (all are south Ethiopian languages). On the other hand, *ʔi* as a demonstrative base for Tigrinya (North Ethiopian languages). The proximal entity is indicated by the suffix *-zi* attached to the base, while the distal entity is indicated by the suffix *-ti.*

In many languages, there are formal and functional similarities between demonstratives and thirdperson pronouns (Dixon 2003:67; Himmelmann 1996:206; and Anderson and Keenan 1985:280). In addition to the basic form, an independent third-person pronoun substitutes the role of demonstrative in Ethiosemitic languages. Like the basic form of demonstratives, the independent third-person pronoun also provides some qualitative information about the referents, as will be seen in (6.2.1.4).
According to Hetzron (1977: 57), the use of demonstrative forms ending in the fricative *h in Ezha* is unclear. However, Fekede (2002: 41) points out that when in a slow-pronounced speech, we use the demonstrative forms ending with the fricative *h; otherwise,* the short forms are more common. According to my investigation, it is not clear the situations. Thus, it needs further investigation.

When we compare the demonstrative bases, the Amharic and Harari demonstratives are formed from the same base*, j-* and attach with the suffixes *- ih* and *-i,* which indicate the proximity's to an entity relative to the deictic center; however, the suffixes *-a* and *-äʔ* attached with the same base *j,* which denote far deixis, respectively. On the other hand, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives are developed from the same base, *z-,* and are attached with *-i* or *-i* for proximal and *-a* for distal, respectively. In terms of the demonstrative base, we could comprehend that the languages are grouped into three categories: Amharic and Harari (the transversal South Ethiosemitic languages) in one group, and Ezha and Kistane (the northern and western Gurage languages) in the other. The third exclusive form has been shown in Tigrinya (the northern Ethiosemitic language).

Qualitative features of demonstratives in Ethiosemitic

Bühler (1934:102) categorized deictic expressions into three semantic categories: person deictic (which indicates the speech participants), place deictic (which expresses objects, locations, or persons beyond the participants), and time deictic (which is

related to the time of the speech event). As a result, semantically, demonstratives are place- or spatial-deictic, whose primary function is to indicate the relative spatial or temporal distance of a referent from a deictic center.

Also, Lyons (1977:648) and Diessel (1999:34) stated that the semantic features of demonstratives share two basic natures: a **qualitative** features and **a deictic** features. Demonstratives give some qualitative features about the referent. Diessel (1999: 48–49) argues that the referents' qualitative characteristics—such as number (i.e., whether the referent is a single or plural entity), gender (male or female), ontology (the demonstrative refers to a place, a person, or an object), human or non-human etc.—indicate the referents' quality.

These characteristics are typically represented in Ethiosemitic languages by demonstratives combined with prepositional and postpositional particles, as I will explain below, as well as by inflectional affixes that affix to a demonstrative base.

6.2.1. Number
Demonstratives in most Ethiosemitic languages are encoded for their number of referents. This feature can be indicated by demonstratives with a suffix in Harari and Tigrinya. However, in Amharic, the number of the referent is marked purely demonstrative with the prefixes, as shown below.

> *(1) a.* **jɨh** *lɨdʒ t'älla jɨwäddall* Amharic jɨh lɨdʒ
> t'älla jɨ-wädd-all PROX. M child beer 3SGM-like.IPV-
> AUX.NP
> 'this child likes a beer '

> **b.** **innäzzih** *lɨdʒotʃtʃ tämariwotʃtʃ natʃtʃäw* Amharic ɨnnä-jɨh
> lɨdʒ - otʃtʃ tamari-otʃtʃ n-atʃtʃäw PL-PROX. child-PL student-PL
> COP.PRS-3PL
> 'these children are students'

> **c.** **innäzzija** *lɨdʒotʃtʃ almazɨn säddäbuat* Amharic ɨnnä-ja
> lɨdʒ-otʃtʃ almaz-ɨn säddäb – u – at PL-DST. child-PL A-ACC
> insult. PV– 3PL.SUB. – 3FSG.OBJ
> 'Those children insulted Almaz'

The bolded parts in the Amharic examples above are the proximal demonstrative bases *jɨh* and the distal *ja,* which change in *-zzi* in (1b) and *-zziya* in (1c) when they are preceded by adding an
'associative' **prefix** *ɨnnä-*. At this time, the fricative *zz* is inserted between the prefix and the base, and the initial approximant *j* of the base changes into the vowel *i. As a*

result, the form changed into *ɨnnäzzih* 'these' and *ɨnnäzziya* 'those', which refer to the plural referent *kɨdʒ-otʃtʃ* 'child-PL' as in (1b) and (1c), respectively. This phonological process also indicates any other prefix that is attached to the demonstrative base, like *kä-*'from', *wädä-* 'toward', *sɨlä-*' because' then, which are yielding *käzzih -*'from here', *wädäzzih* 'towards here',*sɨlähzzi* 'because of this' respectively (Leslau 1969:83; Meyer 2011: 1189). When we compared the plural marker of demonstrative with the referent (noun) plural marker, the plural demonstrative marker *ɨnnä-* is positionally and phonologically different from the nominal plural marker *otʃtʃ* as *kɨdʒ-otʃtʃ* 'child -PL' shown in (1b) and (1c).

But, in Harari, both the proximal demonstrative base *ji* 'this' and the referent *däw* 'goat' are attached with the identical **suffix -**ätʃ for plurality in (2b) below.

(2) a. **ji   wäldi** gudor in*ta*   Harari
     ji   wäldi gudor int-a
     PROX.M   boy tall COP.PRS -3MSG
     'this boy is tall'

b.   **jiätʃ däwatʃ** *wädäl intäju*   Harari
     ji-ätʃ   däw-atʃ wädäl int-äju
     PROX-PL goat-PL fat- COP.PRS -3PL
      'these goats are fat'

(3)   a. **ʔizi   k'ola** *tämäharaj ɨjju*   Tigrinya
          ʔɨzi   k'ola tämähar-aj ɨjj-u
          PROX.MSG child student-M COP.PRS -3MSG
          'this child is a student'

b.   **ʔiziʔom säbat** *nɨfɨʔat ɨjjom*   Tigrinya
      ʔɨzi-om   säb-at   nɨfɨʔ-at   ɨjj-om
      PROX-M.PL person-PL clever-Pl COP.PRS -3M.PL
       'these men are clever'

Consequently, demonstratives with suffixes can be used in Tigrinya and Harari to indicate the plural number of referents, while demonstratives with prefixes can be used in Amharic.

Conversely, when followed by singular or plural head nouns, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives do not indicate the number of referents. These are a few instances.

(4) a. **zɨ gäräd** *m*ärkammanja   Ezha   zɨ   gäräd märkamma -n-ja
                        PROX   girl   beautiful-COP.PRS-3FSG
                         'this girl is beautiful'

b.   **zɨ gɨred** ʃärät ʧäkkärämam

Ezha   zɨ   gɨred   ʃärät ʧäkkär-äma–m
        PROX   girl.PL food cook.PV-3FPL-MVM
            'these girls cooked a food'

c.   **za ärdʒ** fat'uro

Ezha   za   ärdʒ   fat'ura-u
        DST   boy   tall -COP.PRS.3MSG
            'that boy is tall'

d.   **za dängja** ʒäb *k'ätt'ärom*   Ezha

                za   *dängja* ʒäb k'ätt'är-o-m
        DST   boy.PL lion kill.PV-3MPL-MVM
            'these boys killed lions '

(5) a. **za bajj** *ge aräʃʃo*   Kistane   za   bajj ge aräʃʃ-ä-u
        DIS   boy house build PV-3MSG-MVM
            'that boy built a house '

b. **za bajjoʧʧ** *ambässa gäddälmun*

                                                Kistane

        za bajj-oʧʧ ambässa gäddäl-mu-n
        DIS child-PL lion kill.PV. 3MPL-MVM
                'these children killed a lion'

c. **zi goʃh** *angaʧʧi gädälo*   Kistane

        zi goʃh angaʧʧ-i gäddäl- ä-u
        PROX boy cat-DEF   kill.PV-3MSG.MVM
        'that boy killed the cat'

d.   **zi aguʃt** *buswi gäddälmun*

                                        Kistane

        zi   aguʃt busw-i gäddäl-mu-n
        PROX boy.PL tiger-DEF kill.PV. 3MPL-MVM
                'that boys killed the tiger'

As observed from the examples above, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives, in contrast to those in Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya, do not indicate how many referents they have when they are followed by a single or plural referent. The identical form of demonstrative *zɨ* 'this' and *za* 'that' for Ezha determines the singular referent *gäräd* 'girl' in (4a) and *ärdʒ* 'boy' in (4C), and the plural referents *gɨred* 'girls' in (4b) and *dängja* 'boys' in (4d). Similarly, when Kistane demonstratives are followed by a solitary

referent, *bajj* 'child' in (5a), a plural referent, *bajjotʃ* 'children' in (5b), or an *aguʃt* 'boys' in (5c), they do not indicate how many referents they have.

6.2.2. Gender
Demonstratives in most Ethiosemitic languages can be used to infer the gender of their animate referents. The demonstratives that are proximal and distal are indicated according to the gender of their singular referent, while the plural animate referents are gender-insensitive. Examples from the Harari and Amharic data are shown here.

(6) a. **jɨh** **bäre** *tɨlk' näw*   Amharic
    jɨh   bäre tɨlk' n-äw
    PROX.M ox   big   COP.PRS -3MSG
    'this ox is big'

b. **jɨtʃtʃi** **lam** *mäsina n*äʃʃ   Amharic
    jɨh-tʃtʃi *lam mäsina n*-äʃʃ
    PROX -F cow unfertile COP.PRS -3FSG
     'this cow is unfertile'

  c. **ja** **säwɨjje** mästawätun säbbäräw   Amharic
                ja   säw-ɨjje mästawät-u-n   säbbär-ä-u
        DIS.M   man-SG   glass-DEF-ACC break.PV.3MSG.SUB-3MSG.OBJ
        'that man broke the glass'

d. **jatʃtʃi** **setɨjjo** *wäddäk'*äʃʃ   Amharic
    ja- tʃtʃi *set-*ijjo   *wäddäk' -*äʃʃ
    DIS -F   woman-SG   fall.PV-3FSG
    'that woman felt'

  (7) a. **ji** **wäldi** *didʒa*
                                                              Harari
    ji   wäldi *didʒ-a*
    PROX.M   boy come.PV.-3MSG
     'this boy came'

b.   **jittä** **k'äħat** *k'orräm inte*
                                                              Harari
     ji-ttä   k'äħat k'orräm int-e
    PROX -F   girl beautiful COP.PRS-3FSG
    'this girl is beautiful' '

c.   **jäʔ** **bara** *mi sätʃ'a*
                                                              Harari

jäʔ   bara mi sätʃ'-a
DIS.M   ox water drink.PV.3MSG
'that ox drank a water'

d. **jättä lam** *wälätti*   Harari

jäʔ-ttä lam *wäläd-ti*
DIS -F   cow give-birth.PV-3FSG
'that cow gave birth'

Amharic and Harari demonstratives display the qualitative characteristics of their referents, as may be seen from the above-mentioned instances. The aforementioned sentences in (6) and (7) that are bolded have the demonstrative plus lexical noun. For their masculine animate referents, the proximal and distal demonstratives are morphologically unmarked: for Amharic*, bäre* 'ox' in (6a) and *sänɨjje*'man' in (6c); for Harari, *wäldi* 'boy' in (7a) and *bara* 'ox' in (7c). However, the singular feminine animate nouns *lam* (cow) in (6b) and *setɨjjo* (woman) in (6d) for Amharic, and *k'äḫat* (girl) in (7b) and *lam* (cow) in (7d) for Harari, respectively, are modified from the proximal and distal demonstrative bases with the feminine markers -*tʃɨtʃɨ* and -*ttä*.

Gender is also expressed by demonstratives in Tigrinya as shown in (8).

(8)   *a. ʔɨzi*   *tämäharaj* nɨfuʕ *ɨjju*   Tigrinya

ʔɨzi   tämähar-aj   nɨfuʕ ɨjj-u
PROX.MSG student -M clever COP.PRS -3MSG
'this student (M) is clever'

   b. ʔɨziʔa   *tämäharit* nɨfɨʕti *ɨjja*   Tigrinya

ʔɨzi-a   tämähar-it nɨfɨʕ-ti   ɨjj-a
PROX-FSG student-F clever-F COP.PRS -3FSG
'this student (F) is clever'

   c. ʔɨti wäddi habɨ*tam ɨjju*   Tigrinya

ʔɨti   wäddi habɨtam ɨjj-u
DIS.MSG boy   rich   COP.PRS -3MSG
'that boy is rich'

   d. ʔɨtiʔa   *gʷal* azzɨ*ja dɨka ɨjja*   Tigrinya

ʔɨti-a   gʷal azzɨj-a   dɨka ɨjj-a
DIS -FSG girl very- 3FSG poor COP.PRS -3FSG
'that girl is very poor'

Like Amharic and Harari, Tigrinya uses the basic form demonstratives *ʔɨzi* 'this' and *ʔɨti* 'that' (or morphologically unmarked) for the singular masculine referents

tämäharaj'student M' in (8a) and *wäddi* 'boy' in (8c). But the suffix *-a* modifies the demonstratives to a singular feminine noun, *tämäharit'student* F' in (8b) and *gʷal* 'girl' in (8d).

As I mentioned above, Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya demonstratives are morphologically encoded for feminine animate referents but use the basic form for masculine animate referents in the singular form. However, demonstratives have given up gender completely in the plural animate referents. Below are examples from Amharic and Harari data.

(9) a. **ɨnnäzzih säwotʃtʃ** *mɨgɨb yɨfälligallu*   Amharic   ɨnnä-
jɨh   säw - otʃtʃ mɨgɨb   yɨ-fällɨg-all-u
PL-PROX   man-PL   food   3PL-want.IPV- AUX.NP-3PL
'these people want food'

b. **ɨnnäzzih setotʃtʃ** *mɨgɨb jɨfälligallu*   Amharic   ɨnnä-jɨh
set - otʃtʃ mɨgɨb   jɨ-fällɨg-all-u   PL-PROX woman-PL   food
3PL-want.IPV- AUX.NP-3PL
'these people (females) want food'

(10) a **jɨätʃ wäldätʃ** *anu mähat'u*ɲ   Harari   ji-ätʃ   wäldi-ätʃ
an-u   mähat'-u-ɲ
PL-PROX boy-PL   I-ACC beat.PV-3PL.SUB.-
1SG.OBJ.
'these boys beat me'

b. **jɨätʃ k'ähatätʃ** *anu mähat'u*ɲ   Harari
ji-ätʃ   k'ähat -ätʃ an-u   mähat'-u-ɲ
PL-PROX girl-PL   I-ACC beat.PV-3PL.SUB.-
1SG.OBJ.
'these girls beat me'

The Amharic structures *säw-otʃtʃ* 'man-PL' in (9a) and *set-otʃtʃ* 'woman-PL' in (9b) as well as the Harari examples *wäld-ätʃ* 'boy-PL' in (10a) and *k'ähat-ätʃ* 'girl-PL' in (10b) show that the plural referents are masculine and feminine, respectively, and are denoted by the demonstratives *ɨnnäzzih* 'PL-this' and *jɨätʃ* 'this-PL', respectively. Gender differentiation in the single has been demonstrated by Amharic and Harari demonstratives as showed in (6) and (7), however they lose their gender markers when referring to plural subjects as in (10).

In contrast to Amharic and Harari, gender distinction is evident in the plural in the Tigrinya demonstrative. In (11a), the plural male referent *säba* 'man-PL' is denoted by the demonstrative base *ʔɨzi* 'this' with the suffix *-om*. Similarly, in (11b), the plural feminine referent *ʔanʔɨsti* 'woman-PL' is denoted by the distal the demonstrative base

ʔɨʑi 'this' with suffix *än*. These markings are applied to the proximal demonstrative base *ʔɨʑi* 'this' as shown below.

(11) a. **ʔɨʑiʔom säbat** *käjidom*　　　　ʔɨʑi-om
　　säb-at　käjid-om　　　　　　　　　　　　　Tigrinya
　　　　PROX-PLM　man-PL go.PV.-3MPL.
　　　　'these men went'

　　b. **ʔɨʑiʔän ʔanʔɨsti** *käjidän*　　　　　　　　Tigrinya
　　　　ʔɨʑi-än　ʔanʔɨsti käjid-än
　　　　PROX-.PL.F woman.PL go.PV.-3FPL.
　　　　'these women went'

As a result of the above Tigrinya examples, as in (3b-c) and in (11a-bb) the suffixes –*om* and *än* are portmanteau (*i.e.,* a single morph can be analyzed into more than one morpheme, as a gender marker and also a plural marker of the given demonstratives).

Then we can determine from the above discussion that Amharic and Harari demonstratives share some qualitative characteristics, i.e., they are marked morphologically for their singular feminine animate referent vs. basic form for singular masculine animate referents but have a common gender for their plural referents. However, Tigrinya demonstratives distinguish between feminine and masculine referents in both singular and plural referents.

On the other hand, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives are not marked for gender when they occur with inherent masculine or feminine referents. Consider Kistane and Ezha examples below

(12) a. **za gäräd** *mälkamana*　　　　　　　　　Kistane
　　　　za gäräd mälkama –n-a
　　　　DIS　girl beautiful- COP.PRS-3FSG
　　　'that girl is beautiful'

　　b.　　**za goʃ** *buswi gädälo*　　　　　　　　Kistane
　　　　za　goʃ busw-i　gädäl-ä- u
　　　　DIS　boy　dog-DEF　kill.PV-3MSG-MVM
　　　　'that boy killed the dog'

　　c. **zi　miʃt** *ɨňňätti*　　　　　　　　　　　Kistane
　　　　zi　mɨʃt ɨňň-ätt-i
　　　PROX　woman sleep.PV-3FSG-MVM
　　　'this woman sleeps'

　　d. **zi　miss** wätdäk'äm näbbär　　　　　　　Kistane
　　　　zi　mɨss wätdäk'-ä -m　näbbär
　　　　PROX man　fall.PV-3MSG-CVM　AUX.PAST

'this man had fell down'

(13) a. **za ärdʒ** tämarw

    za   ärdʒ tamari-u

    DIS   boy student- COP.PRS.3MSG

'that boy is a student'

b za gäräd *märkamanja*   Ezha

za   gäräd *märkama-n-ja*

DIS giri   beautiful - COP.PRS-3FSG

'that girl is beautiful'

c. zɨ äram *tʃ'ännätʃɨm*   Ezha

    zɨ   äram tʃ'ännä- tʃɨ- m   PROX cow give-

birth.PV-3FSG-MVM

    'this cow gave birth'

d. zɨ bora *mʷätäm*   Ezha

    zɨ   bora mʷät-ä-m

    PROX ox die.PV-3MSG-MVM

    'this ox died'

From the bolded phrases (12a)–(12d) for Kistane and (13a)–(13d) for Ezha above, we see the structure demonstrative + inherently masculine and feminine nouns. *goʃ* 'boy' in (12a) and *mɨss'man*' in (12d) are inherent masculine referents; however, *gäräd* 'girl' in (12b) and *mɨʃt* 'woman' in (12c) are inherent feminine referents. But both are predetermined by the basic demonstrative forms *zi* 'this' and *za* 'that' for Kistane'. In the same way, in (13a) and (13d) above, *ärdʒ* 'boy' and *bora* 'ox' are the masculine referents, but gäräd 'girl' in (13b) and *äram* 'cow' in (13) are the feminine referents. Nevertheless, both are determined by *zɨ* 'this' and *za* 'that', respectively.

Unlike demonstratives in Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya, those in Kistane and Ezha may not indicate whether the referent is male or female. The demonstratives in both languages have the same function as determiners for animate head nouns, as in (12) for Kistane and (13) for Ezha. The inflected demonstratives that were described earlier are repeated below in Table 6 for ease of presentation.

Table: 2 the complete overview of demonstratives of the languages

languages	number	Gender	Proximal	Distal
Amharic	Singular	Masculine	*jɨh*	*ja*
		Feminine	*jɨh-tʃɨtʃɨ*	*ja-tʃɨtʃɨ*
	Plural	Common	*innä-jɨh [innäzzih]*	*innä-ja [innäzziya]*
Harari	Singular	Masculine	*ji*	*jäʔ*
		Feminine	ji-ttä	*jäʔ- ttä*
	Plural	common	*ij-ätʃ*	*jäʔ- ätʃ*
Ezha	Common	Common	*zɨ*	*za*
Kistane	Common	Common	*zɨ*	*za*
Tigrinya	Singular	Masculine	*ʔɨzi*	*ʔɨti*
		Feminine	*ʔɨzi-a*	*ʔɨti-a*
	Plural	Masculine	*ʔɨzi-om*	*ʔɨti-om*
		Feminine	*ʔɨzi-än*	*ʔɨti-än*

As can be seen from the above table, in both Amharic and Harari, the proximal and distal demonstratives in the singular differentiate between masculine and feminine forms; that is, demonstratives convey some gender information about the referents. However, the plural does not. In this instance, the demonstratives of masculinity are either unmarked morphologically or of basic form. Conversely, gender differentiation has been observed in Tigrinya demonstratives for both singular and plural referents.

The number is encoded purely by the suffix for Harari and Tigrinya demonstratives but by the prefix for Amharic. As I mentioned earlier, the associative prefix *innä-* plus the basic form demonstrative *jɨh* and *ja* yield *innäzzih* 'these' and *innäzziya 'those',* respectively, in Amharic. The fricative *zz* is inserted between the prefix and the base, and the initial approximant *j* of the base changes into the vowel *i*.

Based on this discussion, we might conclude that all demonstratives in the languages are phonologically **unbound.** Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya demonstratives provide number and gender information about the referents. However, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives do not indicate the number or gender of their referents. Accordingly, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives are morphologically **invariable.** In addition, the language distance marking systems are grouped into **three** categories: Amharic and

Harari in one group, Ezha and Kistane in the other. The third exclusive form is found in Tigrinya.

6.2.3. Ontology

The demonstrative ontology feature comprises two semantic features: **locational** and **nonlocational**. Demonstrative adverbs identify the referents' position in Ethiosemitic languages. Demonstrative pronouns, on the other hand, indicate the non-locational referents (person and object). Let us describe well below.

6.2.3.1.Locational

Demonstratives in Ethiosemitic languages indicate the referent's location when they are combined with Prepositional and postpositional particles and accompanied by a gesture. The speaker in this instance acts as the deictic center. Consider the following instances:

(14) a. ***izzih*** *täk'ämät'*
     [ɨ -jɨh]   täk'ämät'
     [PRE-PROX.M]=>here sit.IMP.2MSG
       'Sit down here!'

  b. ***izzija*** *täk'ämät'*
     [ɨ - ja]   täk'ämät'
     [PRE-DIS.M]=>there sit.IMP.2MSG
        'Sit down there!'

(15) ***ʔabzi*** *käʃbɨl*   Tigrinya
     [ʔab ʔɨzi]   käf bɨl
     [PRE PROX.MSG] => here sit say IMP.2MSG
    'Sit down here!'

(16) *zahe wɨr*   Ezha
     [za-he] wɨr
     [DST-POST] =>there go.IMP.2MSG
       'go there!'

The adverbial demonstratives in the Amharic examples above consist of two distinct morphemes: the distal demonstrative base *ja* 'that' and the proximal demonstrative base *jɨh* 'this,' both with the locative Prepositional particle *ɨ*. Together, these morphemes produce the adverbial demonstratives ***izzija*** 'there' in (14b) and ***izzih*** 'here' in (14a), which denote the vicinity of the specific location.

In Tigrinya, location can be described by the free morpheme *ʔab* attached to the demonstrative base *ʔizi* as presented in (15).

Similarly, the basic demonstrative forms with the locative morpheme *he* refer to a location, as shown in the Ezha example in (16). The locative prefix *bä-* can further augment the place adverbs *zihe* "here" and *zahe* "there" when the speaker commands the addressee to sit down at a certain location as in (17) below.

(17)a. *bäzihe tora*
bä-[zɨ -he]   tora
LOC-[PROX-at] =>here   sit.IMP.2MSG
'Sit down here!'
   b. *bäzahe tora*
bä-[za-he] =>there   tora
 LOC-[DIS-at] =>there   sit.IMP.2MSG
 'Sit down over there!'

In the Ezha example, the speaker just requests that the hearer be seated at the places that are near the speaker by using the basic form of demonstrative with the locative morpheme *bä-* and *-he* in (17a). But if the speaker requests that the hearer be seated at places further away from him, then just change the demonstrative base rather than the locative morpheme. Similar to this, in Kistane, the locational referent in (18a and b) is referred to by the basic forms *zi* (this) and *za* (that) with the locative morpheme *bä*.

(18)   a. **bäzi** *tona*   Kistane   bä-zi tona
        LOC-PROX sit.IMP.2MSG
        'Sit down here!

    b. **bäza** *tona*
      bä-za   tona
      LOC-DIT sit.IMP.2MSG
      'Sit down over there!'

Similarly, the proximal and distal demonstrative bases and the enclitic *–de* 'place' followed by the relational suffix *–be* can function as place adverbs that indicate the stationary location of the referent in (19a) and (19b) in Harari.

(19)   a. **jidebe** *tägebäla*   Harari
        [ji –de] -   be   tägebäl
        [PROX.M-at] =>here -LOC sit.IMP.2MSG
        'Sit down here!'

   b.   **jäʔdebe**   *tägebäla*
        [jäʔ - de]   - be tägebäl

[DIS.M-at]- => there-LOC sit.IMP.2MSG

'sit down there!'

6.2.3.2.Non-locational referent

Non-locational referents (a person or objects) are referred to by demonstrative pronouns. There are no specific demonstrative pronoun forms for an object or a person as referents in Ethiosemitic languages. Here are examples:

*(20) a. [**jan sɨni**] sɨbäräw*

  Amharic   ja-n sɨni sɨbär -ä-w

 DST.M-ACC cup break IMP-2SG.SUB-3SG.O '

   'break that cup!

b. *[**ja lɨdʒ]** tämari new*

   Amharic ja lɨdʒ tämari new

 DST.M. child student COP.PRS-3MSG   .

  'That child is a student'

21) a. [**ʔɨzi gäza**] abji ɨjju

Tigrinya

  ʔɨzi gäza abji ɨjj-u

  PROX.M house big COP.PRS -3MSG

  'This house is big'

b. **[ʔɨzi säbaj]** mämhɨr ɨjju   Tigrinya

 ʔɨzi säbaj mämhɨr ɨjj-u

  PROX.M man teacher COP.PRS -3MSG

  'This man is a teacher'

. b. [**zi   miʃt]**   *ge aräʃʃätti*   Kistane

  zi   miʃt   ge aräʃʃä-tt-i

  PROX woman house build.PV-3FSG-

MVM

  'this woman built a house

(23) a. [*ji **gar]**   aman int-a*   Harari

  ji   gar   good   int-a

  PROX-M house   COP.PRS -3MSG

  'This house is good'

b. **[jittä k'ähat]** *dätʃ'ibe wädäk'ti*	Harari
ji-ttä k'ähat dätʃ'i-be wädäk'-ti	
PROX.-F girl ground -at fall.PV-3FSG	
'She fell at the ground'	

The bolded phrases in the examples above constitute a demonstrative + noun. *sini* 'cup' in (20a), *gäza* 'house' in (21a), *ge* 'house' in (22a), and *gar* 'house' in (23a) are the object referents. On the other hand, *lidʒ* 'child' in (20b), *säbaj'man* in 21b, *miʃt* 'woman' in 22b, and *k'ähat* 'girl' in 23b are person referents. However, the same demonstrative base predetermines both object referents and person referents. Thus, demonstrative pronouns are used to refer to non-locational referents, such as people or objects. The demonstrative pronouns for an object or a person as referents are not used in different forms, as shown in the above examples.

6.2.4. Humanness
Only Harari has a special demonstrative that indicates human referents in my sample; in addition to the basic form, consider the examples below:

    (24)   a. *huwwä wäldi amirin nāra*   Harari
                huwwä   wäldi   amirin nār-a
                 3SGM/MED.HUM.M   boy king   COP:PAS-3MSG
                'he/that boy'

            b. *hijjä   k'ähat didʒti*
                hijjä   k'ähat   didʒ-ti
            3SGMF/MED.HUM.F girl come,PV-3FSG
                'she/that girl came'

    There is a restriction that *huwwä* always indicates the human masculine referent as in (24a) and *hijjä* with human feminine entities as in (24b). Consider the phrases below:

    (25)   a. ✷*huwwä   gar*   Harari
                3SGM/ MED.HUM.M house
                'he/that house'

             b. ✷*hijjä t'ay*
                3SGF/ MED.HUM.F   sheep
                'she/that sheep'
            c. ✷*huwwä   bara*
                3SGM/MED.HUM.M ox
                    Harari

'he/that ox'

d. ＊*hijjä   lam*
    3SGF/MED.HUM.F cow
       Harari
    'she/that cow'

The structures from (25a)–(2dd) are not allowed in Harari. Because there is a semantic mismatch between the non-human referents *gar* 'house' in (25a), *t'ay* 'sheep' in (25b), *bara* ''ox'* in (25c), and *lam* 'cow' in (25d) with the demonstratives *huwwä* 'that he' and *hijjä 'that* she'. For the reason that the demonstratives *huwwä* 'that he' and *hiyyä* 'that she' are intrinsically marked for human referents.

6.2.5. Third-person pronoun
Like the basic form of demonstratives, independent third-person pronoun also provide some qualitative information about the referents. Here are examples:

(26) a. *ɨssu färäs jäne näw*
    ɨssu färäs jä-ɨne n-äw   3MSG horse GEN-I
COP.PRS-3MSG
    'he (that) horse is mine '

b.   *ɨssʷa dɨmmät jant*ä nätʃtʃ   Amharic   ɨssu-a dɨmmät *ya-ant*ä
n-ätʃtʃ   3SG-F /MED-F / cat GEN-you COP.PRS-3FSG
    'she (that) cat is yours'

c.   *ɨnnässu   wättaddärotʃtʃ itopp'jawijan na*tʃtʃäw   Amharic
    ɨnnä- ɨssu   wättaddär- otʃtʃ itopp'ja awi-jan na-
tʃtʃäw
    PL-3MSG/   soldier –PL itopp'ja-M-PL COP.PRS-
3PL
    'they /those / soldiers are Ethiopians'

(27) a. *azzo gär zäga inta*   Harari
    azzo gär zäga int-a
    3MSG house wide COP.PRS -3MSG
    'he (that) house is big'

b.   *azze ragit däwitu wäxäbti*   Harari
    azze   rag-it   *däw-it-u*   wäxäb-ti
    3FSG woman-F goat –F- ACC. buy.PV-3FSG
    'that (she) old woman bought female goat'

c.   *azzijätʃ gärätʃ gidir intäju*   Harari
    azzo-ätʃ   gär- ätʃ gidir *int-äju*

                3M-PL house-PL big   COP.PRS -3PL
                    'they/those houses are big'

Like the basic form of demonstratives, the inflectional suffixes are attached to the independent third-person pronouns, which encode the gender and number of referents, as shown in the above illustrations. Regarding gender and number agreements, there are quite differences between the basic form of demonstrative and the independent third-person pronoun form. In Amharic, the **prefix** *ɨnnä-* serves as a plural marker for both the basic form of demonstrative, as I mentioned before in (1b) and personal pronoun form as in (26c), but a different plural form for the referents (*wättaddär-* otʃtʃ 'soldier -PL') in (26c). However, Harari uses the same plural suffix *ātʃ* 'PL' for the basic form of demonstrative, the personal pronoun form, and for the referent *gär-* 'house' in (27c).

Conclusion

This paper has shown the basic form and the qualitative features of the demonstrative in five Ethiosemitic languages. Regarding the form, there are three main demonstrative bases, j: for Amharic and Harari, ʑ: for Ezha and Kistane and the third exclusive base ʔɨ has found in Tigrinya. As concerning qualitative features, significant variation has been observed in the demonstrative systems of the languages. Demonstratives in the focused languages are marked to express some qualitative information about the referents. In relation to number, Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya demonstratives distinguish between singular and plural referents (i.e., demonstratives indicate whether the referent is a single entity or plural). However, Ezha and Kistane demonstratives do not agree in number with their head noun (i.e., they do not indicate the number information about the referents). With regard to the number marking of demonstratives, the languages under concern fall into two groups, i.e., Amharic and Harari on one hand,   and Tigrinya on the other. Amharic and Harari demonstratives distinguish between masculine and feminine gender in the singular referents whereas lacking gender agreement in the plural. But, Tigrinya demonstratives is distinguished morphologically between feminine and masculine referents in singular and plural forms. Based on these descriptions, we might conclude that the most common inflectional category of demonstratives in Amharic, Harari, and Tigrinya in number followed by gender. In contrast, the Ezha and Kistane demonstratives do not inflected both for number and gender when they occur either with inherent masculine or feminine or singular or plural referents.

References

Anderson, Stephen and Keenan, Edward. 1985. Deixis. In: Shopen, Timothy (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol, III 259–308. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ashmore, Louise. 2009. Documenting Deixis in Wik-Ngatharr and Wik-Ngathan. In: Peter K. Austin, Oliver Bond, Monika Charette, David Nathan and Peter Sells (eds.), *Proceedings of Conference on Language Documentationand Linguistic Theory 2. 13-14 November 2009, SOAS, London.*

Aweke Tsegaye. 2012. Deixis in Ezha. Addis Ababa University (MA Thesis).

Baye Yimam and Rawda Siraj. 2007. Silte deictics. *Deictics, Copula and Focus in the Ethiopian Convergence Area, 139-151.*

Baye Yimam. 1987. *jamarɨɲɲa səwasɨw* (*Amharic Grammar).* Addis Ababa:

Bender, M. Lionel. 1976. Ethiosemitic languages. In Bender, M. Lionel, J. Donald Bowen, Robert Cooper & Charles Ferguson (eds.). *Language in Ethiopia.* London: Oxford University Press, 99-154.

Bender, M. Lionel and M. Eteffa. 1976. Two Cushitic Languages [A]. In M. L. Bender, J. D. Bowen, R. L. Cooper & C. A. Ferguson (eds.). *Language in Ethiopia* [C]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 130154.

Beniam Mitiku. 2004. The Structure of NP in Harari. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (MA Thesis).

Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie.* Jena: Fischer.hristians. *Orientalia Suecana 17:61-102.*

Cohen, Marcel. 1931. *Etudes d'éthiopien méridional.* Paris: Geuthner.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives*: *form, function and grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger. 2012. Deixis and demonstratives. In C. Maienborn, K. vonHeusinger, P. Portner (eds.), *An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning,*(Vol. 3, pp. 1-25). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dixon, Robert, M.W. 2003. Demonstratives: A cross-linguistic typology. *Studies in Language 27:1.61*112.

Dixon, Robert, M.W. 2010. *Basic Linguistic Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1983. *Deixis und Anapher.* In Rauh (ed.), 79–98.Eleni Private Limited Press.

Endalew Assefa. 2014. *Descriptive Grammar of Ezha.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (PhD Dissertation).

Fekede Menuta. 2006 Morphology of Eža pronouns. In: S. Uhlig (ed.). *Proceedings of the XVth InternationalConference of Ethiopian Studies, Hamburg July 20_25, 2003* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz) 754_762.

Fillmore, Charles. 1971. *Santa Cruz Lectures in Deixis.* Berkeley: University of California.

Fillmore, Charles. 1982. *Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis.* In: R. J. Jarvella &W.

Klein (eds.). *Speech, Place, and Action.* Chichester: John Wiley, 31–59.

Fillmore, Charles. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Getachew Haile. 1967. Demonstrative pronouns in Amharic. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 5: 9-12.

Goldenberg, Gideon. 1968. Kəstanəňňa: Studies in a Northern Gurage language of Christians. *Orientalia Suecana* 17: 62-102

.Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, Ruqaia .1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hanks, William F. 2009. Fieldwork in Deixis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41, 10-24.

Hatch, Evelyn. 1992. *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hetzron, Robert. 1968. *The Classification of the Ethiopian Semitic Languages*. Unpublished Manuscript, Addis Ababa University, Institute of Ethiopian Studies.

Hetzron, Robert. 1972. *Ethiopian Semitic: Studies in Classification.* Manchester:

Hetzron, Robert. 1977. *The Gunnan-Gurage Languages.* Napoli: Don Bosco

Himmelmann, Nikolaus .1996. *Demonstratives in narrative discourse*: A taxonomy of universal uses.In: B. Fox (ed.). *Studies in Anaphora.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 205–254.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: Zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur.* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Jaszczolt, Katarzyna. 2002. *Semantics and Pragmatics. Meaning in Language and Discourse*. London: Longman.

Kempson, Ruth. 1975. *Presupposition and the Delimitation of Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

König, Ekkehard & Carla Umbach. 2016. Demonstratives of Manner, of Quality and of Degree: A Neglected Subclass. In E. Boef, M. Coniglio, E. Schlachter & T. Veenstra (eds.). *Demonstratives: syntax, semantics and typology*. Berlin, de Gruyter Mouton.

Krasnoukhova, Olga .2012. *The Noun Phrase in the Languages of South America*. Utrecht: LOT.

Leslau, Wolf. 1992. Toward a Classification of the Gurage Dialects. In: Wolf Leslau. *Gurage Studies*: *Collected Articles*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 246-259.

Leslau, Wolf. 1997. *Ethiopic Document: Argobba Grammar and Dictionary*[M]. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1996. Frames of reference and Molyneux' Question: Cross-linguistic evidence.

In: P. Bloom et al. (eds.). *Language and Space*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 109–169.

Levinson, Stephen .2003. *Space in Language and Cognition. Explorations in Cognitive Psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2004. *Deixis and pragmatic*. In: L. Horn & G. Ward (eds.). *The Handbook of pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 97–121.

Lyons, John .1977. *Semantics, vol. 1–2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John .1979. *Deixis and anaphora*. In: T. Myers (ed.). *The Development of Conversation and Discourse.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 88–10Manchester University Press.

Meyer, Ronny. 2011. Amharic. In Weninger, S. et al (eds.). *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook (De Gruyter Mouton), 1178-1212).*

Meyer, Ronny. 2011. Gurage. In Weninger, S. et al (eds.). *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook (De Gruyter Mouton), 1220-1275).*

Meyer, Ronny. 2019. Demonstrative system in the Highland East Cushitic-Gurage contact zone. In Meyer, Ronny and Teris, Yvonne (eds.). *47TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC CONFERENCE ON AFROASIATIC.* PARIS: INALCO-/CNRS-LLACAN.

Rose, Sharon.1997. *Theoretical issues in comparative Ethio-Semitic phonology and morphology.* Montréal: McGill University.PhD Dissertation.

Sindu Alemu. 2014. Documentation and the description of Amharic demonstratives. Addis Ababa:

Addis Ababa University (MA Thesis).

Tesfaye Tewelde. 2002. *Modern Grammar of Tigrinya.* Rome.

Tsehay Abza. 2008. Comparative Morphology of Ezha, Kistane and Muher. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University (MA Thesis).

Ullendorff, Edward.1955. *The Semitics Languages of Ethiopia: A Comparative Phonology.*   . London.Taylor's (Foreign) Press.

Yule, George. 2006. *The Study of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aw, C. (2012). *Materials and Methods in ELT.* John Wiley & Sons.