Practical Theories and Empirical Practice

A linguistic perspective

Edited by Andrea C. Schalley

Griffith University, Brisbane

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences - Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

*For Dietmar Zaefferer
on the occasion of his 65th birthday*

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Practical theories and empirical practice : a linguistic perspective /
edited by Andrea C. Schalley.

p. cm. (Human Cognitive Processing, ISSN 1387-6724 ; v. 40)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Competence and performance (Linguistics) 2. Communicative competence. 3.
Speech acts (Linguistics) 4. Interaction (Philosophy) 5. Linguistics--Methodol-
ogy. 6. Psycholinguistics. I. Schalley, Andrea C., 1972-

P375.C65P73 2012

401'.4--dc23

2012036720

ISBN 978 90 272 2394 4 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 7245 4 (Eb)

© 2012 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

List of contributors	IX
Preface	XI
Practical theories and empirical practice – facets of a complex interaction <i>Andrea C. Schalley</i>	1
PART I. Empirical practice	
The embodiment of linguistic meaning: Key findings from psychology and neuroscience <i>Patric Bach</i>	35
Infants' encoding of social interaction as a conceptual foundation for the acquisition of argument structure <i>Claudia Thoermer, Annina Neumann & Beate Sodian</i>	55
Referring to colour and taste in Kilivila: Stability and change in two lexical domains of sensual perception <i>Gunter Senft</i>	71
Yucatec demonstratives in interaction: Spontaneous vs. elicited data <i>Jürgen Bohnemeyer</i>	99
Many languages, one knowledge base: Introducing a collaborative ontolinguistic research tool <i>Andrea C. Schalley</i>	129
PART II. Practical theories	
Nen assentives and the phenomenon of dialogic parallelisms <i>Nicholas Evans</i>	159
Evidentiality, modality, focus and other puzzles: Some reflections on metadiscourse and typology <i>Leila Behrens</i>	185
Does Searle's challenge affect chances for approximating assertion and quotative modal <i>wollen</i> ? <i>Hans-Martin Gärtner</i>	245

The pragmatics of argumentation: Commitment to implicit premises <i>Thomas Becker</i>	257
Implicatures of complex sentences in error models <i>Anton Benz</i>	273
The semantics of functional spaces <i>James Pustejovsky</i>	307

List of contributors

Patric Bach
University of Plymouth,
United Kingdom
patric.bach@plymouth.ac.uk

Thomas Becker
Universität Bamberg, Germany
Thomas.Becker@uni-bamberg.de

Leila Behrens
University of Cologne, Germany
Leila.Behrens@uni-koeln.de

Anton Benz
Centre for General Linguistics (ZAS),
Berlin, Germany
benz@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Jürgen Bohnemeyer
University at Buffalo – SUNY, NY, USA
jb77@buffalo.edu

Nicholas Evans
Australian National University,
Canberra, Australia
nicholas.evans@anu.edu.au

Hans-Martin Gärtner
Hungarian Academy of Sciences –
Linguistics, Hungary
gaertner@nytud.hu

Annina Neumann
University of Munich, Germany
[no email available]

James Pustejovsky
Brandeis University, Waltham, MA, USA
jamesp@cs.brandeis.edu

Andrea C. Schalley
Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia
a.schalley@griffith.edu.au

Gunter Senft
Max Planck Institute for
Psycholinguistics, Nijmegen,
the Netherlands
Gunter.Senft@mpi.nl

Beate Sodian
University of Munich, Germany
beate.sodian@psy.lmu.de

Claudia Thøermer
University of Munich, Germany
claudia.thoermer@psy.lmu.de

Preface

This volume is dedicated to Dietmar Zaefferer, who celebrated his 65th birthday in May 2012, and whose academic journey has taken him from applying formal approaches to semantics and pragmatics, via linguistic typology and what is nowadays referred to as 'digital linguistics' or 'cyberlinguistics', to experimentally studying the language-cognition nexus with a focus on the cognitive grounding of language. The volume engages with all of these strands and follows Dietmar Zaefferer's lead, also by embracing his long-standing interest in integrating linguistic data into an overarching framework or theory as well as his more recent captivation with empirical approaches. His work has provided the frame on which this volume has been built.

I would like to thank the authors for their stimulating contributions to this volume and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments, which proved invaluable in the revision of the volume. I am grateful for the indispensable help and support I received from Alexander Borkowski in preparing the manuscript. The *Human Cognitive Processing* Series Editors Linda L. Thornburg and Klaus-Uwe Panther have been a delight to work with, and I would also like to thank Els van Dongen of John Benjamins for her unfailing support.

We, the contributors and the editor of this volume, wish Dietmar Zaefferer all the best for the future. I in particular would like to express my deeply felt gratitude to him, for being the open-minded and inspiring teacher, supportive and generous mentor, and rigorous and pioneering scholar and collaborator he has been over many years.

Brisbane, Australia, August 2012
Andrea C. Schalley

Nen assentives and the phenomenon of dialogic parallelisms*

Nicholas Evans

Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

A task for ontolinguistics is to delimit the set of grammatical devices sensitive to the speech-act nexus – whether speech-act role (speaker, hearer, etc.), knowledge asymmetries (ignoratives and demonstratives), speech-act goals (imperatives, questions, etc.), or social relations (e.g. honorifics). These devices are co-constructed by speaker-hearer dyads, and a convincing framework for dealing with them needs a typology of dialogic parallelisms: grammatical constructions in which there are tight formal and grammatical links between the contributions of the two parties. In the first part of this chapter I survey a number of known phenomena, including interrogative-demonstrative parallelisms, question-answer parallels, and conjunct/disjunct systems. In the second part I introduce a further, previously unreported example of dialogic parallelisms: assentives are a category used to supply assenting answers to imperatives. In the Papuan language Nen these show tight formal parallels to imperatives. I conclude by arguing for the need for greater attention to dialogic coordination in the shaping of core grammatical morphology.

Keywords: adjacency pairs; conversational analysis; dialogism; ignoratives; interaction

1. Introduction

Within the western grammatical tradition, the long history of taking the sentence as the unit of analysis – representing, as it is taken to do, the contents of a single,

* I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Australian National University and of the Australian Research Council (Grants: *Language and Social Cognition* DP0878126, *Languages of Southern New Guinea* DP110100307, as well as a professorial setup grant at the ANU for initial fieldwork in the Morehead District), which made this research possible. I would also like to thank the villagers of Bimadbn and especially Jimmy Nébni, Michael Binzawa, and Aramang Wlila, for their generosity and their most insightful instruction in the wonders of Nen, and Stéphane Robert for discussion of the Wolof material.

individual mind – has tended to detach grammar from the patent social fact that most speaking is carried out in interaction with others. As Levinson has put it, in his own scholarly dialogue with Schegloff:

The linguistic, philosophical and psychological traditions treat the utterance as 'the product of a single speaker and a single mind', whereas 'the conversation-analytic angle of inquiry does not let go of the fact that ... more than one participant is present and relevant to the talk even when only one does any talking' [Schegloff 1982:72] (Levinson 1988:203)

How far, in fact, are grammars tuned to their primary function of framing speech in interaction (cf. Enfield and Levinson 2006; Levinson 2006; Behrens, this volume; Bohnemeyer, this volume)? Answering this comprehensively will require us to develop a whole subdomain of ontolinguistics focussing on the set of grammatical devices sensitive to the speech-act nexus.¹ Among other things, this includes considerations of speech-act role (speaker, hearer, etc.), knowledge or attentional asymmetries (ignoratives revealing gaps in speaker-knowledge, demonstratives seeking to calibrate speaker and addressee attention, conjunct/disjunct systems grammaticalising the privileged access of speakers in declaratives and addressees in interrogatives), the encoding of speaker-hearer social relations (e.g. honorifics), and speech-act goals and consequences (imperatives, questions, etc.).²

In this chapter I make a modest contribution to this goal, by describing what is, as far as I know, an unreported example of a grammatical category closely aligned with the dialogic structure of communication: the assentive, a category used in the Papuan language Nen to signal assent to imperatives.³ From the point of view of its morphology, the Nen assentive is an interesting hybrid between a

future (the signalled future action which will follow the assentive) and an imperative (linking it back to the command it is responding to).

Through all these phenomena there runs a tension between traditional grammatical accounts, for which the encoding of meaning is strictly the business of the speaker, and other approaches more sensitive to pragmatics and conversational turn-structure, which focus on meaning as co-constructed in conversation. Key here is the concept of 'adjacency pair' – preference-organised sequences like question-answer, invitation-uptake and so forth – which "highlights, among other things, the normative constraints that the type of first action exerts on the type of action with which the recipient should respond" (Raymond 2003:942).⁴

Though in this chapter I will focus on dialogic dyads as the simplest and most tractable case, there are also many elaborations of the basic dyadic scenario once one takes into account such factors as triadic communication in West Africa (Ameka 2004) where messengers speaking on behalf of others will employ logophoric pronouns to represent the original speaker's position, or the potentially important category of overhearers – see e.g. Fillmore 1997 on a special deictic distinction in the Philippine language Samal that distinguishes between non-speaker/hearers tuned in to the conversation (overhearers) and those not attending to it. The reader is referred to Levinson (1988), Irvine (1996), Ducrot (1984, 1996), and Goffman (1983) for interesting discussions of these problems, which we ignore here.

As a clear example of the differences in semantic analysis that follow from the differences between speaker-based and dialogic approaches, consider the well-known case of T-V pronoun systems such as French *tu* vs. *vous*, German *du* vs. *Sie*, Italian *tu* vs. *lei*, Russian *ты* vs. *вы* etc. in which an intimate or informal pronoun (the first in each of the above pairs) is contrasted with a polite or formal one.⁵

1. It is a pleasure to dedicate this chapter to Dietmar Zaefferer, in recognition of his abiding interests in pragmatics on the one hand and on the other in developing a supple and comprehensive cross-linguistic ontology.

2. See Section 2.2.2 for discussion and examples of conjunct/disjunct systems.

3. Appropriately for the theme of this chapter, the language name Nen or Nen Zi (phonetically [nen dʒi]) literally means "what" language (zi 'word, language'). Languages throughout the Morehead Region are named after their word for 'what', rather as if English was called *What-language* or *Whattish*, German *Was-Sprache* or *Wassisch*, and French *Langue de Quoi* or *Quoiais*. This metalinguistic classification in turn is revealingly reminiscent of Dante's (1996 [c. 1302]) classification of Romance languages in *De vulgari eloquentia*, using second-pair-part interjections for 'yes': "*nam alii oc, alii si, alii vero dicunt oil*" – some (i.e. Occitan) say *oc*, others (i.e. Italian) say *si*, others (i.e. French) say *oil*. These in turn derive from second pair-part deictics (i.e. *oc < hoc* 'this', *si < sic* 'thus, like this', *oui < oil < hoc ille* 'thus he'). In both cases, then, it is responses from dialogic pair-parts (the first part in the Morehead Region, the second part in the Romance languages) that are used as shibboleths in classifying and naming languages.

4. Within the conversation-analytic tradition, 'preference organisation' – i.e. the fact that particular types of 'first pair parts' project a particular type of 'second pair part' – sets up defaults on sequencing, to which speakers are sensitive. For example, the preference for an invitation to be followed by an acceptance can be detected by various means (Davidson 1984, 1990) such as the shorter transition time to uptakes than refusals, and by the use of various markers (pauses, excuses, hedges, etc.) when giving a 'dispreferred response' as the second pair part.

5. T-V systems are the best known – here the coding of politeness is on second person pronouns. But there are languages, like Javanese, where similar problems arise with first person pronouns as well (see Errington 1988). He reports cases where the choice of a particular first person form by a high official (*priyayi*), which the official expected to be reciprocated by a more deferential first person form by the addressee, was instead met with the same form in an assertion of equality by his interlocutor. The fact that the full social import is not locked in until the second dyad member has responded thus offers possibilities for both parties to contribute to defining the social tenor.

If we focus just on speaker-encoding (or hearer-decoding) there is a simple 2-way contrast here between two forms, typically characterised by some opposition like intimate vs. formal. But if we focus on the dyad, i.e. on the summed uses across the two participants, we find that there is in fact a three-way contrast, as described in the classic paper by Brown and Gilman (1960): mutual T, mutual V, and asymmetric T-V, where one interactant uses T and the other uses V. Typical situations would be between two friends for mutual T, between two mutually respectful strangers for mutual V, and between a master and a servant (or, in some conservative practices, a parent and a child) for T-V.⁶ The crucial point, also long known, is that once asymmetric uses are a social possibility, just hearing the first use of one form (e.g. T) is insufficient for us to determine the footing between participants.⁷ It is only when the response is also heard (e.g. mutual T, or respectful asymmetric V) that we can decide what the relationship between the participants is. Clearly, the degree to which one needs to take the second turn into account depends on the markedness of asymmetric uses – the rarer they are, the more one can use the first turn as a good heuristic.

A convincing framework for dealing with the pronoun problem needs to build on a typology of what I will call *dialogic parallelisms*: grammatical constructions in which there are tight formal and grammatical resemblances between the contributions of the two parties. Relatively well-known phenomena relevant to this problem are question-answer dependencies (e.g. Welsh, which has special auxiliary forms for questions and their responses), interrogative-demonstrative parallelisms (cf. Russian *Kuda? Tuda* and its English translation 'Whither?' 'Thither', on which more below), and conjunct/disjunct systems where particular formal or semantic properties are shared by the speaker of declaratives and the addressee in interrogatives. I will briefly summarise these in Section 2, and then pass to the empirically new material on Nen assentives in Section 3, before returning to some general remarks on the relation of grammatical categories to conversational structure in Section 4, and concluding in Section 5.

6. As is well-known, asymmetric practices are generally on the retreat in most European languages (German being something of an exception – see Clyne et al. 2009), but at least if we include historical literary materials we need to include them.

7. A possible analytic move is to give abstract invariant meanings to each of the two pronouns, e.g. 'intimate' to the T and 'formal' to the V form, and then to derive the situated meanings of the three interactional dyads from the social relations which lead each participant to choose the forms they do. This fails to capture, however, the very different social tenor that use of a particular form has, as between symmetric and asymmetric uses.

2. Dialogic parallelisms in grammar: A brief survey

2.1 Karcevski's observation: Ignorative-deictic parallelisms

In a seminal article written in 1941, the Swiss-Russian linguist Serge Karcevski made the following observation, taking as his point of departure certain parallelisms between the interrogative and deictic series of Russian (Karcevski uses the term 'ignorative' for reasons I will return to in Section 4).

La réponse la plus concrète à la question "Ty kuda?" "Où vas tu?" serait naturellement "Tuda" "La-bas" accompagnée du geste correspondant. C'est pourquoi la formule du dialogue d'information est k/t, c'est-à-dire "ignoratif" – deictique.
(Karcevski 1969 [1941]: 216)

The most concrete answer to the question *ty kuda?* 'where are you going?' would naturally be *tuda* 'there', accompanied by the corresponding gesture. That is why the formula for a question-answer dialogue is *k/t*, that is to say "ignorative" – deictic. [My translation]

As a good Geneva-school structuralist, he goes on to elaborate this 'formula' with other Russian pairs, such as *kogda/togda* 'when/then' and *kto/to* 'who/that'. In English we could make similar points with a formula *wh/th*, using examples like *where/there, when/then, what/that*, and so forth.

This is hardly independent evidence, of course, since both Russian and English are simply preserving an older Indo-European version of the same correspondence. Nonetheless, if we look further afield we find even more elegant and consistent patterns among far-flung and unrelated languages. Exemplifying from Japanese and Tamil we see comparable systems (Tables 1 and 2). In Japanese there is an opposition between ignoratives, which begin with *d-*, and deictics, which begin with *ko-*, *so-*, or *a-* depending on whether they are close to the speaker, the hearer, or neither. In Tamil each category begins with a different vowel: ignoratives with *e-*, and demonstratives with either *i-* (proximal, i.e. near speaker) or *a-* (distal, i.e. far from speaker); see Bohmeyer (this volume) for another comparable example.⁸ Though the exact set of roots is not precisely the same in both languages, what is particularly clear in each case is the way that the ignorative/deictic prefixes combine productively with the other categories, and generate precise, echoic, formal parallels in basic question-answer sequences: Japanese in (1), Tamil in (2).

8. Classical Tamil had an extra demonstrative category, contrasting proximal *i-*, medial *u-*, and distal *a-*, and had *yaa-* for the ignorative (Lehmann 1998), but otherwise the logic was essentially the same.

Table 1. The Japanese *d-/ko-/so-/a*-system (see also (1))

Status	... one	... (adjective)	... place	... way (of two)	... kind of	like ...
Ignorative	<i>dore / dare</i>	<i>dono</i>	<i>doko</i>	<i>dochira</i>	<i>donna</i>	<i>doo</i>
Near speaker	<i>kore</i>	<i>kono</i>	<i>koko</i>	<i>kochira</i>	<i>konna</i>	<i>koo</i>
Near hearer	<i>sore</i>	<i>sono</i>	<i>soko</i>	<i>sochira</i>	<i>sonna</i>	<i>soo</i>
Far from both	<i>are</i>	<i>ano</i>	<i>asoko</i>	<i>achira</i>	<i>anna</i>	<i>aa</i>

- (1) a. *Keizaigaku no hon wa dore*
economics GEN book TOP which.one
desu ka?
be:NPST:POL Q
'Which one is the economics book?'⁹
- b. *Keizaigaku no hon wa*
economics GEN book TOP
kore /sore /are desu.
this that.near.you that.DIST be:NPST:POL
'The economics book is this one (near me) / that one (near you) / that one (near neither of us).'¹⁰
- (2) a. *Evan con-n-aan?*
who(NOM) say-PST-3SG.MA
'Who / which (male) said (it)?'
- b. *Ivan /Avan con-n-aan.*
PROX:3SG.MA(NOM) DIST:3SG.MA(NOM) say-PST-3SG.MA
'He (near) / he (far) said (it).'¹¹

The important thing about Karcevski's analysis, for present purposes, is his observation that regular formal alternations – whether *k/t* as in his Russian case,

9. I use the following glosses in examples: A – actor; ABS – absolutive; ACC – accusative; ADJ – adjective; AFF – affirmative; AL – allative; ASS – assentive; CJ – conjunct; CONJ – conjunctive form ('-te form'); COP – copula; DECL – declarative; DIST – distal; DJ – disjunct; DU – dual; ERG – ergative; FUT – future; GEN – genitive; HON – honorific; IMM – immediate; IMP – imperative; IPFV – imperfective; M – middle; MA – masculine; ND – non-dual; NEG – negative; NEU – neutral aspect; NMLZ – nominaliser; NOM – nominative; NPST – non-past; NSG – non-singular; PFV – perfective; PL – plural; POL – polite; PROG – progressive; PROX – proximal; PST – past; Q – question; REM – remote; RPST – remote past; SG – singular; TOP – topic; TOW – towards; U – undergoer. 1, 2, and 3 mean first, second, and third person (and where no number specification follows, their number is unspecified).

10. Example adapted from Hasegawa (2005:23).

11. Example adapted from Lehmann (1989:103, 104) and confirmed by Umarani Pappuswamy (p.c.).

Table 2. The Tamil *e-/i-/a*-system (see also (2))

Status	... one (masculine)	... one (neuter)	... (adjective)	... place	... way	... much	... many	... time
Ignorative	<i>evan</i>	<i>edu</i>	<i>enda</i>	<i>enge</i>	<i>epdi**</i>	<i>evlavu</i>	<i>ettane</i>	<i>eppa</i>
Proximal	<i>ivan</i>	<i>idu</i>	<i>inda</i>	<i>inge</i>	<i>ipdi</i>	<i>ivlavu</i>	<i>ittane</i>	<i>ippa</i>
Distal	<i>avan</i>	<i>adu</i>	<i>anda</i>	<i>ange</i>	<i>apdi</i>	<i>avlavu</i>	<i>attane</i>	<i>appa</i>

** Tamil is famously diglossic with the non-archaic variety non-standardised and represented differently in different sources, e.g. *eppadi* vs. *epdi*, or *evlavu* vs. *evlavu*. I have employed the more colloquial forms here (as per Asher and Annamalai 2002), although they do not give every form in the cell; so for consistency I have adjusted some from the more formal forms given in Asher and Annamalai (2002) or Lehmann (1989).

d-/ko-/so-/a- in Japanese, or *e-/i-/a-* in Tamil – are linked to connected steps in a dialogue, in this case question/answer. These in turn are connected precisely because of the complementary stance of successive speakers with respect to the epistemic domain (spatial location, time, identity) that is the focus of attention: the first speaker lacks some crucial bit of information, which the second participant then supplies. Form, dialogic discourse organisation, and semantics are thus closely tied together – though how close the tie must be is a topic I return to in Section 4.

2.2 Extension to other phenomena within question-answer sequences

Karcevski's observation applied specifically to information-questions, and within them to that part of the information-negotiation system that is locked into the ignorative/deictic dyad. But there are also other types of formal connection across question-answer pairs.

2.2.1 Question-answer parallelisms in Welsh polar questions

Firstly, there are languages where answers exhibit formal resemblance to the corresponding polar questions. Welsh is a nice example (King 1993:147; Morris Jones 1999). For the auxiliary verb *bod* 'to be' Welsh has three distinct series of verb forms: affirmative, interrogative, and negative, e.g. *rydy* 'he is (aff.)', *ydy* 'is he?', *dydy* (... *ddim*) 'he is not (neg.)'. Answers to polar questions echo the interrogative form, using the same *y*-initial form that is used in the question, rather than the *r*-initial form of the affirmative; negative answers combine the negative *nag* with the *y*-initial form. Compare the affirmative and negative auxiliaries in (3a, 3b), prefixing *r*- and *d*- respectively, with the question-answer sequence in (3c), where both question and answer use the *ø*-initial form:

- (3) a. *R-ydy-n ni yma.*
AFF-be-1PL 1PL here
'We are here.' (Rhys Jones 1977:39)
- b. *D-ydy-n ni ddim yn hoffi llaeth*
NEG-be-1PL 1PL NEG in like milk
'We don't like milk.' (Rhys Jones 1977:50)
- c. *ø-ydy-n ni 'n mynd yn y car.*
NEU-be-1PL 1PL in go in the car
ø-ydy-n /nag ø-ydy-n
NEU-be-1PL NEG NEU-be-1PL
'Are we going in the car?'
'Yes we are. / No we aren't.' (Rhys Jones 1977:39, 40)

The use of the same *ø*-initial form in both polar questions and the answers to them creates another kind of formal link between the elements of question and answer

pairs – here, between polar questions and their affirmative responses, rather than between information questions and their deictic responses as was exemplified in Section 2.1.

2.2.2 Conjunct / disjunct systems

Secondly, there is a burgeoning body of descriptions of languages displaying so-called conjunct-disjunct patterning, in which formal patterns associated with first person subjects in declaratives are used with second person subjects in interrogatives. Note that I am using the term 'conjunct-disjunct patterning' here in a very broad way, to cover any situation where there is identity of form between declaratives with first person subjects and interrogatives with second person subjects (the 'conjunct' form), as opposed to another form used elsewhere (the 'disjunct' form) – cf. Bickel's (2000:2) use of the term 'conjunct person' to refer to "the combined set of speaker in statements and addressee in questions".¹² Conjunct/disjunct patterning, in this broad sense, includes:

(a) privacy-motivated conjunct/disjunct patterning, where constructions have specific semantics that happens to induce this patterning across speech act types. These include so-called 'private predicates' in Japanese (Aoki 1986; Nariyama 2003) or Korean (Chun and Zubin 1990), as well as conjunct/disjunct patterned coding of volitionality in Kathmandu Newari (Hargreaves 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 2005). In each of these cases the motivation for the conjunct-disjunct patterning appears to be that there are types of subjective information¹³ – about such states as 'feel cold', 'feel lonely', 'want', or 'intend' in Japanese or Korean, or 'do on purpose' in Kathmandu Newari – which are only directly accessible to the

12. Logophoric subjects in various types of subordinate clause (i.e. that are third person with respect to the primary speech act but first person with respect to the reported, declarative speech act or mental state) are also part of the conjunct pattern, and indeed it is this use, as originally formulated by Hale (1980) for Newari, that gives rise to the term 'conjunct', as a type of coreference between the main clause subject and the complement subject in a sentence like 'He_i said he_i was cold' (= 'He said, "I am cold"', linking back to the first person declarative use).

13. Within the literature, there are two variant approaches to dealing with this patterning: the first (e.g. Iwasaki 1993, 2002) treats it as a matter of subjective access, while the second (e.g. Kamio 1997) treats it as arising from different 'territories of information', which place subjective information within particular role-identified territories, along with other types of information on which it is most appropriate for a given participant to comment. Clearly the two approaches are not unrelated, but while the first focusses predominantly on ability to know, i.e. subjective access, the second focusses on rights to be the knowledgeable party: to comment on another's mental state may be perceived as an arrogant intrusion, even if it is accurate.

speaker of a declarative, and to the addressee of an interrogative.¹⁴ We can call these 'privacy-motivated conjunct/disjunct systems'; illustrative examples from Japanese are given in (4a–d from Nariyama 2003:139–140), where the adjective *ureshi* can be used directly with first person subjects of declaratives (4a) and second person subjects of interrogatives (4c), but under other conditions (4b, 4d) must combine with a further element like *soo* 'look'. *Gatte iru* 'give outward signs of, act like' would also be possible instead of *soo*.

- (4) a. *Ureshi-i desu*
happy-ADJ be:NPST:POL
'(I am) happy.' (*you are / *(s)he is happy.)
- b. *Ureshi soo desu*
happy appearance be:NPST:POL
'(Someone) looks happy (to my observation).'
- c. *Ureshi-i desu ka?*
happy-ADJ be:NPST:POL Q
'Are you happy?' (*am I / is (s)he happy?)
- d. *Ureshi soo desu ka?*
happy appearance be:NPST:POL Q
'Do I / does someone look happy (to your observation)?
(*Are you happy?)

In dialogue, this patterning can set up formal similarities between the predicates of questions and answers, in similar ways to those seen above with ignorative/deictic pairs. In the sequence illustrated in (5a,b), for example, the basic (directly adjectivalised) form of another private predicate, *hoshi-i* 'desirous, wanting' is used for the second person question and the first person answer, whereas a third person answer (as in (5c)) would require that the suffix sequence *-gatteiru* 'give outward signs of' be added to the stem *hoshi-* (examples from Hasegawa 2005:252–253).¹⁵

14. Cf. the characterisation in Iwasaki (1993:13), though the formulation needs to be extended so that it is not always the speaker: "It is understandable that predicates which show perspective difference tend to concern the internal state of human beings, because this is the area for which the speaker can (or must) make a clear distinction between self and others. That is, internal states can be directly observable only by the person who is experiencing or possessing them."

15. *Hoshi* takes a predicate adjective marker *-i* when used directly as a predicate (or with the copula *desu*). Note that the case frame changes once *-gatteiru* is added: the desired object shifts from the nominative to the accusative. This is a further parallel between the basic, private form (desired object in nominative) setting it off from the non-basic, non-private form (desired object in accusative).

- (5) a. *Nani ga hoshi-i desu ka?*
what NOM desirous-ADJ be:NPST:POL Q
'What do you want?'
- b. *Hana ga hoshi-i desu.*
flower NOM desirous-ADJ be:NPST:POL
'I'd like some flowers.'
- c. *Furukawa-san wa wain wo*
Furukawa-HON TOP wine ACC
hoshi-gat-te-iru.
desirous-show.signs.of-CONJ-be:NPST
'Furukawa-san wants (lit. gives the appearance of wanting) wine.'

What is important here is the way conjunct/disjunct patterns induce formal parallelisms between question and answer parts of a dialogue. If a basic form is chosen in the question (e.g. a direct private predicate), it will normally be answered with a basic form; if a non-basic, evidentially-modulated form is chosen (e.g. in *-gatteiru*) then it will be normally answered with a comparable form.

The resulting formal parallelism reveals the phenomenological motivation for the conjunct/disjunct distinction: the 'epistemic authority' for private predicates is the second person in questions (since the questions ask the interlocutor to supply information on their subject state), but the first person in statements. Normally, question-answer pairs will either be conjunct throughout – when the first speaker is enquiring about their interlocutor's private state, i.e. when the conversation is seeking subjectively-accessible information – or disjunct throughout – when the conversation is seeking information that is not subjectively accessible by the other speaker or hearer. In other words, the formal parallel between question and answer in the case of conjunct/disjunct systems reflects a rather specific categorisation of the question-answer sequence, into the type 'private inquiry'.

(b) Besides languages like Japanese or Kathmandu Newari, in which there is a clear motivation for conjunct/disjunct patterning in terms of distribution of epistemic authority across speech types, there are also *grammaticalised conjunct/disjunct* languages like the Barbacoan language Cha'palaa (Floyd 2011), where this patterning is "relatively non-fluid, and is not governed by differences in volitionarity or intention" (Floyd 2011:7). Examples are:

- (6) a. *(i-ya) libru ka-n-tsu-yu*
1-TOP book get-NMLZ-PROG-CJ
'I'm getting (buying) a book.'
- b. *(ñu/ya) libru ka-n-tsu-we*
2/3 book get-NMLZ-PROG-DCL.DJ
'You are / she is getting a book.'

- c. (*ñu-ya*) *libru ka-n-tsu-yu*
 2-TOPI book get-NMLZ-PROG-CJ
 'Are you getting a book?'

In this section we have reviewed a number of phenomena, already reported in the literature, which reveal dialogic parallelism in question-answer pairs – ignorative/deictics, neutral verb forms in Welsh question-answer pairs, and various types of conjunct/disjunct systems. However, dialogic interaction is not just about asking questions and receiving answers – it also involves other sorts of speech acts and interaction, such as getting one's interlocutors to do things. The Nen assentive category, to which we now pass, shows that in those situations, too, dialogic parallelisms can be found.

3. The Nen assentive

Nen is a hitherto-undescribed language of Papua New Guinea, belonging to the Morehead-Marô language family which contains around 15 languages all spoken in the flatlands of Southern New Guinea, spanning the two modern nations of Papua New Guinea and Indonesia. Nen itself is spoken by around 350 people, primarily in the village of Bimadbn, Morehead District, Western Province, Papua New Guinea. The data contained here is based on fieldwork carried out by the author in Bimadbn village on four field trips since 2008.¹⁶

Typologically and phylogenetically, languages of the Morehead-Marô family differ substantially from the languages of the Trans New Guinea phylum (Kalam, Usan, Hua, etc.) which have been taken as prototypical of Papuan languages. Like them they have a dominant SOV order, but unlike them they make virtually no use of verb chaining, and instead employ a rich set of non-finite constructions in clause combining. They possess complex verbal morphology, with rich systems of both prefixation and suffixation, indexing the undergoer by prefix and the actor by suffix, and distributing a rich set of tense/aspect/mood (TAM) information across both the prefixes and suffixes. At least in Nen, there is a fundamental contrast between perfective, imperfective, and neutral aspects, with the dominant focus of the perfective vs. imperfective contrast lying at the initial event boundary (i.e. inceptive vs. continuative).

16. However, since total time in the village has so far been just over two months, it goes without saying that many pragmatic and semantic subtleties of the assentive construction have yet to be explored.

TAM values are calculated by unifying material from both the prefixes and the suffixes of a verb.¹⁷ Prefixes are portmanteaux signalling the person and number of the undergoer (object, or stative subject) and a TAM-relevant series which I simply represent by Greek letters (α , β , γ); this does not have a clear semantic value until unified with a TAM suffix.¹⁸ Some examples of the various prefix forms, held constant at 3SG.U, are given in (7a–e).

- (7) a. *Ynd nne bä y-ane-ta-n*
 1¹⁹ food(ABS) FUT 3SG.U: α -eat-ND:IPFV-1SG.A
 'I will eat the food.'
- b. *Ynd nne totr y-ane-ta-n*
 1 food(ABS) now 3SG.U: α -eat-ND:IPFV-1SG.A
 'I am eating the food now.'
- c. *Ynd nne tba y-ane-ta-n*
 1 food(ABS) just.now 3SG.U: α -eat-ND:IPFV-1SG.A
 'I have just gone eaten the food.'
- d. *Ynd nne kae t-ane-ta-n*
 1 food(ABS) $\pm$ 1.day 3SG.U: β -eat-ND:IPFV-1SG.A
 'I ate the food yesterday.'

17. A small number of 'prefixing' verbs – 'be', its directional derivatives 'come' and 'go' (literally 'be hither' and 'be thither'), and around 30 'posals' designating position and posture ('be sitting', 'be up high', 'be wedged', 'be inside', etc.) – have minimal suffixal material, with person and TAM information both being largely or wholly confined to the prefix system. The remarks in this chapter do not readily generalise to them, but in any case it is rare to use imperatives with members of this set. This is because they denote states, which are hard to command – changes into the corresponding state, such as 'sit down', will be encoded by a derived verb which does take suffixes.

18. The dominant semantics for the split, in terms of coding intransitive subjects, is between stative vs. dynamic subjects rather than volitional vs. non-volitional – e.g. 'be up high' (prefix) vs. 'walk' or 'fall' (both suffix). The only exceptions are the verbs for 'come' and 'go', which are formally based on the stative 'be' plus a directional prefix, and the verb for 'walk' – these three are the only non-stative prefixing verbs.

19. In Nen, the first person pronoun *ynd* and the second person pronoun *bm* have a range of interpretations – either absolutive (any number) or singular (either absolutive or ergative). Non-absolutive, non-singulars have distinct forms, e.g. *yndbem* '1NSG.ERG' and *bmbem* '2NSG.ERG' (*-bem* is found in all non-singular ergative pronouns). The various possible readings of the basic forms *ynd* and *bm* are disambiguated by the agreement of the corresponding verb prefix or suffix. In this chapter I simply gloss them as 1 (first person) for *ynd* and 2 for *bm*.

20. Actually *nne* means both 'food' and 'yam' (the prototypical food in the region); since this is irrelevant to the argument I just gloss it as 'food' here.

- e. *Ynd nne tende d-ane-taw-n*
 1 food(ABS) before 3SG.U:γ-eat-ND:RPST-1SG.A
 'I ate the food (long ago).'

Two other points about the prefix series to bear in mind here are: (a) Basic imperatives take the β-series whether they are perfective or imperfective (8a, 8b). Note in passing (this will be relevant later) that, like imperatives in many languages around the world, the second person singular imperative is zero (cf. Aikhenvald 2010).

- (8) a. *Bm ombte nu t-z-ø*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-PFV.IMP.2SG.A
 'Boil (some) hot water!' (put it over the fire, boil it from the start)
 b. *Bm ombte nu t-z-ya-ø*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-ND:IPFV.IMP.2SG.A
 'Boil the hot water!' (it's already over the fire; heat it up more)

(b) In declaratives, the γ-series is used for remote past in the imperfective (7e), but the future in the perfective (9).

- (9) *Ynd ombte nu kae d-z-ng-n.*
 1 hot water ±1.day 3SG.U:γ-cook-ND:FUT.PFV-1SG.A
 'I'll put hot water on to boil tomorrow.'

Although the prefix and suffix series form different formal paradigms, their exact TAM values are not determinable until the prefix and suffix series are combined, and in that sense the best morphological treatment is as a circumfixal paradigm (see Evans to appear), though in this chapter I gloss each morph individually to make the function of each form clearer to the reader.

The data given so far are representative of the following generalisations about Nen verb morphology. The complex verb morphology of Nen means that each verb has many hundreds of possible inflected forms, but the following generalisations (among others) hold fast in the midst of an extremely complex set of paradigms.

- For perfective aspectual values, the γ-prefix series is associated with the future (e.g. (9)).
- Imperatives use the β-prefix series (8a, 8b).
- Suffixing verbs have two slots after the stem: a 'thematic' and a 'desinence'. The thematic codes a combination of number (unusually organised as 'dual' vs. 'non-dual') and tense/aspect/mood, grouped into three main aspectual series (imperfective, perfective, and neutral) with further divisions within each of those. The desinence codes a combination of person/number of actor, plus TAM; some person/number combinations (e.g. 1SG -*n* and 1NSG -*m*) do not change for TAM while others (e.g. 3SG) exhibit many TAM-sensitive forms. These are summarised in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Canonical forms of thematics across all TAM categories

	Imperfective			Neutral		Perfective		
	Imperative	Basic	Remote past	Primordial	Preterite	Imperative	Future	Current
ND	<i>ta</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>taw</i>	<i>tama</i>	<i>we</i>	<i>ø</i>	<i>ng</i>	<i>nd</i>
DU	<i>e</i>	<i>ø</i>	<i>ø</i>	<i>anz</i>	<i>anz</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>

- Imperatives with second person singular subjects have a zero final suffix in the actor slot (8a, 8b).²¹ This contrasts with second person singular subjects in most other TAM values; the commonest 2SG allomorph is -*e*, as in *yanete* 'you (sg.) / (s)he eats/ate it' [*y-ane-t-e* 3SG.U:α-eat-ND:IPFV-2/3SG.A]
- The result of (c) and (d) are that the bare stem, without overt suffixation, is only found in perfective imperatives with second person singular subjects (as in (8a)). As in so many languages around the world, this means that imperatives are the shortest verb forms. '(You) boil it!', for example, is *tz!* (see (8a) for glossing), which is the shortest available form for this verb (the prefix *t-* marks a third person singular object) precisely because it has both a zero thematic and a zero desinence.²²
- Everywhere else in the paradigm the stem will be followed either by a non-zero thematic (e.g. non-dual imperfective -*ta*, dual perfective -*a*) or a non-zero actor+TAM desinence (e.g. 2PL imperative -*ng*) or both (e.g. -*ta-n* or *taw-n* in (7a-e), -*ng-n* in (9)).
- As already noted, first singular subjects are marked by the suffix -*n* throughout the paradigm, regardless of TAM value (see 7a-e).

These generalisations falter in a single place: assentives. Functionally, the main goal of assentives is to give affirmative responses by singular actors to perfective commands, as in (10), which is an appropriate response to (8a). Formally, these resemble perfective imperatives with second singular subjects, in that there is no overt suffixal material after the stem.²³

21. There is one other TAM value for which 2SG actors have a zero suffix: the 'current' form, which is close in meaning to the English perfect. In the non-dual this builds its actor inflections on a thematic -*nd*. Cf. *yzndn* 'I have cooked it', *yzndm* 'we have cooked it', *yznda* 'he/she has cooked it', *yzndt* 'you (pl.) / they have cooked it', but zero-suffixed *yznd* for 'you (sg.) have cooked it'.

22. More accurately, equal-shortest in principle at least, sharing the prize with the more pragmatically unusual *qz!* 'boil me! (from scratch)'.

23. Elsewhere in this chapter I give thematics and desinences separate glosses, even when this requires the use of two zero suffixes. With assentives, however, I just give a single gloss

Table 4. Canonical forms of desinences across all TAM categories[†]

	Imperfective			Neutral			Perfective		
	Imperative	Basic	Remote past	Primordial	Preterite	Past customary	Imperative	Future	Current
1SG		n	n	n	n	n		n	n
1NSG		m	m	m	m	m		m	m
2SG	ø	#e	#e	nga	ø	ø	ø		ø
3SG		#e	#e	nga	ø	ø		a	a
2/3PL	ng	t	t	nd	nd	t	ng	ø	t
2/3DU	ng	t	t	t	t	t	nd	nd	nd

[†] In tables of Nen suffixes, # means 'displacing preceding vowel', and † means 'replacing preceding -av'.

- (10) *Ē, bā d-z-ø*
 yes IMM.FUT 3SG.U:γ-cook-PFV:1SG.A:ASS
 'Yes, I'll boil it' (from scratch)

Strikingly, these violate generalisations (c)–(e) above. They have a zero final suffix and are not second person (violating (c)), they have a bare stem but are not imperatives (violating (d)), and they have first singular actors but do not end in -n (violating (e)). Formally, then, assentives are quite unexpected in their association of inflectional values to forms. On the other hand, if we view them as part of a dialogic sequence or adjacency pair, of the type command-assent, then their form is less mysterious: the suffix simply echoes the form in the preceding command, while the prefix takes the expected form for a future perfective. To make this clearer, in (11) we put (8a) and (10) together as a mini-dialogue:

- (11) *Bm ombte nu t-z-ø-ø*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-PFV:IMP-2SG.A
 'Boil the hot water!' (put it over the fire, boil it from the start)
Ē, bā d-z-ø
 yes IMM.FUT 3SG.U:γ-cook-PFV:1SG.A:ASS
 'Yes, I'll boil it' (from scratch)

It seems reasonable to hypothesise, then, that the form of the assentive has been shaped historically, not by the rest of the paradigm it belongs to, but by echoic reference to the corresponding suffix in the conversational move that precedes it. The suffixal form of assentives, in other words, functions to tie them closely to the preceding imperatives of which they form a second pair-part, in conversation-analytic terms.²⁴ The effects of this can be seen if we compare a straightforward statement of future intent (12), formulated using the imperfective plus a future preverbal particle, with an assentive (13a) which locks on to a preceding imperative: there is a formal similarity between the assentive (13b) and the imperative (i.e. both ending in -*esr*) which does not exist in the case of the basic future form (12).

for the combined thematic + desinence values. This is because assentives differ from all other inflected suffixing verbs in being restricted to first singular subjects; since they do not have subjects of other numbers we cannot contrast the number values to set up a thematic series.

24. In conversation-analytic terms, assent (i.e. obeying) is the preferred response to a command. Negative responses in Nen, i.e. non-compliances, do not use any single grammaticalised form, but would typically be expressed by *yao* 'no' plus either an excuse or a general statement like *yao pitas ym* 'it's not a good idea'.

- (12) *Ynd bä n-ng-es-na-n yuw-at*
 1 IMM.FUT M²⁵:α-away-descend-ND:IPFV-1SG.A below-AL
 'I'll come ['go'] down (to the ground beneath the house).
 [not a pair part – normal immediate future, with 1SG actor suffix -n]
- (13) a. *Bm k-n-esr-ø-ø yuw-at!*
 2 M:β-TOW-descend-PFV:ND-2SG.A.IMP below-AL
 'You come down below!'
 [Imperative – zero actor suffix]
- b. *Ynd bä g-ng-esr-ø yuw-at*
 1 IMM.FUT M:γ-away-descend-PFV:1SG.A:ASS below-AL
 'OK, I'll come down.'
 [Assentive – zero actor suffix]

Note that the above remarks apply only to perfective, singular, positive responses to imperatives.²⁶ If the original command is in the imperfective, then a normal formation is used for the response, e.g. the 1SG.A form -n that would be used for an imperfective future (14a). Likewise, if the original command is a perfective but not in the singular, then the perfective form must be used, which takes the usual non-zero suffixes for aspect and actor person/number features, such as future perfective non-dual thematic -ng and 1NSG actor -m (14b).

- (14) a. *Bm ombte nu t-z-ya-ø!*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-IPFV:ND-2SG.A
 '(You singular) Boil the hot water!
 (it's already over the fire; heat it up more)
Ē, bä y-z-ya-n
 yes IMM.FUT 3SG.U:α-cook-IPFV:ND-1SG.A
 'Yes, I'll boil it.' (it's already over the fire)

25. Nen has a large set of middle verbs, used for dynamic one-place predicates including almost all motion verbs; the verb *esr* 'descend' is one of them. Middle verbs employ a 'middle prefix' in the undergoer slot and an actor suffix in the actor suffix.

26. Why should this be so? At present there is no clear data (and we still lack relevant data from related languages that could give us historical depth). Does it have something to do with the semantics of the perfective that focuses on inception of activity, and the fact that inception is somehow a more salient and overtly cooperative response than continuation (which could have happened anyway without the interference of an imperative)? And why is it restricted to singular subjects? Again, is it because speakers can only report their own planned actions rather than those of others with full confidence? At present we lack any satisfactory answer to this puzzle.

- b. *Bm ombte nu t-z-ya-ng!*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-IPFV:ND-2NSG.A
 '(You, three or more) Boil the hot water!
 (it's already over the fire; heat it up more)
Ē, bä y-z-ya-m
 yes IMM.FUT 3SG.U:α-cook-IPFV:ND-1NSG.A
 'Yes, we (three or more)'ll boil it.' (it's already over the fire)
- (15) *Bm ombte nu t-z-ø-ng!*
 2 hot water 3SG.U:β-cook-PFV:IMP:ND-2NSG.A
 '(You, three or more) put the hot water on to boil!'
Ē, bä d-z-ng-m
 yes IMM.FUT 3SG.U:γ-cook-PFV:FUT:ND-1NSG.A
 'Yes, we (three or more)'ll boil it (from scratch).'

As a formal category, then, assentives are limited to singular participants, in the perfective. However, and particularly given the clearly unmarked status of singular addressees in imperatives, this restriction does not diminish the significance of the formal echoic effect found between assentives and the imperatives which they answer. They furnish a clear example of dialogic parallelism for the speech-act pair command-assent, showing that dialogic parallelisms are not restricted to the question-answer phenomena described in Section 2.

4. Semantics vs. discourse position

I have been arguing above that certain types of formal parallel between grammatical categories are best understood as signalling the close interrelation between two pair-parts, in terms of dialogic conversational sequences. Ignoratives and deictics, questions and answers, commands and assentives, are linked in each case as the first and second parts of an adjacency pair. There are at least two good reasons why languages should signal these links through formal parallelisms.

The first is that, in terms of the production of conversation, the timing of transition from one turn to another is very tight and fast (Stivers et al. 2009), so that some replication of formal content, possibly through shadowing or mimicking of part of the preceding turn, may assist in rapid coordination of turn transitions through speeding up speech production by the second participant.

The second has to do with the signalling needs of structure within more complex, nested dialogue types. 'Insert sequences', as is well-known, can embed one adjacency pair inside another, as in a sequence like 'Whose is the coat?' 'Which coat?' 'This one.' 'That old lady's.' Schegloff (2007:97–114) gives a number of interesting examples, sometimes running to over 80 lines of transcript before the

first pair-part is closed by its corresponding second pair-part. Formal similarities across interrogatives and demonstratives can ensure that the right answer gets paired with the right question – although, interestingly, the Conversation Analysis tradition, despite gathering a vast collection of elaborate naturalistic examples of complex nesting, has not to my knowledge systematically illustrated similarities in the form of pair-parts along the lines initiated in this chapter.

There is an alternative approach to these formal resemblances, which seeks the explanation not in interlocking sequences in conversation, but in comparable semantics, shared across both members of the pair – in other words, the formal parallel simply represents an invariant epistemic category. Thus, extracting *-uda* from Russian *kuda/tuda* 'whither/thither', *-oo* from Japanese *doo/koo* 'how/like this', and *-v\avu* from Tamil *ev\avu/av\avu* 'how/this much', we obtain meanings of direction for *-uda*, manner for *-oo*, and (mass) quantity for *-v\avu*, which are then assembled with ignorative or deictic semantics according to what they are combined with. Note that – as with the traditional speaker-based characterisations with which we began this chapter – this then removes us from an interactional characterisation of their semantics.

A number of authors have advanced analyses that take this speaker-based position, more or less explicitly. One case is the analysis of questions in Aboriginal languages presented by Diana Eades (1982). Commenting on the phenomenon that English interrogatives and indefinite pronouns receive the same translation in many Aboriginal languages (e.g. *who/someone*), she leads this back to a conversational practice in many varieties of Aboriginal English which gives the hearer great freedom in how to respond:²⁷ rather than posing questions which require the addressee to respond, the speaker makes a statement of their own ignorance, implicitly inviting the addressee (or perhaps some bystander/hearer) to fill in this gap if they wish. This analysis proposes a conversational system with much freer transitions between turns, in the sense that by not giving such explicit indication of question status, the addressee is given much more licence about whether they need to construe it as a question or not, and hence whether they need to furnish an answer. In connection with the widespread distribution of this conversational practice throughout indigenous Australian societies, it is interesting to note that formal parallels between ignoratives and

27. Subsequently this view of communication styles in many Aboriginal communities was elaborated in Walsh's 'broadcast model' (1991), which, as the name suggests, characterises a communication style based on 'broadcasting' by the speaker without requiring a close dyadic lock-in by a particular targeted hearer. Paired with Eades' analysis of questioning practice, this would imply a model of information-seeking in which the speaker puts on record their lack of knowledge on a particular issue, and then leaves it to the discretion of any present hearers as to whether they then volunteer a response that would fill in an answer. For a recent conversation-analytic study of Garrwa conversation that only partly supports these findings see Gardner (2010).

deictics, of the type exemplified for Russian, Japanese, and Tamil, have not to my knowledge been reported for Australian languages.

A second case is the analysis of the West African language Wolof proposed by Stéphane Robert (2006). Wolof, rather like Tamil, uses a three-way vowel contrast that pervades a very large number of epistemic and morphosyntactic categories in the deictic realm. On Robert's analysis, however, this system does not oppose demonstrative to ignorative categories. Rather, it involves the three egocentric deictic categories *-i* 'close to the speaker', *-a* 'far from the speaker', and *-u* 'absent from localisation in the space of the speaker'. The contrast *nit ki / ka* 'person close to / far away from the speaker' exemplifies the first two categories (*k-* being a gender/class prefix); the form *ku* is used in a range of situations including indefinite relative clauses and interrogatives (e.g. *ku* 'who?', Robert 2006:161). Underlying Robert's analysis is a view that the basic semantics of *-u* is not directly that of the ignorative. Rather, non-localisability within deictic space can generate implicatures calling for assistance with localisation from the addressee, and hence construal as questions.²⁸

The contrast between these approaches is reminiscent of the 24th aphorism from Ludwig Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*:

If you do not keep the multiplicity of language-games in view you will perhaps be inclined to ask questions like: "What is a question?" – Is it the statement that I do not know such-and-such, or the statement that I wish the other person would tell me ...? Or is it the description of my mental state of uncertainty?...
(Wittgenstein 1974 [1953]:12)

Resolution of these issues is rather subtle, and Wittgenstein's own formulation in the preceding 23rd Aphorism makes it clear that he is sceptical of any straightforward general categorisation:

But how many kinds of sentence are there? Say assertion, question, and command? – There are *countless* kinds... And this multiplicity is not something fixed, given once for all; but new types of language, new language-games, as we may say, come into existence, and others become obsolete and get forgotten.
(Wittgenstein 1974 [1953]:11)

28. There is a second set of words in Wolof, ending in *-an*, which apparently lack the non-localised deictic reading, e.g. *kan* 'who' – *Kan moo def jef ji?* 'who did that?' (Sall 2005:52). This series appears to be much closer in its semantics to standard interrogative pronouns. Though there is no contrastive study of the uses of this series and that of the *-u* series in questions, Stéphane Robert (email to NE, 18/11/2011) characterises the *-u* form interrogatives as 'l'interrogation en indiquant un manque de localisation, une sous-spécification des termes en question', vs. the *-an* form where 'on extrait d'une relation prédicative préconstruite ... l'élément qui est la variable inconnue' – giving a contrast roughly along the lines of *qui est venu?* 'who's come?' vs. *qui est-ce qui est venu?* 'who is it who's come?'.

Though Wittgenstein did not explicitly cast his enquiry as concerned with ontolinguistics, its concern with the question of 'how many kinds of sentence are there' directly targets the ontology of sentence-types, and is a salutary reminder that the answer is subtle and cannot be definitively answered just by focusing on any one language at a given moment in its history.

The considerations discussed in this section suggest that when it comes to ignorative/deictic pairs the mix of motivations – between semantic commonality and pair-part signalling device – may vary from language to language, including the exact way in which question-answer sequences are construed in particular cultures and systems. And it may also be the case, of course, that both factors are operative and reinforce each other in many cases. Nonetheless, the plausibility of non-dialogic analyses – based solely on the semantics of speaker-meaning – make it important, in developing an ontology of dialogically-motivated grammatical devices, that we find other examples where the analysis more straightforwardly compels a conversation-based or interactive analysis.

Assentives, I have argued, are just such a case, since it is harder to find a common semantics that underlies the imperative and the assentive, and it is also impossible to identify the crucial final element of the assentive verb form as anything other than a copy of the corresponding imperative, since, unlike the ignorative elements discussed above, it does not occur anywhere else in the verb's inflectional system. This makes them in many ways a better illustration than questions provide of how the dialogic interlocking of discourse moves can produce formal reflexes in grammar (cf. also Benz, this volume, for another type of reflex of the interlocking between discourse and grammar).

5. Conclusion

This chapter is deliberately exploratory, bringing together several phenomena from question-answer grammar that have been known but not linked to each other, locating this at the interface of grammar and dialogue, and then using the example of Nen assentives to argue that the phenomena of dialogic parallelisms may appear in other types of dialogue moves. The current blossoming of ontolinguistics is being driven by a continually expanding knowledge of typology on the one hand, and on the other by the rapidly-growing number of grammatical descriptions within an integrated comparative framework that form the basis for "Humboldt's dream", as Dietmar Zaefferer (2006) has put it. We can expect to find further examples of how grammars respond to the inherently dialogic nature of human language by encoding the distribution of speech activity and negotiation of a common conceptual world across the multiple parties that drive human conversation and through it shape grammar.

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2010. *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ameka, Felix. 2004. Grammar and cultural practices: The grammaticalization of triadic communication in West African languages. *Journal of West African Languages* XXX (2): 5–28.
- Aoki, Haruo. 1986. Evidentials in Japanese. In W. Chafe & J. Nichols, eds., *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, 223–238. Norwood: Ablex.
- Asher, Ron E. & Elayaperumal Annamalai. 2002. *Colloquial Tamil*. London: Routledge.
- Bickel, Balthasar. 2000. Introduction: Person and evidence in Himalayan languages. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23: 1–12.
- Brown, Roger & Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In T.A. Sebeok, ed., *Style in Language*, 253–276. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chun, Soon Ae & David A. Zubin. 1990. Experiential vs. agentive constructions in Korean narrative. *BLS XVI*: 81–93.
- Clyne, Michael, Catrin Norrby, & Jane Warren. 2009. *Language and Human Relations: Styles of Address in Contemporary Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dante Alighieri. 1996 [c. 1302]. *De vulgari eloquentia*, edited and translated by Steven Botterill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, Judy. 1984. Subsequent versions of invitations, offers, requests, and proposals dealing with potential or actual rejection. In J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage, eds., *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*, 102–128. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davidson, Judy. 1990. Modifications of invitations, offers and rejections. In G. Psathas, ed., *Interactional Competence*, 149–180. Washington: University Press of America.
- Ducrot, Oswald. 1984. *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Les éditions de minuit.
- Ducrot, Oswald. 1996. *Slovenian Lectures: Argumentative Semantics / Konferenca Slovence: Sémantiques argumentatives*, ed. Igor Ž. Žagar. Ljubljana: ISH Inštitut za humanistične študije Ljubljana.
- Eades, Diana. 1982. You gotta know how to talk...: Information seeking in south-east Queensland Aboriginal Society. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 2 (1): 61–82.
- Enfield, Nick & Stephen C. Levinson (eds.). 2006. *Roots of Human Sociality. Culture, Cognition and Interaction*. Oxford & New York: Berg.
- Errington, J. Joseph. 1988. *Structure and Style in Javanese*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Evans, Nicholas. To appear. Inflection in Nen. In M. Baerman, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of Inflection*.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. (Originally distributed as Fillmore, 1975/1971, *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis* by the Indiana University Linguistics Club).
- Floyd, Simeon. 2011. Conjunct/disjunct marking in Cha'palaa. Handout, Workshop on Conjunct/disjunct marking from a cross-linguistic perspective. Boulder, 12 July 2011.
- Gardner, Rod. 2010. Question and answer sequences in Garrwa talk. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 30 (4): 423–446.
- Goffmann, Erving. 1983. The interaction order. *American Sociological Review* 48: 1–17.
- Hale, Austin. 1980. Person markers: Finite conjunct and disjunct forms in Newari. In R. Trail, ed., *Papers in South-East Asian Linguistics No. 7*, 95–106. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Hargreaves, David. 1990. Indexical functions and grammatical subsystems in Kathmandu Newari. *Chicago Linguistics Society* 26: 179–193.

- Hargreaves, David. 1991a. The conceptual structure of intentional action: Data from Kathmandu Newari. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 17: 379–389.
- Hargreaves, David. 1991b. *Intentional action in the grammar of Kathmandu Newari*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.
- Hargreaves, David. 2005. Agency and intentional action in Kathmandu Newari. *Himalayan Linguistics* 5: 1–48.
- Hasegawa, Yoko. 2005. *Elementary Japanese. Volume One*. Tokyo: Tuttle.
- Irvine, Judith T. 1996. Shadow conversations: The indeterminacy of participant roles. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban, eds., *Natural Histories of Discourse*, 131–159. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 1993. *Subjectivity in Grammar and Discourse. Theoretical Considerations and a Case Study of Japanese Spoken Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2002. *Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Theory of Territory of Information*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Karcevski, Serge. 1969 [1941]. Introduction à l'étude de l'interjection. In R. Godel, ed., *A Geneva School Reader*, 196–213. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [Original publication details *Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure* 1: 57–75.]
- King, Gareth. 1993. *Modern Welsh: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Lehmann, Thomas. 1989. *A Grammar of Modern Tamil*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- Lehmann, Thomas. 1998. Old Tamil. In S.B. Steever, ed., *The Dravidian Languages*, 75–99. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1988. Putting linguistics on a proper footing: Explorations in Goffmann's concepts of participation. In P. Drew & A. Wooton, eds., *Erving Goffmann. Exploring the Interaction Order*, 161–227. Abingdon: Polity Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2006. On the human "interaction engine". In N.J. Enfield & S.C. Levinson, eds., *Roots of Human Sociality: Culture, Cognition and Interaction*, 39–69. Oxford: Berg.
- Morris Jones, Bob. 1999. *The Welsh Answering System*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Nariyama, Shigeko. 2003. *Ellipsis and Reference Tracking in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Raymond, Geoffrey. 2003. Grammar and social organization: Yes/no interrogatives and the structure of responding. *American Sociological Review* 68 (6): 939–967.
- Rhys Jones, Thomas. J. 1977. *Living Welsh. A Complete Working Course*. Sevenoaks: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Robert, Stéphane. 2006. Deictic space in Wolof: Discourse, syntax and the importance of absence. In M. Hickmann & S. Robert, eds., *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, 155–174. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sall, Adjiratu Oumar. 2005. *La subordination en Wolof: Description syntaxique*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel. 1982. Discourse as an interactional achievement: Some uses of 'uh huh!' and other things that come between sentences. In D. Tannen, ed., *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, 71–93. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel. 2007. *Sequence Organization in Interaction. A Primer in Conversation Analysis 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Stivers, Tanya, Nick J. Enfield, Penelope Brown, Christina Englert, Makoto Hayashi, Trine Heinemann, Gertie Hoymann, Federico Rossano, Jan Peter de Ruiter, Kyung-Eun Yoon, & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009. Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *PNAS* 106 (26): 10587–10592.
- Walsh, Michael. 1991. Conversational styles and intercultural communication: An example from northern Australia. *Australian Journal of Communication* 18 (1): 1–12.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1974[1953]. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zaefferer, Dietmar. 2006. Realizing Humboldt's dream: Cross-linguistic grammatography as data-base creation. In F. Ameka, A. Dench, & N. Evans, eds., *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar-Writing*, 113–136. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.