...

Luiza de Moura Alves, Laura Becker, and Johannes Helmbrecht

# The intangible demonstrative *yu-* in Hup

## A versatile marker of discourse relations

**Abstract:** This study presents a detailed overview of the so-called intangible demonstrative *yu-* in Hup (Naduhup, Brazil). Analyzing its distribution in spontaneous speech data from narratives and conversation, we show that the demonstrative has a variety of discourse-managing functions, which have traditionally received less attention in the typological literature on demonstratives. We first present anaphoric and different discourse-deictic uses of *yu-*, and then analyze a number of conventionalized constructions based on the intangible demonstrative. We show how these constructions signal relations between different discourse segments and how they are used for opening and closing discourse topics. Finally, we discuss several functions of the intangible demonstrative *yu-* in Hup that are reminiscent of predicative demonstratives in other languages. Besides describing the particular distribution and functions of a demonstrative in a lesser described South American Indigenous language, our study aims at contributing to a better understanding of what additional discourse-managing functions demonstratives can have.

**Communicated by:** ...
**Dedicated to** ...

# 1 Introduction

The present study is a detailed overview of the different functions and uses of the so-called intangible demonstrative in Hup. We use spontaneous speech data to analyze its distribution and complex functions that include anaphoric and discourse-deictic

**Luiza de Moura Alves,** University of Regensburg
**Laura Becker,** University of Freiburg
**Johannes Helmbrecht,** University of Regensburg

reference, and extend to signaling other discourse relations. Our objective is two-fold: on the one hand, we aim at a detailed description of the demonstrative *yu-* in Hup. On the other hand, our analysis of this particular marker contributes to a better understanding of the discourse-managing functions of demonstratives in general, which have only started to receive more attention in the typological literature (cf. Guérin 2015, 2018, Killian 2022, König 2015).

For our study, we use spontaneous speech data from Patience Epps' Hup collection that can be found at AILLA (The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America). Our data comes mostly from narratives and from one conversation, as shown in Table 1. For all four speech situations, transcriptions with glosses and translations are available in addition to the audio files.

**Tab. 1:** Data

| title | type | reference |
|---|---|---|
| Curupira sucks woman's brain | narrative | Epps & Monteiro (2001) |
| Spirit who fished for Traira | narrative | Epps & Salustiano (2001) |
| Pineapple field spirit | narrative | Epps & Pires (2002) |
| Conversation about the fight at Santa Atanasio | conversation | Epps (2004) |

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 gives an overview of Hup as a language, the structure of noun phrases and the demonstrative system in Hup. Section 3 then zooms in on the intangible demonstrative *yu-* and provides a detailed analysis of its various functions: anaphoric, discourse-deictic and other clause-linking uses, the use of two complex constructions based on *yu-*, and finally, its use as a predicative demonstrative. Section 4 concludes.

# 2 Some relevant aspects of Hup

## 2.1 The Hup language and its speakers

Hup (glottocode: hupd1244) belongs to the Naduhup family and is spoken by some 1,500 speakers in the Amazonian basin at the border between Brazil and Colombia. The closest relative of Hup in the Naduhup family is Yuhup, followed by Dâw and Nadëb (Epps 2008: 3). The area where most Hup speakers live is located between the Tiquié, the Vaupés and the Papuri rivers as shown in Figure 1 (Epps 2008: 1). Traditionally recognized as skilled hunters, the Hup people (Hupd'əh) have been known for a semi-nomadic lifestyle. Due to missionary work in the region, however, most of

**Fig. 1:** Map of the Vaupés and Rio Negro area where Hup is spoken; reproduced from Epps (2012: 199) with permission.

the Hupd'əh had settled in villages along the Tiquié and Papuri Rivers by the 1970s (Epps 2008: 34-36). The Vaupés region is also known for its linguistic diversity with various languages from different families being spoken in the area, and for the complex socio-linguistic contact between the various communities (Epps & Michael 2017: 938). Multilingualism is also common among the Hup'əh; according to Epps (2008: 27), virtually all adult Hup speakers also understand and speak (at least) Tukano. Hup also exhibits notable dialectal variation, and three main dialect areas can be distinguished: Western, Central, and Eastern (Epps 2008: 10).

## 2.2 Hup noun phrases

Nouns in Hup can be divided into two main categories that show different morphosyntactic properties: free nouns and bound nouns. Free nouns typically consist of a single morpheme and can appear as a bare stem without any additional overt grammatical markers. Bound nouns, however, cannot occur on their own and must be preceded by another nominal expression, e.g. a possessive marker, a possessive construction or in a compound construction (Epps 2008: 232). Bound nouns include terms referring to humans, kin terms, animal body parts and plant parts.[1] Examples of free and bound nouns are shown in (1) and (2), respectively.

---

**1** Interestingly, human body parts are not part of obligatorily bound nouns in Hup (Epps 2008: 232).

(1)    examples of free nouns
  a.   *tĭw* 'path'                                  (Epps 2008: 167)
  b.   *hə̌p* 'fish'                                 (Epps 2008: 112)
  c.   *yud* 'clothes'                               (Epps 2008: 114)

(2)    examples of bound nouns
  a.   *ʔə̆h=ʔín* 'my mother' ('1SG-mother')         (Epps 2008: 234)
  b.   *tɨh=dóʔ* 'child' ('3SG-child')              (Epps 2008: 239)
  c.   *húp=ʔĩh* 'Hup man' ('Hup=male')             (Epps 2008: 241)

Nouns in Hup can be marked for plural with the clitic *=d'əh*, as can be seen in (17). The use of plural marking depends on the animacy of the referent; nouns referring to humans are consistently marked for plural, nouns referring to non-human animates can but do not necessarily receive plural marking, and nouns referring to inanimates are typically not overtly marked for number.

Hup also marks nominal case for both core and oblique verbal arguments (Epps 2008: 165). Core case marking in Hup follows nominative-accusative alignment, with single arguments of intransitive clauses as well as agents remaining formally unmarked. Patients in transitive clauses, but also recipients or beneficiaries are flagged overtly as objects by the marker *-ăn*. Example (3) shows *-ăn* marking a transitive pronominal object.

(3)    híd-**ăn**,  húptok g'óp=n'ăn,    hɨd wæd-hũʔ-yíʔ-íy
       3PL-**OBJ** caxiri   scoop=PL.OBJ 3PL eat-finish-TEL-DYNM
       'They ate up all of them, those who were serving caxiri.'
       (Epps 2008: 167)

Note that Hup has differential object marking based on the animacy status of the referent expressed as the object. Object marking is obligatory with human referents (including pronouns and demonstratives), can but does not necessarily have to be used with other non-human animate referents and is ungrammatical with inanimate referents (Epps 2008: 170). Besides core case marking, Hup features a number of case markers to express other relations, such as comitative, instrumental, or directional. One example is given in (4), showing the use of the directional marker *-an*.

(4)    yág-**an**        g'ãʔ-ʔáy            hám!
       hammock-**DIR** suspend-VENT.IMP go.IMP
       'Go lie in the hammock!'
       (Epps 2008: 182)

There are two other important markers that can occur on nominal expressions in Hup under certain circumstances, namely the dependent marker and the declarative

marker. The dependent marker -*Vp* is mainly used to signal subordinate clauses such as relative and adverbial clauses (Epps 2008: 841-845).[2] The marker is relevant for the present study because of its extended functions related to discourse structure. The dependent marker is not only used to signal a structural relation between the dependent clause and the main clause, but it can also occur in main clauses to mark the relation between the current predication and the larger discourse context (Epps 2008: 845-847). Epps (2008: 845) notes that, in such uses, the marker "[...] is particularly frequent with emphatic and evaluative statements, and in some cases appears to mark the utterance as topical or relatively presupposed in relation to the larger discourse or pragmatic context." This is important, because the dependent marker can also be used with nominal arguments in a clause to mark topicality, and it is likely that this function is an extension of its function to express emphasis or topicality when used with predicates of main clauses. When a subject is expressed clause-finally, for instance, it generally receives some overt contrastive or focus marking as well as the dependent marker (or the declarative marker, see below). This is shown in (5), where the pronominal subject *ʔám* 'you.SG' occurs with the dependent marker -*ǎp*.

(5)  náw=yɨʔ  tok-póg=həʔ,      cɔ́c,
     good=TEL pound-EMPH1=TAG2 INTERJ
     ʔəg-naʔ-pó-y=cud-áh                          ʔám-**ǎp**!
     drink-lose.consciousness-EMPH1-DYNM=INFR-FOC 2SG-**DEP**
     'Pound (the coca) carefully, darn it, you're drunk!'
     (Epps 2008: 848)

The dependent marker also occurs on nominal arguments that are fronted or postposed and separated from the rest of the clause prosodically by a slight pause and can be co-referenced by a pronoun in the main clause. In such cases, the nominals can be interpreted as topics (Epps 2008: 848). An example is given in (6). We will see similar constructions that include the dependent marker in Sections 3.2 and 3.4.

(6)  g'ǎg=tǽh-**ǽp**, tǎh  wǎd=həb-ɔt=mah      tɨh hib'áh-atíh
     bone=son-**DEP** tapir food=HOLLOW-OBL=REP 3SG be.created-EMPH2
     'So as for Bone-Son, they say he was born in a cow-trough.'
     (Epps 2008: 848)

Another marker that is mainly used with predicates but that can be used on nominal arguments to express topicality is the declarative marker -*V́h*. This marker generally occurs on the last element in the clause and its main function is to mark a clause as

---

**2** Here, "*V*" refers to a vowel that is realized by copying the quality of the preceding vowel. The same notation is used for the declarative marker -*V́h* described below.

declarative, as opposed to, e.g., interrogative, imperative or negative (Epps 2008: 761). As will be shown in Section 3.6, the intangible demonstrative *yu-* combines with the declarative marker when used as a demonstrative identifier.

## 2.3 Hup demonstratives

There are four types of demonstratives in Hup; a proximal and distal one which mainly express spatial deixis, the alternative demonstrative to express 'other', and the intangible demonstrative, which has a number of discourse-managing functions. All four types of demonstratives can occur on their own in their uninflected form, or in combination with other inflectional, e.g. case, markers (Epps 2008: 291). The four types of demonstratives are shown in Table 2 in their uninflected, pronominal and adnominal forms.[3]

**Tab. 2:** The four demonstratives in Hup

|             | uninflected | pronominal | adnominal |  |
| ----------- | ----------- | ---------- | --------- | --- |
| proximal    | nu-/ni-     | núp        | núp=g'æt  | 'this leaf' (relatively close by) |
| distal      | n'i-        | n'íp       | n'íp=g'æt | 'that leaf' (relatively further away) |
| alternative | cã-         | cãp        | cãp=g'æt  | 'another, a different leaf' |
| intangible  | yu-/yi-     | yúp        | yúp=g'æt  | 'that leaf' (out of sight / not present) |

The proximal and distal demonstratives are the main markers of spatial deixis, which directs the hearer's attention to entities that are physically present in the discourse situation. Such deictic uses of demonstratives are prototypically accompanied by a pointing gesture towards the entity referred to (Diessel 1999: 94).[4] The proximal demonstrative *nu-* points to a referent near or within the range of the speaker and is commonly used together with a pointing gesture. An example of the proximal demonstrative is shown in (7), which is taken from a conversation about a violent and long fight with many deaths in the village of Santa Atanasio. When recounting what happened during this fight, the speaker makes use of the proximal demonstrative, together with a pointing gesture to the torso.

---

**3** The proximal and the intangible demonstrative are realized as *ni-* and *yi-* in certain phonological environments (Epps 2008: 298).

**4** Diessel (1999) discusses this function as exophoric use (as opposed to other endophoric uses of demonstratives), and Himmelmann (1996) as immediate situation use.

(7)  **Nɨ**-n'ɨ̆h-ɨ́t=ʔʉ̆y=d'əh=mah naʔ-yíʔ-íh.
     **this**-NMZ-OBL=who=PL=REP lose.consciousness-TEL-DECL
     'Those shot here [gestures to torso] died.'
     (Epps 2004: 11)

Besides expressing spatial deixis, the proximal demonstrative can also be used to express temporal proximity, anaphoric reference and discourse deixis. An example of the latter use is shown in (8), where *núp* 'this' refers to the idea expressed in the immediately preceding clause.

(8)  g'ǽg=tǽh ʔín-ăn  y'æt-yíʔ-ay-áh,     j'ŭg   cóʔ **núp** ʔɨn
     bone=son 1PL-OBJ leave-TEL-INCH-DECL forest LOC **this** 1PL
     ni-nɨh-tég-éh
     be-be.like-FUT/PURP-DECL
     'Bone-Son left us in the forest (area); this is the way we are supposed to live.'
     (Epps 2008: 295)

The distal demonstrative *n'ɨ-* is typically used for spatial deictic referents that appear further away from the speaker; often, the referent remains in the visible area (Epps 2008: 296). An example is given in (9), showing *n'ɨ́t* 'over there' in its locative adverbial use.

(9)  **n'ɨ́t**   tɨh g'əç-ní-h        **n'ɨ́t**! ...
     **there** 3SG bite-INFR2-DECL **there** ...
     'Over there it (snake) bit him, over there! ...'
     (Epps 2008: 297)

Similarly to the temporal functions of the proximal demonstrative, the distal demonstrative can also be used to encode a temporal meaning, but in contrast to its proximal counterpart it is used to refer to a past event. This is shown in (10).

(10)   maca-ní-h           ... **n'ɨ́**-wag-an
       be.born-INFR2-DECL ... **that**-day-DIR
       'I was born ... in earlier days.' (doesn't know the year)
       (Epps 2008: 297)

The alternative demonstrative expresses, as the label indicates, alterity. An example is given in (11), where we see the demonstrative in both an adverbial and an adnominal context.

(11)  n'íp pót?ah=có?-óy     nǐh ?ɨd  **cãp**=yí?=b'ay-áh,      **cấp**
      that upriver=LOC-DYNM POSS speech **other**=TEL=AGAIN=DECL **other**
      ?ɨd=yɨ?
      speech=TEL
      'Those upriver people's language is different, it's a different language.'
      (Epps 2008: 304)

Before we turn to the intangible demonstrative in Section 3, a few notes regarding the morphosyntactic properties of demonstratives in Hup are in order. As could be seen from the examples in this section, Hup demonstratives can occur in adverbial (9), pronominal (7) and adnominal (10) contexts. Hup demonstratives also inflect for number and case when used pronominally. With animate referents, example (12) shows that demonstratives take the same plural marker *=d'ɔh*, otherwise used for animate plural nouns.

(12)  hɨ́   j'ek-yɔhɔy-yí?-íy,     yɨ-**d'ǒh**-ə́h!
      only steal-search-TEL-DYNM that.ITG-**PL**-DECL
      'They're just looking (for something) to steal, those ones!'
      (Epps 2008: 199)

(13)  ?ín-ɨp   yɨ́-**nǐh**=n'ǎn        hipãh-níh yǽh   tí
      1PL-DEP that.ITG-**NMZ**=OBJ.PL know-NEG FRUST EMPH.DEP
      'We (humans) don't know about these things.'
      (Epps 2008: 695)

As mentioned in Section 2.2, inanimate nouns are not marked for plural. With demonstratives, however, plurality of inanimate referents can be marked by using the nominalizer *-n'ɨh*. This is shown in (13).

# 3 The intangible demonstrative *yu-* and its uses

The intangible demonstrative *yu-* is distinct from the other, especially spatial deictic, demonstratives for three main reasons. As Epps (2008: 298) notes, (i) it is rarely accompanied by a deictic gesture of pointing, (ii) it is commonly used as a reference-tracking and discourse-managing device, and (iii) it has extended its use to function as a third-person plural pronoun. She further explains that "[s]emantically, the Intangible gram is the most flexible of all the demonstratives; in general, it points to a referent that is physically absent, out of sight, or in some other way outside the immediate frame of reference (hence the label 'Intangible')" (Epps 2008: 298). In this section, we present and systematize these various functions of the intangible demonstrative *yu-* and those

of related constructions that *yu-* is an integral part of. Whenever possible, we provide the audio clips of the examples presented in this section.[5]

## 3.1 Anaphoric use

One of the common functions of the intangible demonstrative in Hup is to express anaphoric reference. In such uses, the demonstrative is co-referential with a previously mentioned (pro)nominal expression, which helps to track referents through discourse (Diessel 1999: 95). The intangible demonstrative in Hup can mark such an anaphoric relation together with a lexical noun or on its own as a pronoun.

Adnominal anaphoric uses of the intangible demonstrative seem to occur in cases in which the antecedent is not found in the immediately preceding discourse segment, but somewhat further away. This means that the referent is typically not in the current center of attention, and the use of the intangible demonstrative helps to guide the addressee's attention back to an afore-mentioned referent. This is very much in line with the types of contexts and conditions in which anaphoric demonstratives are used as opposed to, e.g., zero anaphora, pronouns or lexical nouns, the latter of which may also occur with a definite article (cf. Ariel 1988, Gundel et al. 1993, Himmelmann 1996: 226-229, Diessel 1999: 96).

One example of the intangible demonstrative marking the nominal expression it occurs with as anaphoric is shown in (14). Here, *baktĭb'* 'spirit' is the main protagonist of the preceding discourse segment (14a) and therefore activated. The last lexical mention, however, occurs 4 clauses before (14b), and we also find a number of intervening referents between its last lexical mention and its mention in (14b).

(14)   a.   'So, it's said, having said "Let's go fish for traira together!" he (the spirit relative) took his affinal relative along, (took) that man, the spirit (did), (took) his affinal relative. It was out there in a forest clearing, in a forest clearing, it's said, he fished for traira. He (the spirit) searched out rats (for bait) with his hands,

       b.   căʔ-át              hãʔ-ʔĕ-h,               **yúp       baktĭb'-íh**.
            root.clump-OBL   search.in-PERF-DECL   **that.ITG  spirit-DECL**
            'searched (them) out in clumps of roots, (did) that spirit.'
            (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 2)[6]

---

Probably more common in narratives, however, is the use of the intangible demonstrative as an anaphoric pronoun with no accompanying lexical noun. So much so that Epps (2008: 285) describes the pronominal singular and plural forms of the intangible demonstrative as "common variants of the basic third person pronouns". She further notes that these pronouns commonly occur as post-verbal subjects in clause-final position, as is shown in (15).

(15)  "Hɜ̌ʔ, key-ʔay-kɛ̌m,  ʔǎn       cicid-icáp=hõ,     (0.6) **yɨ-d'ɜ̌h-óh**"
      yes   see-VENT-IMP2 1SG.OBJ itch-INTS1-NONVIS      **that.ITG-PL-DECL**
      'All right, come look, they're (the lice) making me itch a lot.'
      (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 3)[7]

Similarly to (14b), the intangible demonstrative in (15) is also postposed like an afterthought. It is preceded by a silent pause of about 0.6 seconds, which sets it apart prosodically from the rest of the clause.[8] This position is, however, not the only context for anaphoric pronominal occurrences of the intangible demonstrative, as can be seen in (16).

(16)  ...yúp    pó    hæhó **yúp=ʔã̌y**  ni-ní-h,       nóyhaʔ, yúp
      ...that.ITG thicket middle **that.ITG=F** be-INFR2-DECL INTERJ  that.ITG
      pó       hæhó-an.
      thicket middle-DIR
      '... there in the middle of the thicket was the woman, say, there in the middle
      of the thicket.'
      (Epps & Pires 2002: 3)[9]

In this example, the intangible demonstrative is additionally marked for feminine gender, as it refers to a woman.[10] The antecedent of the referent expressed by *yúp=ʔã̌y* in (16) was last mentioned 8 clauses earlier. A longer distance between the antecedent and the current mention of a referent paired with intervening referents is a typical context for demonstratives. As Diessel (1999: 99) states: "What all anaphoric demonstratives have in common is that they do not just continue the focus of attention; rather, they indicate that the antecedent is not the referent that the hearer would expect in this context (i.e. the most topical NP)."

---

**7** Audio of (15) at https://osf.io/6n39c.
**8** Whenever applicable and relevant, we include pause durations in brackets in the first line of the examples.
**9** Audio of (16) at https://osf.io/qxhac.
**10** The use of the gender marker for human referents is not obligatory (Epps 2008: 285).

## 3.2 Discourse deictic uses

Another common function of demonstratives is to signal discourse deixis. In this case, the demonstrative points to an adjacent discourse segment, referring back to an event that was previously established in the discourse. Discourse deixis thus anchors the current proposition to a specific preceding discourse segment, ensuring coherence and continuity in communication (cf. Diessel 1999: 100-105, Himmelmann 1996: 224-226).

Examples (17) and (18) show how the intangible demonstrative is used to mark discourse deixis in a conversation. The pronominal forms of the demonstrative occur clause-initially to refer back to the entire proposition of the preceding utterance. In both examples, speaker P uses the intangible demonstrative to add new information in relation to the proposition of the preceding utterance by speaker J.

(17)   J:   That woman was covered with wounds!
       P:   **Yúp**       tɨh=tǽh=dʼəh      kʼít-ɨp  mǽy=yɨʔ=mah;     ...
            **that.ITG** 3SG=offspring=PL cut-DEP payment=TEL=REP ...
            "That was her (Bʼɔŋʼs) sons' revenge, it's said; ...'
            (Epps 2004: 10)

(18)   J:   When they eat snake, it's said, they lose all self-control.
       P:   **Yɨ̃**       nɔ́-ɔ̃́y=mah     jʼám      yɨ-dʼə̌h-ɔ́h,      **yɨ̃**
            **that.ITG** say-DYNM=REP DST.CNTR that.ITG-PL-DECL **that.ITG**
            nɔ́-ɔ̃́y     jʼám      ʔãh=hūtǽh     nʼǔh-ǔ́h.
            say-DYNM DST.CNTR 1SG=nephew CNTR-DECL
            'That's what they say, that's what my nephew told.'
            (Epps 2004: 4)

The intangible demonstrative in Hup is also commonly found in sequences of events in narratives, where it marks the relation between the current and a previous event.[11] One example of this use is given in (19b). Here, *yúp* is used to establish a relation between the event of arriving and the sequence of events described in the previous discourse segment in (19a). Note that the predicate of the first clause in (19b) includes the use of the sequential marker *yóʔ*, which additionally signals a temporal chain of

---

[11] Its function in such contexts is similar to what has been discussed as frame setting in the literature on information structure (cf. Chafe 1976, Jacobs 2001, Krifka 2007, Ozerov 2018). Frame-setters typically provide discourse-old information that is used to delimit the domain of the main proposition where new information is presented. Frame-setting constructions often correspond to left-dislocated expressions and equivalents of *as for* constructions.

events.[12] Syntactically, verbs marked by *-yóʔ* correspond to dependent clauses, which usually precede the main clause as in (19b). In this example, the *yúp*-marked dependent clause in (19b) summarizes the previous clause (19a), before the next event is introduced by the following main clause.

(19)    a.    'Thus having quickly pulled manioc, it's said, having gathered it into her basket, she went down to the river.'

       b.    D'ob-yóʔ=mah     **yúp**,     tɨh wɨdd'ob-key-yǽh-ǽh.
           go.to.river-SEQ=REP **that.ITG** 3SG arrive.go.to.river-see-FRUST-DECL
           'Having gone down to the river, it's said, she arrived down and looked around in vain.'

       c.    'There was no one there, it's said; she looked around as she went down, there was no one there. "Where could he have gone?! He just now went down here!"'
           (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 4)[13]

Example (20) shows another context in which *yúp* occurs together with a predicate that resumes the previous clause to signal their connection and temporal succession. In (20b) and (20c), the speaker uses *yúp* repeatedly in this sequence describing how the protagonist cooks fish in order to share the food with her relatives.[14]

(20)    a.    "Come cook (these fish), I'll offer food to (i.e., eat with) my affinal relatives!" (he) said, it's said, her husband. So it's said, she cooked (them),

       b.    cɨw-yóʔ=mah **yúp**,
           cook-SEQ=REP **that.ITG**
           'having cooked them,'

       c.    cɨw-hup-cĩp=mah     **yúp**,
           cook-REFL-COMPL=REP **that.ITG**
           'it's said, when she finished cooking them,'

       d.    '"come offer food to your affinal relatives," she said, it's said.'
           (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 5)[15]

---

**12** The use of the reportative marker *=mah* is not specific to discourse deixis but the default marker of reported, second-hand information in narratives like the one that example (19) is taken from (cf. Epps 2008: 654-655).

**13** Audio of (19b) at https://osf.io/3tmnr.

**14** The syntactic and semantic repetition in (20b) and (20c) fits well into what we know about the role of repetitions in narratives. For instance, already Tannen (1982: 7) notes that repetitions of lexical material as well as of syntactic constructions are particularly common in spoken narratives to "establish a mesmerizing rhythm which sweeps the hearer along."

**15** Audio of (20b) and (20c) at https://osf.io/r3egw.

The intangible demonstrative can also occur clause-initially when referring back to the preceding event in a sequence of events. This is shown in examples (21) and (22).

(21)  a.  'After having spent a long time coming up (to reach her field), she lit a fire, she would sweep the ground (and burn the weeds), so she lit a fire.'

 b.  **Yúp**   tíh=yɨʔ hæp-hup-cɨ́p=mah,   ʔayŭp=ʔĩh tíh-ăn
    **that.ɪᴛɢ** 3ꜱɢ-ᴛᴇʟ sweep-ʀᴇꜰʟ-ᴄᴏᴍᴘʟ=ʀᴇᴘ one=ᴍ    3ꜱɢ-ᴏʙᴊ
    wɨdnǽn-ay-áh.
    arrive.come-ɪɴᴄʜ-ᴅᴇᴄʟ
    'Then when she had finished sweeping up, it's said, a man arrived to her.'

 c.  He looked like her husband, it's said; however, it was Curupira, apparently.
    (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 2)[16]

(22)  a.  Having washed her manioc, it's said, she went up from the river, to her house. She arrived and set down her manioc.

 b.  **Yúp**   tɨh wɨdcɔp-húyʔah       díyɨʔ=mah,
    **that.ɪᴛɢ** 3ꜱɢ arrive.go.from.river-before ᴠᴅɪᴍ=ʀᴇᴘ
    tɨh=tǽhʔíp    hɔ̃̌p mæh-ʔay-ʔeʔ-ní-p,
    3ꜱɢ=child.father fish kill-ᴠᴇɴᴛ-ᴘᴇʀꜰ-ɪɴꜰʀ2-ᴅᴇᴘ
    wɨdb'áy-ay-áh.
    arrive.return-ɪɴᴄʜ-ᴅᴇᴄʟ
    'Then shortly after she had arrived, her husband, who had gone to kill fish, returned.'

 c.  He had killed a lot of fish.
    (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 4-5)[17]

We saw in examples (19) to (22) that event sequences in narratives include repetitions. Information from the previous clause is repeated as given information and combined with new information in the current clause. According to Epps (cf. 2008: 861), this is a fairly common strategy in Hup narratives. In fact, repeating discourse-old information to introduce new information in this way is a cross-linguistically common strategy to organize discourse. The Hup patterns are reminiscent of what has been discussed as tail-head linkage or as bridging constructions more recently in the typological literature (cf. de Vries 2005, Guérin 2018). Interestingly, in her analysis of discourse demonstratives in Vatlongos (Oceanic, Vanuatu), Ridge (2020: 86) notes that the demonstrative that has important reference tracking functions is often used in

---

**16** Audio of (21b) at https://osf.io/g39vx.
**17** Audio of (22b) at https://osf.io/dmzt6.

the first part of such bridging constructions, where old information is repeated. This is very similar to the use of *yúp* in (19) to (22).

Another noteworthy aspect of the use of the intangible demonstrative in the preceding examples is that it also appears to mark a topic shift, or at least to close the current discourse topic. The clauses in which *yúp* occurs conclude a dynamic sequence of events, marking the transition to a new discourse segment. The start of these new discourse segments are shown in (19c), (20d), (21c) and (22c), respectively. More research is needed to assess properly to what extent and under which circumstances *yúp* marks a topic shift, but this function is certainly not uncommon for demonstratives in general. Especially for anaphoric uses of demonstratives, it is established in the literature that such uses often mark topic shifts in that the demonstrative refers back to a referent who was not in the center of attention in the immediately preceding discourse segment (cf. Diessel 1999, 2006, Fuchs & Schumacher 2020, Himmelmann 1997), and demonstrative clause linkers have also been shown to develop into topic markers (Diessel & Breunesse 2020).

Himmelmann (1996) distinguishes a further, temporal, subtype of discourse deixis. In this case, the demonstrative is used to refer back "to a point in time in a sequence of narrated events, or, in expository and procedural texts, a sequence of arguments or acts" (Himmelmann 1996: 225). In Hup, this type of temporal discourse deixis is also expressed by constructions that include the intangible demonstrative. An example is shown in (23). Here, the use of the complex adverbial expression *yɨnɨh-mɨʔ=mah* indicates the the event referred to in the current proposition (23b) occurs simultaneously to the event described in the previous utterance (23a).[18]

(23)  a.   A woman, it's said, once went to her roça. She went across to the her roça on the other side of the river, it's said, she alone.

      b.   **Yɨnɨh-mɨʔ=mah**              tíh=tǽhʔíp=b'ay        hõp kɛ́k-əp
           **that.ɪᴛɢ.be.like-ᴜɴᴅᴇʀ=ʀᴇᴘ** 3sɢ=child.father=ᴀɢᴀɪɴ fish pull-ᴅᴇᴘ
           hám-ɛ́́h.
           go-ᴅᴇᴄʟ
           'At the same time her husband went fishing.'
           (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 2)[19]

Another example of the intangible demonstrative used to express temporal discourse deixis is given in (24). In this example, *yɨnɨh-yóʔ* signals temporal sequence between the events expressed in (24a) and (24b).

---

**18** A *roça*, mentioned in example (23a), is a "slash-and-burn field; primarily for manioc but also bananas, hot peppers, etc" (Epps 2008: 936).
**19** Audio of (23b) at https://osf.io/yh7a2.

(24)  a.  tinɨ̌h    pát  có?-óy    ?in  hæy'-hũ?-yi?-tég=ə?,
          3PL.POSS hair LOC-DYNM 1PL cut-follow-TEL-FUT=TAG2
          'We'll cut off her hair;'

     b.  **yɨnih-yó?**              ?in  hi-cɨ?-wob-té-h!
         **that.ITG.be.like-SEQ** 1PL FACT-stick-rest.on-FUT.DECL
         'then we'll stick her hair onto our heads'
         (Epps 2008: 589)

Note that the form of the intangible demonstrative is very similar in (23) and (24), being based on its manner variant *yɨnih*. To express simultaneity as in (23), it is combined with the spatial expression *-mǐ?* 'under', while it occurs with the sequential marker *-yó?* to express temporal succession.

## 3.3 Other clause-linking uses

Epps (2008: 301) mentions a few additional, conventionalized expressions based on the intangible demonstrative that mark other clause-linking functions related to discourse deixis. One of these is the oblique form of the intangible demonstrative, *yɨ́t* 'thus, with that', which is often used to express a sequential or also causal relation between propositions. Two examples are shown in (25b) and (25c). In (25c), we also see that *yɨ́t* can combine with the reportative marker *=mah* in narratives.

(25)  a.  'So, it's said, a child was crying (at night). Because she cried, it's said, her father put her outside.

     b.  **Yɨ́t** tɨh d'o?-way-g'et-yɨ́?-ɨ́t=mah      yɔ̌y              canǎ
         **thus** 3SG take-go.out-stand-TEL-OBL=REP pineapple.type pineapple
         pɔ́    baktɨ̌b'  d'o?-ham-yɨ́?-íh.
         thicket spirit  take-go-TEL-DECL
         'Then when he put her outside, it's said, a yɔy pineapple-thicket spirit took (her) off.'

     c.  **Yɨ́t=mah** hɨd ?ũh-toh-hám-ɑ́h,      ...
         **thus=REP** 3PL INTRC-steal-go-DECL
         'With that, it's said, they (the other spirits) went chasing after each other to steal (the girl), ...'
         (Epps & Pires 2002: 1)[20]

The oblique form of the intangible demonstrative can also combine with the telic marker *yɨ́t-yi?* 'like that, exactly' (Epps 2008: 301). An example is shown in (26), where

---

**20**  Audio of (25b) at https://osf.io/n2vh3; audio of (25c) at https://osf.io/4exkm.

the expression is used by speaker J to refer back to the previous proposition uttered by speaker P. Speaker J confirms the proposition and thereby expresses agreement with P.

(26)  P:  'My little nephew, that Fernando, the father of that girl they apparently cut there in Manaus.'

  J:  **Yɨ́t-yiʔ.** nɨ-n'ɨ̌h-ɨ̃́t    pɨ́d=mah  hɨd kɨt-j'ap-d'əh-hám-ɨ̃́h,   …
  **thus-TEL** this-NMZ-OBL DISTR=REP 3PL cut-divide-send-go-DECL …
  'That's right. They chopped off right here, …'
  (Epps 2004: 4)

Another common clause-linking construction based on the intangible demonstrative is shown in (27). Here, the manner variant *yinɨh* 'be.like that.ITG' of the demonstrative combines with the dynamic suffix *-iy*. According to Epps (2008: 301), the resulting expression *yinɨh-ɨy* 'thus and so' often occurs in the reduced form *yinɨy*. The speaker uses *yínɨ́y=mah* in (27b) to refer back to the proposition of the final clause in (27a).

(27)  a.  The women too are always holding machetes, they say, always holding hoes. They always fight with their husbands!

  b.  **Yínɨ́y=mah**           yúp  tã́ʔɨ́y=n'an=hin    hɨd
  **that.ITG.be.like.DYNM=REP** that.ITG woman=PL.OBJ=also 3PL
  mæh-yiʔ-bɨ́-h.
  beat-TEL-HAB-DECL
  'That's why they always hit/kill the women too.'
  (Epps 2004: 13)

Manner demonstratives such as *yinɨh* and its variants in Hup are commonly found across languages to develop into markers of discourse deixis and clausal connectives (cf. Guérin 2015, König 2015). As we will see in 3.5, the manner demonstrative *yinɨh* is also the basis of a more complex construction that is used to mark discourse relations.

## 3.4 The *yúp=mah yúp* construction

We also find the intangible demonstrative *yu-* as part of the more complex construction *yúp=mah yúp*, which is used to establish a link between different clauses.[21] The construction is common in narratives, and its function seems to be to connect a previous sequence of events with the following discourse event(s). More so than the other

---

**21** Epps (2008: 301) mentions *yúp=mah yúp* as a "semi-formulaic device" but does not discuss its uses further. We refer to *yúp=mah yúp* as a construction here, because it forms one prosodic unit and its use appears conventionalized in the corpus data.

expressions based on the intangible demonstrative presented in Section 3.3, *yúp=mah yúp* concludes and summarizes the previous sequence of events.

An example is given in (28). Here, the speaker mentions several sounds that Curupira makes and types of birds that he imitates in (28a). The following utterance in (28b), which summarizes the previous statements, is introduced by *yúp=mah yúp*. In (28c), we see how the following utterances then turn to the beginning of the story about a woman who encounters Curupira. In (28b), *yúp=mah yúp* is uttered as a single intonation unit, with a short following pause of about 0.1 seconds.

(28)  a.  When he wants to eat people, he shrieks (to lure them near), it's said, he always shrieks just like a puppy, it's said, does Curupira; he shrieks like a jacamim bird, it's said. The inambu bird, it's said, is another that he imitates, does Curupira.

  b.  **Yúp=mah      yúp**     (0.1) j'ŭg-út     g'et-g'óʔ=d'əh
      **that.ITG=REP that.ITG**      forest-OBL stand-wander=PL
      wiʔ-hipãh-nó-ɔ́h.
      hear-know-say-DECL
      Thus, it's said, those who go wandering in the forest tell about how they hear and recognize him.

  c.  'He imitates all the animals, it's said, he imitates (them); so say those who have heard him. A woman, it's said, once went to her roça …'
      (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 1)[22]

The *yúp=mah yúp* construction has a similar function in (29). In this case, its use in (29b) also appears to mark the transition to a new discourse segment from (29a), describing the bathing of the child, to the actions of the man in (29b). In (29b), *yúp=mah yúp* is followed by a longer pause of 0.5 seconds.

(29)  a.  So, it's said, there was a man standing there listening, one who was out shooting inambu. So, it's said, she bathed (the child), in the lake. She bathed him, it's said, and took him back up to the house.

  b.  **Yúp=mah      yúp**     (0.5) tíh=ʔíp-ăn      ʔid-wɨdyé-éh.
      that-ITG=REP that-ITG      3sg=father-OBL speak-arrive.enter-DECL
      So, it's said, (the man) went back and told her father.
      (Epps & Pires 2002: 2)[23]

Evidence for the fact that *yúp=mah yúp* is a formulaic discourse marker that can be used as a filler in hesitation contexts comes from (30). The utterance in (30a), which starts

---

22  Audio of (28b) at https://osf.io/b3wy7.
23  Audio of (29b) at https://osf.io/fguq2.

with *yúp=mah yúp*, is the first utterance of a story, i.e. there is no preceding context that the construction could establish a link to. Note that the *yúp=mah yúp* construction is also followed by a longer pause in this example.

(30)   a.   **Yúp=mah   yúp**   (0.6) baktĭb'=ʔá̌y-ǎn=mah ʔayŭp=ʔĩh
            that.ITG=REP that.ITG        spirit=F-OBJ=REP       one=M
            yɔh-ní-í̃y.
            affine-be-DYNM
            So, it's said, there was a man who had taken a spirit woman as a wife.
       b.   That man, the one who was thus affinally related, it's said, he went visit-
            ing his affinal relatives (spirits).
            (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 1)[24]

Furthermore, we find several instances in narratives where the *yúp=mah yúp* construc-
tion precedes direct speech. Two examples are given in (31) and (32). Note that in both
cases, the speech is also marked as such by the following speech verb. Because of that,
and because *yúp=mah yúp* does not occur systematically with direct speech, it should
certainly not be analyzed as a quotative marker *per se*. Still, it is interesting to note
that the use of *yúp=mah yúp* in (31) and (32) resembles constructions from other lan-
guages in which demonstratives have developed into quotative markers (cf. Diessel &
Breunesse 2020: 314-317).

(31)   a.   'Having sat down and waited, it's said, that one was lying about looking
            (for lice); he sucked her, he sucked out her brain, it's said.'
       b.   **Yúp=mah      yúp**,   (1.3) "pá̌   yɨ-d'ɂ̌h-ɂ́h.       Kayak tɔ́ʔ
            **that.ITG=REP that.ITG**       NEG:EX that.ITG-PL-DECL manioc tuber
            g'ɔʔ-ʔáy-áy!"               nɔ́-ɔ́y=mah   yúp    dohʔá̌y-á́h.
            pull.manioc-VENT-INCH.IMP say-DYNM=REP that.ITG Curupira-DECL
            'So with that, "There aren't any (lice). Go pull manioc!" said that Cu-
            rupira.'
            (Epps & Monteiro 2001: 3)[25]

(32)   a.   'Having carried them (*traira* fish) quickly off, at the stream he said, "let's
            gut them!"'
       b.   **Yúp=mah      yúp**   (0.15) "pĕc kój!"        nɔ-yóʔ=mah
            **that.ITG=REP that.ITG**       scale scrape.off.IMP say-SEQ=REP
            tíh-íh,
            3SG=DECL
            'So then, it's said, "scrape off the scales!" he (the spirit) said;'

---

**24**  Audio of (30a) at https://osf.io/a5utm.
**25**  Audio of (31b) at https://osf.io/q5agy.

    c.    "I don't know how!" the man said in his turn. "We don't know anything about those things!'"
        (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 5)[26]

The last aspect of *yúp=mah yúp* to be mentioned is its internal form and potential diachronic origin. While we cannot be certain about the latter, there are several constructions and uses of the intangible demonstrative that are likely to have contributed to the development of *yúp=mah yúp* as a formulaic construction. We have seen in Section 3.2 that *yúp* occurs as a marker of discourse deixis clause-finally in bridging contexts following a dependent clause as in (19) and (20), or in clause-initial position as in (21) and (22). We also find contexts in which both *yúp*-marking strategies are combined, as in (33). Similarly to the uses of *yúp* in Section 3.2, the *yúp*-marked clause in (33b) summarizes the discourse segment in (33a) and marks the transition to the following event in (33c) and (33d). In addition to the clause-initial *yúp*, we see that *yúp* is also used clause-finally in a dependent clause in (33b) that forms a bridging construction with the following clause in (33c). It is possible that *yúp=mah yúp* developed from this type of construction through the omission of the predicate.

(33)    a.    Having had a child, it's said, she took him down to the river to bathe him.
        b.    **Yúp**      d'oʔ-d'ób-op=mah      **yúp**,
                that.ITG take-go.to.river-DEP=REP **that.ITG**
                'As she was taking him down to the river, it's said,'
        c.    tɨnɨ̌h     mǒy-ő̃t     kək-g'ãʔ-d'oʔ-kədwáy-ay-áh;
                3SG.POSS house-OBL pull-be.suspended-take-pass.go.out-INCH-DECL
                'she swung him against the house (rafter) as she went quickly out (bumping him accidentally),'
        d.    'and the child cried.'
                (Epps & Pires 2002: 1-2)[27]

Moreover, we also find *yúp* together with the reportative marker in a clause-initial position. Two examples are shown in (34b) and (34d). Note that in (34d), the dependent clause features another instance of *yúp* at the end, which makes it even more similar to the *yúp=mah yúp* construction.

(34)    a.    "'The little ones always arrive first,'" (the spirit) said, it's said.'

---

26  Audio of (32b) at https://osf.io/ze9xr.
27  Audio of (33b) and (33c) at https://osf.io/bvk37.

b.  **Yúp=mah**    tɨh kə́k-ə́h,    tɨh
   **that.ITG=REP** 3SG pull-DECL 3SG
   b'uy-yæt-d'əh-pɨ́d-íh,
   throw-lie.on.ground-send-DISTR-DECL
   'So he fished; he kept pulling (them) out and throwing them on the
   ground,'

c.  'he kept pulling out the little ones.'

d.  **Yúp=mah**    tɨh=nuhɨ̌y tɨh tə́h-əp=mah  **yúp**,    kúnunununu
   **that.ITG=REP** 3SG=neck  3SG break-DEP=REP **that.ITG** IDEO
   tɨh  nɔ-pɨ́d-íh.
   3SG say-DISTR-DECL
   'Then, it's said, he broke their necks, *kúnunununu* was the sound it made.'
   (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 2)[28]

Another potential explanation of the repeated use of the intangible demonstrative in
the *yúp=mah yúp* construction comes from evidence of processing in articulation (planning). As we have shown in the preceding examples, from a synchronic perspective,
*yúp=mah* and following *yúp* arguably form one prosodic unit, since speakers systematically pause after *yúp* but not before.[29] It is unclear, however, what specific function the final *yúp* has in this construction. It does not seem to be referential;[30] its use
rather appears to have arisen from its discourse-deictic function that was shown in
examples (19) to (22). Such uses of the form *yúp* of the intangible demonstrative are
very frequent, and we can assume that it has a lower activation level compared to
new, lexical material (cf. Levelt 1989, Levelt et al. 1999). Himmelmann (2014) shows
for various languages that this often leads to high-frequency function words being uttered early, followed by a pause, after which speakers articulate the remaining lexical
material. He shows how this systematically breaks up syntactic units, e.g. a preposed
determiner (followed by a pause) and the head noun of the NP. Besides the processing account, Himmelmann (2014) argues that the early production of the function
words and the resulting pause serve a communicative purpose. It allows the speaker
to hold the floor, signaling the intent to continue speaking. While the situation of the

---

**28** Audio of (34b) at https://osf.io/dvjbt; audio of (34d) at https://osf.io/fr8dj.

**29** We thank Patience Epps for the suggestion to consider the occurrence of pauses in the spoken
signal.

**30** Epps (2008: 301) states the following: "As a semi-formulaic device, its reference is not always entirely clear, but [...] its [the demonstrative's] first instance seems to be adverbial ('thus, with that'),
while its second instance is a proleptic pronoun referring to the subject of the clause (which is often
not otherwise stated)." However, Patience Epps (p.c., 2025) also notes that the second use of *yúp* is not
necessarily referential but "it could easily have the same 'thus/this way' sort of adverbial interpretation that we see in other instances of this kind of construction."

*yúp=mah yúp* construction is somewhat different from the types of constructions discussed by Himmelmann (2014), the construction-final *yúp* could be the result of the speakers' intention to hold the floor and to avoid complete silence while preparing the articulation of the following clause, which usually contains new information and has an arguably higher processing load. Further evidence to support the hypothesis that *yúp* has a low activation load and can be articulated easily comes from its use as a repair strategy with hesitations.[31] As can be seen in (35), *yúp* is used as a placeholder for *baktǐb'* 'spirit'.

(35)   Yúp        tɨh=yǒh=d'əh  máh-an  wat-hám-ãp=mah      **yúp**,      hǎy
       that.ITG   3SG=affine=PL  near-DIR  go.visiting-go-DEP=REP  **that.ITG**  um
       máh  **yúw-úh**,          baktǐb'  máh-an   wɨd-hám-ǎh.
       near  **that.ITG-DECL**  spirit    near-DIR  arrive-go-DECL
       'He went visiting to where his affinal relatives lived; he arrived to where the,'
       um, where the spirits were.'
       (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 1)[32]

Thus, the systematic combination of *yúp=mah* and *yúp* for processing and discourse-managing reasons could have contributed to the development into *yúp-=mah yúp* as a single construction. As we will show in the following section, Hup has another, similar construction that could have reinforced the construction-final *yúp*.

## 3.5  The *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah (yúp)* construction

In narratives, the intangible demonstrative can also occur in another complex construction that links clauses, namely *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah (yúp)* 'that.ITG.be.like-SEQ=REP (that.ITG)'. According to Epps (2008: 862), the construction *yɨnɨh-yóʔ* 'that.ITG.be.like-SEQ' is used to signal the start of a new event in narratives. Interestingly, almost all instances that we find in the corpus data also include the reportative marker and the repeated demonstrative *yúp* 'that.ITG'. We take *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* to form a single, complex construction, as it is uttered within a single prosodic unit, with a silent pause following *yúp* in most cases.

---

**31**  We did not find other examples for this use of the intangible demonstrative in the corpus. However, it well established in the literature that anaphoric and other discourse-deictic demonstratives are often used as fillers and involved in this type of repair constructions related to their recognitional functions (cf. Becker 2021, Himmelmann 1996). To what extent this is a more systematic function of *yúp* remains to be examined in future research.
**32**  Audio of (35) at https://osf.io/b5sqg.

Example (36) shows *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* being used to summarize the previous discourse segment and to mark the transition to the next one. Note that the construction in (36b) is followed by a pause. Also in (37), *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* concludes the proposition of the previous utterance and introduces the current one, which involves a shift from the description of jaguars arriving to the actions of the spirit. Again, we find a pause between *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* and the second part of the utterance.

(36)  a.  'So, it's said, (the man) went back and told her father. "Your daughter is bathing a child, the girl you beat and drove away," (he) said to him as he entered.

   b.  **Yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah            yúp**     (1.0) ʔecáp     cóʔ hɨd
       **that.ITG.be.like-SEQ=REP that.ITG**       tomorrow LOC 3PL
       nǽn-ay-áh,        híd-ăn  mǽh=d'ə-óh.
       come-INCH-DECL 3PL-OBJ kill=PL-DECL
       'So with that, it's said, the following day they went out, in order to kill them.'
       (Epps & Pires 2002: 2)[33]

(37)  a.  And in the middle of the night the big ones began to arrive; for us (humans) they were big jaguars.

   b.  **Yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah            yúp**,     (1.3) tɨh  mǽh-hũʔ-yíʔ-íh,
       that.ITG.be.like-SEQ=REP that.ITG       3SG kill-finish-TEL-DECL
       'So after that, it's said, he (the spirit) finished killing them all,'

   c.  (while) that person was trembling right up against his (the spirit's) back, against his affine's back, afraid of the jaguars.
       (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 2-3)[34]

In other examples, the main function of *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* seems to be to summarize the previous sequence of events rather than marking the beginning of a new discourse segment. In other words, it signals the closing of a discourse topic. This is shown in (38). Here, the previous utterances given in (38a) describe how the spirit strings up the *traira* fish, and the utterance in (38b), introduced by *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp*, summarizes and concludes the discourse segment that describes how the fish are strung up. It is only in the following utterance in (38c), where the discourse moves from the description of stringing up the *traira* fish to a conversation between the spirit and the man.

---

[33] Audio of (36b) at https://osf.io/hdxpv.

[34] Audio of (37b) at https://osf.io/2exzd.

(38)  a.   "This is how I always do it, when I string traira," (the spirit) said, it's said,
           and he strung them all up. (He) strung (one) up by the chin, strung (the
           next) up by the chin (and so on), thus he did, it's said.'
      b.   **Yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah**            **yúp**    (0.96) tɨh=pǒg=n'ăn   tɨh
           **that.ɪᴛɢ.be-like-ꜱᴇǫ=ʀᴇᴘ that.ɪᴛɢ**        3ꜱɢ=big=ᴘʟ.ᴏʙᴊ 3ꜱɢ
           cuh-d'oʔ-yí-b'ay-áh.
           string-take-ᴛᴇʟ-ᴀɢᴀɪɴ-ᴅᴇᴄʟ
           'Having done this, it's said, he then strung up the big ones.'
      c.   "'Go on, carry them," (the spirit) said. Then, it's said, he (the man) was
           standing around again, not knowing how to carry (them).'
           (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 4)[35]

Similarly, the first instance of *yɨnɨh-yóʔ* in (39b) summarizes the sequence of events
described in (39a). This is the only instance of the short alternative in the corpus,
without the reportative marker and without the repeated demonstrative. There is no
pause after *yɨnɨh-yóʔ*, but the last syllable *yóʔ* is substantially lengthened, which could
also indicate a prosodic break between *yɨnɨh-yóʔ* and the remainder of the utterance
in (39b).

(39)  a.   Having opened the bellies and thrown out the innards, he um, he scraped
           off the scales.
      b.   Tɨh koj-yóʔ,   **yɨnɨh-yóʔ**           tɨh tok  coʔ-hũʔ-yóʔ,
           3ꜱɢ scrape-ꜱᴇǫ **that.ɪᴛɢ.be.like-ꜱᴇǫ** 3ꜱɢ belly gut-finish-ꜱᴇǫ
           '(The spirit's) having scraped off the scales, and after that having finished
           gutting them,'
      c.   'they went off carrying (the fish) dangling from their hands,'
      d.   té  **yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah**           **yúp**       tɨh
           until **that.ɪᴛɢ.be.like-ꜱᴇǫ=ʀᴇᴘ that.ɪᴛɢ** 3ꜱɢ
           wɨdye-yíʔ-ay-áh.
           arrive.enter-ᴛᴇʟ-ɪɴᴄʜ-ᴅᴇᴄʟ
           'until after that, it's said, he (they) arrived home.'
           (Epps & Salustiano 2001: 5)[36]

The use of *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* in (39d) serves to sum up and conclude the previous
propositions, and it links the current proposition about arriving home to the preced-
ing ones. The utterance in (39d) also corresponds to the end of the story.
    As for the development of the *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah yúp* construction, it is likely that it
interacted with the development of the *yúp=mah yúp* construction. The account based

---

**35**  Audio of (38b) at https://osf.io/xc7h5.
**36**  Audio of (39b) at https://osf.io/6r5v3; audio of (39d) at https://osf.io/kexnz.

on processing and articulation planning, and on early utterance for holding the floor that was presented for construction-final *yúp* in Section 3.4 may also account for the use of *yúp* in this construction.

## 3.6 Uses as a predicative demonstrative

According to Epps (2008), the intangible demonstrative *yu-* can also be used as a demonstrative identifier. This is shown in (40), where *yúw-úh*, the combination of the intangible demonstrative and the declarative marker, presents and identifies Mario.

(40)    madio=ʔĩh **yúw-úh**!
       Mario=M   **that.ITG-DECL**
       'That's Mario!'
       (Epps 2008: 302)

For such uses as in (40), Epps further notes:

> While this form is clearly a demonstrative, and not a true copula, the demonstrative identifier realization of *yu-* does appear to be taking on an identity that is distinct from that of its other functions. In particular, *yu-* often appears at the end of clauses that already have a verbal predicate and that may even have an explicit subject (to which *yu-* then refers back). In these cases, the demonstrative almost always occurs following a verb-final enclitic or particle (usually an evidential or contrast marker). (Epps 2008: 301)

We found three examples of *yúw-úh* as a demonstrative identifier in the corpus, shown in (41) to (43). Example (41) concludes a narrated story; the speaker clarifies that she has told everything. In this example, *yúw-úh* is does in fact combine with a verbal predicate as described by Epps in the quote above.[37]

(41)    Yaʔăp-ay    **yúw-úh**.
       all.gone-INCH **that.ITG-DECL**
       'That's all.'
       (Epps & Pires 2002: 3)

The other two examples feature nominal predicates (Epps p.c., 2025) but involve contrast. In (42), several spirits argue about who gets to steal a girl, and the statement in (42b) includes the marker *páh*, which Epps (2008) analyzes as a proximate contrast marker.[38]

---

37 Epps (p.c., 2025) clarified that *yaʔap* 'run out, be all gone' is in fact a verb.

38 Epps (2008: 600) writes: "The 'temporally proximate' contrast marker *páh* emphasizes the relevance of the contrast in relation to the time immediately surrounding the speech moment – the recent

(42)  a.  'With that, it's said, they (the other spirits) went chasing after each other
to steal (the girl), saying,

   b.  Nɨ̌=mah   páh       **yúw-úh**!
       1SG:POSS PRX.CNTR **that.ITG-DECL**
       "But she's mine!"'
       (Epps & Pires 2002: 1)[39]

Also the context of (43) involves contrast, as speaker J corrects the previous statement of speaker P when trying to remember who was involved in a certain fight. Here, we see the use of the so-called distant past contrast marker *j'ǎh*.[40]

(43)  P:  Tɨh=tǽh=d'əh=y'íʔ=mah!
          3SG=offspring=PL=TEL=REP
          'It was her sons, they say!'

     J:  Tɨh=hũtǽh=d'əh=mah j'ǎh      **yúw-úh**.
         3SG=nephew=PL=REP   DST.CNTR **that.ITG-DECL**
         'It was her nephews, they say.'
         (Epps 2004: 8)

Given that contrast is already encoded by the proximate and distant past contrast markers in (42) and (43), the demonstrative identifier *yúw-úh* does not necessarily express contrast as such. What could explain its use in contrastive contexts, however, is the fact that the core function of demonstratives is to draw the hearer's attention towards some entity or event (Burenhult 2003, Dawuda et al. 2009, Diessel 2006, Enfield 2003). In these types of contexts, the function of the demonstrative identifier could thus be to draw the hearer's attention to the entire proposition to highlight that it goes against the hearer's expectations in some way.

   Demonstrative identifiers constitute one type of a broader category of predicative demonstratives. Besides the uses of *yúw-úh* as a demonstrative identifier shown in the preceding paragraphs, certain uses of *yu-* resemble those of other types of predicative demonstratives.[41] Killian (2022) defines predicative demonstratives as follows:

---

past, the present, and the immediate future [...] The particle *páh* typically signals a contrast between entities and/or between events or states, within the proximate temporal context."

**39**  Audio of (42b) at https://osf.io/u7zst.

**40**  Epps (2008: 603) describes this marker as follows: "Whereas *páh* signals a temporally proximate contrast, the form *j'ám* (phonologically reduced to *j'ǎh* in the Tat Deh/Eastern dialect) indicates a distant past contrast. It is typically used in reference to a relatively distant past event, which is contrasted with the present."

**41**  We follow Diessel (1997) and Killian (2022) in using the label of predicative demonstrative, as it is broader and more suited to include other, similar functions besides identification. Diessel (1999) calls demonstratives with such functions demonstrative identifiers.

> The canonical construction for predicative demonstratives is a nominal or pronominal argument in combination with a unique demonstrative form, which together forms a sentence. They are used for presentation, identification, and localization; to a more limited extent, they can be also used for possession or nominal predication. (Killian 2022: 5)

Killian (2022) further distinguishes between four subtypes of predicative demonstratives, namely presentative, identification, localizing and copular demonstratives. Whether or not *yúw-úh*, i.e. the combination of the intangible demonstrative and the declarative marker, comply with Killian's criteria to be counted as a predicative demonstrative requires a more detailed analysis. The important point is that *yúw-úh* shares some of its functions with presentative and identification demonstratives, as it is used to identify, present and highlight a referent or an event.

Moreover, there also seems to be a parallel between some of the functions of clause-initial constructions with *yu-* and some secondary functions of presentative demonstratives. For instance, Killian (2022: 19) notes that "[p]resentative demonstratives are also important to the organization of discourse, such as marking the opening or closing of topical units [...]". He cites the following example from Russian, where "/" marks a brief unmeasured pause between the presentative demonstrative and the rest of the utterance (Grenoble & Riley 1996: 819).

(44)    Nu **vot** / vsë konči-l-o-s' tem, čto ix
well **PRSV:PROX** / all.NOM end-PST-N.SG-REFL that.INS COMPL 3PL.ACC
vygna-l-i iz restoran-a
throw.out-PST-PL from restaurant-GEN.SG
'Well *vot*, everything ended with them being thrown out of the restaurant.'
(Grenoble & Riley 1996: 835)[42]

Example (44) and its description resemble the *yúp=mah yúp* and the *yinɨh-yóʔ=mah (yúp)* constructions presented in Section 3.4 and 3.5. Like *vot* in (44), both types of constructions in Hup were shown to be followed by a pause in most cases, setting them apart prosodically from the rest of the clause. In terms of their function, the two Hup constructions also marked the closing or opening of discourse topics by concluding a previous sequence and/or by marking the transition to a new discourse segment.

Another function that Killian (2022: 19) mentions for presentative demonstratives is that they "may also be used to help organize the temporal flow of discourse". He shows example (45) from Kordofanian Baggara Arabic to illustrate this function. Here, the demonstrative *dawú* is used together with the conjunction *wa* 'and' to mark

---

**42** The original example in Grenoble & Riley (1996) is not glossed, the glosses shown here are taken from Killian (2022: 19).

the temporal succession of two events. Again, "/" is used to indicate a minor pause (Manfredi 2014: 30).

(45)    katal-ná      / wa **dawú**            ji-na     hini
        kill-1PL>3SG.M / and **PRSV.PROX.SG.M** come-1PL here
        'We killed it and then we came here.'
        (Manfredi 2014: 42)

The function of *wa dawú* 'and then' shown in (45) is very similar to those of *yúp* and *yít* 'thus, then'. As was shown in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, Hup commonly uses *yúp* and *yít* to express temporal (and other) discourse-deictic relations between the current and the previous proposition.

        The last additional function of presentative demonstratives that Killian (2022: 19) mentions is that of "strengthen[ing] social bonds between speakers." He shows an example of French *voilà* for illustration:

(46)    H:  Oui. Et  ça  aide     de donner un        peu  de contact
            yes  and that help.3SG of  give.INF ART:INDEF little of contact
            humain.
            human
            'Yes. And that helps to give a little human contact.'
        C:  **Voilà**.
            **PRSV.DIST**
            'Exactly.'
            (Grenoble & Riley 1996: 836)[43]

Again, we find that the intangible demonstrative in Hup also covers this function. As was shown in example (26), *yít-yiʔ* expresses confirmation and agreement and translates as 'exactly, that's right'.


# 4  Conclusion

We presented a detailed overview of the so-called intangible demonstrative *yu-* in Hup (Naduhup, Brazil), analyzing its distribution in spontaneous speech data from narratives and conversation. We showed that the demonstrative has a variety of discourse-managing functions: it is used for anaphoric and discourse-deictic reference, includ-

---

[43] The original example in Grenoble & Riley (1996) is not glossed; the glosses shown here are ours. Also, *voilà* is translated as 'there' by Grenoble & Riley (1996: 836), but we translate it as 'exactly' here, which comes closer to its original communicative function.

ing temporal discourse-deixis where the demonstrative refers back to an earlier point in time in a sequence of events. Other clause-linking usages of *yu-* include its oblique form *yít* with the conventionalized meaning 'thus', and the combination of *yít* and the telic marker into *yít-yɨʔ* to express agreement. We then turned to two more complex constructions based on *yu-*, namely *yúp=mah yúp* and *yɨnɨh-yóʔ=mah (yúp)*, both of which often occur with the repeated demonstrative form *yúp* at the end of the construction. Both constructions were shown to relate the current proposition to the previous one, and to be used mainly to signal the opening and closing of a given discourse segment and the transition between two different discourse segments. We argued that the repeated intangible demonstrative form, *yúp*, at the end of the construction may have originated due to the high frequency of this element in discourse, its low processing load and therefore early production in order to hold the floor and avoid complete silence. We then discussed some properties that suggest intangible *yu-* in Hup is similar to what has been described as predicative demonstratives in the typological literature. We showed that *yúw-úh*, the combination of the intangible demonstrative and the declarative marker, are used as a demonstrative identifier, especially in contrastive contexts. Moreover, we drew a parallel between some functions of *yu-* and those of predicative demonstratives reported in the literature, namely its discourse-structuring uses to open / close discourse topics, to organize the temporal flow of discourse, and its communicative function to express agreement between speakers. By having analyzed the distribution and functions of the intangible demonstrative *yu-* in Hup, our study also contributes to a better understanding of the various discourse-managing functions of demonstratives in general.

**Author contributions:**
LMA and LB contributed equally to all aspects of the study and the paper.

# Abbreviations

1 – 1st person, 2 – 2nd person, 3 – 3rd person, ACC – accusative, ART – article, AGAIN – repetitive aspect, CNTR – contrastive, COMP – complementizer, COMPL – completive, DECL – declarative, DEP – dependent, DIR – directional, DIST – distal, DISTR – distributive, DST.CNTR – distant past contrast, DYNM – dynamic, EMPH1 – emphasis 1, EMPH2 – emphasis 2, EMPH.CO – emphatic coordinator, EMPH.DEP – dependent emphasis, FACT – factitive, F – feminine, FLR – filler, FOC – focus, FRUST – frustrative, FUT – future, GEN – genitive, HAB – habitual, IDEO – ideophone, IMP – imperative, IMP2 – imperative suffix, INCH – inchoative, inchoative focus, INDEF – indefinite, INF – infinitive, INFR – inferential, INFR2 – inferential 2, INS – instrumental, ITG – intangible, INTERJ –interjection, INTRC – interactional, INTS1 – intensifier 1, LOC – locative, M – masculine, N – neuter, NEG – negative, NEG:EX – negative existence, NMZ – nominalizer, NOM – nominative, NONVIS – nonvisual, OBJ – object, OBL – oblique, PERF – perfective, PL – plural, POSS – possessive, PRSV – presentative, PROX – proximal, PRX.CNTR – proximate contrast, PST – past, PURP – purpose, REP – reportative, REFL – reflexive, SEQ – sequential, SG – singular, TAG2 – interactive tag 2, TEL – telic, UNDER – locative adverbial, VDIM – verbal diminutive, VENT – venitive

# References

Ariel, Mira. 1988. Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24(1). 65–87.

Becker, Laura. 2021. *Articles in the world's languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110724424.

Burenhult, Niclas. 2003. Attention, accessibility, and the addressee: The case of the Jahai demonstrative ton. *Pragmatics* 13(3). 363–379. https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.13.3.01bur.

Chafe, Wallace. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 25–55. New York: Academic Press.

Dawuda, Carmen, Cultures Monash University. School of Languages & Linguistics. 2009. *Discourse functions of demonstratives and place adverbs with exophoric reference in Logea, an Oceanic language of Papua New Guinea*. Melbourne: Monash University.

de Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail–head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2). 363–384. https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.29.2.04vri.

Diessel, Holger. 1997. Predicative demonstratives. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 72–82. Berkeley, CA: Linguistic Society of America.

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

Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. 17(4). 463–489. https://doi.org/10.1515/COG.2006.015.

Diessel, Holger & Merlijn Breunesse. 2020. A typology of demonstrative clause linkers. In Åshild Næss, Yvonne Treis & Anna Margetts (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse*, 305–341. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4054814.

Enfield, Nick. 2003. Demonstratives in space and interaction: Data from Lao speakers and implications for semantic analysis. *Language* 79(1). 82–117.

Epps, Patience. 2004. *Conversation: Curupira and Fight at Serra dos Porcos. Hup Collection of Patience Epps* (PID Set: 19644). Austin, TX: The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (AILLA).

Epps, Patience. 2008. *A grammar of Hup*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Epps, Patience. 2012. On form and function in language contact: a case study from the Amazonian Vaupés region. In Claudine Cahmoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Dynamics of Contact-Induced Language Change*, 195–230. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Epps, Patience & Lev Michael. 2017. The Areal Linguistics of Amazonia. In Raymond Hickey (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Areal Linguistics* (Cambridge Handbooks in Language and Linguistics), 934–963. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107279872.033.

Epps, Patience & Teresa Monteiro. 2001. *Story: Curupira sucks woman's brain. Hup Collection of Patience Epps* (PID Set: 19579). Austin, TX: The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (AILLA).

Epps, Patience & Elias Andrade Pires. 2002. *Story: Pineapple field spirit. Hup Collection of Patience Epps* (PID Set: 19587). Austin, TX: The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (AILLA).

Epps, Patience & Isabelle Salustiano. 2001. *Story: Spirit who fished for traira. Hup Collection of Patience Epps* (PID Set: 19578). Austin, TX: The Archive of the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (AILLA).

Fuchs, Melanie & Petra B. Schumacher. 2020. Referential shift potential of demonstrative pronouns – Evidence from text continuation. In Åshild Næss, Yvonne Treis & Anna Margetts (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse*, 185–213. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4054814.

Grenoble, Lenore & Matthew Riley. 1996. The role of deictics in discourse coherence: French voici/voilà and Russian vot/von. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(6). 819–838. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(95)00011-9.

Guérin, Valérie. 2015. Demonstrative verbs: A typology of verbal manner deixis. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 141–199. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2015-0006.

Guérin, Valérie (ed.). 2018. *Bridging constructions*. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2563698.

Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69(2). 274–307.

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

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

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2014. Asymmetries in the prosodic phrasing of function words: Another look at the suffixing preference. *Language* 90(4). 927–960. https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2014.0105.

Jacobs, Joachim. 2001. The dimensions of topic-comment. *Linguistics* 39(4). 641–681. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.2001.027.

Killian, Don. 2022. Towards a typology of predicative demonstratives. *Linguistic Typology* 26(1). 1–41. https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2021-2078.

König, Ekkehard. 2015. Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.), *Perspectives on Historical Syntax*, 35–60. Benjamins.

Krifka, Manfred. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In Caroline Féry, Gisbert Fanselow & Manfred Krifka (eds.), *The notions of information structure* (Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure 6), 13–56. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.

Levelt, Willem. 1989. *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. The MIT Press. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6393.001.0001.

Levelt, Willem, Ardi Roelofs & Antje Meyer. 1999. A theory of lexical access in speech production. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 22(1). 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x99001776.

Manfredi, Stefano. 2014. Demonstratives in a Bedouin Arabic dialect of Western Sudan. *Folia Orientalia* 51. 27–50.

Ozerov, Pavel. 2018. Tracing the sources of Information Structure: Towards the study of interactional management of information. *Journal of Pragmatics* 138. 77–97. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.017.

Ridge, Eleanor. 2020. Morphosyntactic and functional asymmetries in Vatlongos discourse demonstratives. In Åshild Næss, Yvonne Treis & Anna Margetts (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse*, 69–101. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.4054814.

Tannen, Deborah. 1982. Oral and literate strategies in spoken and written narratives. *Language* 58(1). 1–21.