

Anaphoric uses of demonstratives in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa

Timofey Mukhin

*National Research University Higher School of Economics,
University of Liège
Moscow, Russia
tmukhin@hse.ru*

This study presents the first systematic comparison of anaphoric uses of demonstratives in two East Caucasian languages, Kina Rutul (Lezgi) and Mehweb Dargwa (Dargic). Both languages lack dedicated third-person pronouns and employ demonstratives anaphorically in both pronominal and adnominal positions. Data from thirteen Kina Rutul and nine Mehweb Dargwa Pear Stories show that the default demonstrative (in terms of frequency) differs in the two languages: it is the proximal in Kina Rutul and the distal in Mehweb Dargwa. Demonstratives are found to differ with respect to the discourse prominence of the referent and the number of its previous mentions — that is, whether a demonstrative is used for the second or a subsequent mention of the referent in the text [Kibrik 2011: 363]. The proximal in both languages more often refers to more prominent referents than the medial and the distal. Drawing on Ariel's [1990] accessibility theory, the study tests whether proximal, medial, and distal demonstratives differ iconically, according to their exophoric semantics, in terms of anaphoric distance [Givón 1983] and referent accessibility. In both languages, the distal demonstrative in adnominal uses, often used for referent reactivation [Kibrik 2011: 413], occurs at greater average anaphoric distances than other demonstratives, supporting an iconic link between its exophoric meaning and anaphoric distance. Pronominal uses, by contrast, show no such correlation. The medial demonstrative, in both its adnominal and pronominal uses, displays similar or even shorter average anaphoric distances than the proximal in both languages, therefore arguing against the hypothesized iconicity link between its exophoric and anaphoric uses.

Keywords: demonstratives, anaphora, anaphoric distance, accessibility theory, East Caucasian

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Saida Magomedova, Patimat Musaeva and Saadi Suleimanov for their help with transcribing the Pear Stories, which serve as the main data source for this study, as well as to the other residents of the villages of Kina and Mehweb. I also thank Michael Daniel, Timur Maisak, and Polina Nasledskova for their input on the study, and the two anonymous referees for their valuable questions and comments, which helped improve the clarity and precision of the paper.

For citation: Mukhin T. Anaphoric uses of demonstratives in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa. *Rodnoy yazyk. Linguistic Journal*, 2026, 1: 169–193.

DOI: 10.37892/2313-5816-2026-1-169-193

Анафорические употребления демонстративов в кининском рутульском и мегебском даргинском

Тимофей Мухин

*Национальный исследовательский университет
«Высшая школа экономики»,
Льезский университет
Москва, Россия
tmukhin@hse.ru*

В данной статье представлено первое систематическое сравнение анафорических употреблений демонстративов (указательных местоимений) в двух нахско-дагестанских языках — кининском рутульском (лезгинская группа) и мегебском даргинском (даргинская группа). В обоих языках отсутствуют местоимения третьего лица, и демонстративы используются анафорически как в местоименной, так и в приименной позициях. Данные тринадцати кининских и девяти мегебских историй о грушах показывают, что дефолтный демонстратив (с точки зрения частотности) различается в этих двух языках: ближний демонстратив доминирует в кининском, дальний — в мегебском. Демонстративы в текстах различаются с точки зрения дискурсивной значимости референта и количества его предыдущих упоминаний, а именно используется ли демонстратив для второго или для последующего упоминания референта в тексте [Kibrik 2011: 363]. В обоих языках ближний

демонстратив чаще реферирует к более значимым референтам, чем средний и дальний. Опираясь на теорию доступности Ариэль [Ariel 1990], в работе проверяется, различаются ли демонстративы с точки зрения анафорической дистанции [Givón 1983] и доступности референта иконично в соответствии с их экзофорической семантикой. В обоих языках дальний демонстратив в приименных употреблениях, часто используемый для реактивации референта [Kibrik 2011: 413], в среднем встречается на большей анафорической дистанции, чем другие демонстративы, что поддерживает гипотезу об иконичной связи между его экзофорическим значением и анафорической дистанцией. Напротив, местоименные употребления не демонстрируют такой корреляции. В обоих языках, средний демонстратив, как в приименных, так и в местоименных употреблениях, в среднем показывает сходные или даже меньшие значения анафорической дистанции, чем ближний демонстратив, что говорит против предполагаемой иконичной связи между его экзофорическими и анафорическими употреблениями.

Ключевые слова: указательные местоимения, анафора, анафорическая дистанция, теория доступности, нахско-дагестанские языки

Для цитирования: Мухин Т. Анафорические употребления демонстративов в кининском рутульском и мегебском даргинском. *Родной язык. Лингвистический журнал*, 2026, 1: 169–193.

DOI: 10.37892/2313-5816-2026-1-169-193

1. Introduction

This study examines the anaphoric uses of demonstrative pronouns in two East Caucasian languages, Kina Rutul (Lezgian) and Mehweb Dargwa (Dargic). Demonstratives in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, as in many other languages, serve a variety of functions, including EXOPHORIC – when a demonstrative refers to non-linguistic entities in the surrounding situation – as in (1a) from Kina Rutul, where the demonstratives *mi* (*mi χala* ‘this house’) and *ti* (*ti χala* ‘that house’) refer to physical buildings. In contrast, in ENDOPHORIC use the demonstrative refers to a textual entity, for example to a noun phrase in the preceding discourse, as in the case of the ANAPHORIC function [Diessel 1999: 6–7], central to this study. An example of anaphoric use is

given in (1b) from Kina Rutul, where the demonstrative *ha* (*ha-nowa* ‘she’) refers to an NP in the preceding clause (*babaj* ‘grandmother’). Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa lack a dedicated third-person pronoun and use the same demonstrative stems in both pronominal and adnominal position, as in (1b), where the same demonstrative *ha* is used anaphorically as a noun modifier (*had* *χinimer* ‘these children’), referring to an NP in the preceding clause (*juq’di jetimak^{wan}* ‘four orphans’).

(1) Kina Rutul

- a. [*mi* *χal-a*] *zi* *ješemiš* *ruʔu-r=a*,
 this **house-IN** I live 1.become.IPFV-CVB=be
 [*ti* *χal-a*] *babaj*
 that(DIST) **house-IN** grandmother
 ‘[Pointing to the house.] I live in **this house**, my grandmother lives in **that house**.’ [Mukhin & Nasledskova 2025: 2]

- b. *babaj* *a-r-gi-r* *mu^og^w-a*
 grandmother IN-2-stay.PFV-CVB village-IN
 juq’di *jetim-a-k^{wan}*. [*ha-now-a*]
 four-ATTR orphan-OBL-COM **that(MED)-OBL.H-ERG**
 giš-e-k^{wan} *miq’-i-k^{wan}* *haa-sa=kal*
 hunger-OBL-COM cold-OBL-COM that-MNR=SIMIL
 q’ix-e *d-iʔi-r* [*ha-d* *χini-mer*]
 big-ADJ HPL-do.PFV-CVB **that(MED)-ATTR** **child-PL**
 ‘The grandmother remained in the village with four orphans. **She** raised **those children** with difficulty, through hunger and cold.’ (kna_2018_03_nzle_1963)

Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, like many other East Caucasian languages, have elaborate demonstrative systems consisting of three or more pronouns, all of which can appear in anaphoric function. However, in Kina Rutul and Mehweb, as well as in many other languages of the family, the mechanisms determining the choice of different demonstratives have not been studied in detail independently of their exophoric uses. While a few corpus-based studies exist for individual (mostly Lezgi) languages – such as Agul [Ganenkov et al. 2009], Udi [Schulze 2008], Tsakhur [Toldova 1999] and Bagvalal [Ljutikova 2001] –

there are no typologically oriented studies dedicated to the anaphoric uses of demonstrative pronouns. This study addresses this gap by applying a comparable cognitive approach, drawing on Ariel's [1990] ACCESSIBILITY THEORY, to reference-tracking mechanisms in two distantly related East Caucasian languages.

Accessibility theory models mechanisms of reference tracking, defining the function of REFERENCE-TRACKING DEVICES – such as zero anaphora, (demonstrative) pronouns, and full NPs – as signaling to the addressee the ease with which a mental representation can be retrieved from memory, that is, its degree of accessibility [Ariel 1990: 16]. The more accessible this representation is, the less informative the device that is used to track it needs to be. Accessibility is represented as a combination of factors [Ariel 1990: 28–29, 31], the most indicative of which is ANAPHORIC (or referential) DISTANCE [Givón 1983: 13, 18] defined as the distance in clauses between the previous occurrence in the discourse of a referent and its current occurrence in a clause. This study investigates Ariel's [1990: 55] claim that the choice of demonstrative reflects the cognitive status of the referent, iconically linking their exophoric and endophoric uses: distal demonstratives signal lower accessibility and therefore tend to occur at greater anaphoric distances than proximal ones. The correlation between the accessibility and the choice of demonstrative is exemplified with (2) from English which illustrates a discourse-deictic use of demonstratives. Unlike in their anaphoric use in (1), demonstratives in (2) refer not to a noun phrase but to a proposition in the preceding discourse [Diessel 1999: 93]. In (2a) both statements are produced by the same speaker, and the first statement can be referred to from the second using either a proximal or distal demonstrative. Proximal demonstratives, however, cannot be used in (2b), as the first statement is produced by a different person and is less accessible to speaker B. Note that the demonstratives in (2a) and (2b) show the same degree of accessibility in terms of anaphoric distance (one clause), but they differ with respect to another parameter, unity, which investigates whether the referent is within the same frame/point of view/segment or paragraph as the anaphor [Ariel 1990: 29].

- (2) English ([Lakoff 1974:74] cited in Ariel [1990: 55])
- a. A: *Dick says that the Republicans may have credibility problems. **This/that** is an understatement.*
 - b. A: *Dick says that the Republicans may have credibility problems.*
 B: ****This/that** is an understatement.*

Providing evidence in favor of the correlation between the primary meaning of demonstratives and their endophoric uses, Ariel [1990] focuses on languages with dedicated third-person pronouns (e. g. English *he, she*) and two-term monocentric (or distance-oriented) demonstrative systems (e. g. English *this, that*), leaving unaddressed languages such as Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, which lack dedicated anaphoric pronouns and have more complex polycentric (or person-oriented) systems – those with medial demonstratives anchored to the addressee and not to the speaker [Anderson & Keenan 1985; Schultze 2003: 297]. While in Ariel's data, there is evidence for a correlation between the distance contrast expressed and the degree of accessibility for proximal and distal demonstratives, it is unclear how this applies to medial demonstratives. The present study tests the hypothesis that the choice of a specific demonstrative as a reference-tracking device in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa varies iconically with anaphoric distance, with the medial demonstrative associated with an intermediate anaphoric distance, since in its exophoric uses it typically refers to a greater distance than the proximal demonstrative but a shorter one than the distal.

In addition to anaphoric distance, I consider other parameters commonly assumed to affect referential choice (see Section 3), discussed within Kibrik's [2011: 363] cognitive multifactorial framework – another cognitive approach to reference tracking, which assumes that referential choice is motivated by the cognitive activation of a referent in working memory, calculated based on a set of parameters. Although Kibrik's work addresses different types of reference-tracking devices (including demonstratives), unlike Ariel [1990], he does not discuss possible correlations between the type of demonstrative (e. g. proximal vs. distal) and referential choice. For this reason, while

the present paper does draw on some of Kibrik's [2011] findings, it does not fully adopt his methodology and instead focuses on testing Ariel's [1990] claim.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 provides a brief introduction to the grammatical features of Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa; Section 3 describes the annotation method and the data used in the study; Section 4 presents a general overview of the distribution of demonstratives in anaphoric uses; Section 5 reports calculated anaphoric distances and discusses them from the perspective of accessibility theory; Section 6 summarizes the results and contextualizes them within a broader typological perspective by comparing them with findings from similar studies. Finally, Section 7 wraps up the analysis and offers conclusions.

2. Relevant grammatical features

Both languages are mainly spoken by residents of only one village each. Mehweb Dargwa is spoken in the village of Mehweb (Gunibsky district, Daghestan, Russia) and has around 600–700 speakers [Dobrushina 2019: 1]; Kina Rutul, which is a dialect of Rutul, is spoken in the Kina village (Rutulsky district, Daghestan, Russia) and has approximately 600 speakers [Dobrushina in prep.]. All speakers are mostly multilingual and typically fluent in Russian, as well as in some other languages of the family [Dobrushina et al. 2017].

Both languages are left-branching with ergative case marking and gender agreement encoded on the verb. The verb distinguishes between four genders (Kina Rutul) or three genders (Mehweb Dargwa) in the singular and two genders in the plural. In Kina Rutul Gender 1 denotes males, Gender 2 denotes females, while Gender 3 and Gender 4 are mixed and denote various non-human referents. In Mehweb Dargwa there are masculine, feminine and neutral genders (but see more on the complexities with feminine and mass nouns in Magometov [1982: 16, 38]). In the plural, both languages offer only two options: human and non-human [Magometov 1982: 16, 38; Maxmudova

2002: 20–21, 40, 81]. In Mehweb Dargwa, besides gender agreement some verb forms also agree in person (egophoric agreement) [Ganenkova 2019: 201]. In both languages nominals inflect for case and number.

Kina Rutul, as well as Mehweb Dargwa, has a polycentric demonstrative system with triple distance contrast [Mukhin & Nasledskova 2025: 470; Magometov 1982: 55] which consists of the proximal demonstrative ‘close to the speaker’ (*mi* in Kina Rutul; *iš* in Mehweb Dargwa), the medial ‘close to the addressee’ (*ha* in Kina Rutul; *il* in Mehweb Dargwa), and the distal ‘far from both the speaker and addressee’ (*ti* in Kina Rutul; *it* in Mehweb Dargwa). Mehweb Dargwa additionally has two elevational demonstratives: the inferior *iχ* ‘below’ and the superior *ič* ‘above’. The same demonstrative forms are used both in the pronominal and adnominal position, as in (1b) from Kina Rutul in Section 1. In both languages, demonstratives inflect for case, number and gender in pronominal positions. When used adnominally, demonstratives in Mehweb Dargwa inflect for number, whereas in Kina Rutul they are uninflected. As typical of East Caucasian, both languages lack dedicated anaphoric third person pronouns and use demonstratives instead. As an alternative to demonstratives, Kina Rutul also uses the ‘self’ pronoun anaphorically.¹

3. Method and data

The data used for this study are recordings of Pear Stories [Chafe 1980]. These include thirteen texts for Kina Rutul and nine texts for Mehweb Dargwa. The texts were recorded under settings standard for this type of elicitation: the speaker was requested to describe the plot of the movie to an interlocutor who had not watched it (or, in some cases, did not reveal their knowledge of the story). The speaker watched the movie only

¹ In some East Caucasian languages, the reflexive ‘self’ pronoun can be used as a third person anaphor bounded by the antecedent located outside the local domain. See the discussion in [Testeleto & Toldova 1998] and [Daniel 2015].

once. All the texts were transcribed by native consultants, time-aligned and annotated in Praat [Boersma & Weenink 2023].

All anaphoric uses of demonstratives are annotated according to a predefined set of parameters, often taken to affect referential choice. In addition to the TYPE OF DEMONSTRATIVE (proximal, medial, distal, superior, inferior) and its REFERENT (e. g. *the boy who steals the pears*), I annotated the DISCOURSE PROMINENCE of the referent in the original plot, cf. Kibrik's [2011: 413] "protagonisthood". Here, I used the basic distinction based on overall screen time, dividing characters into more central ones (the boy with the bike, the man collecting pears and the boys) and secondary characters (all others).² Other parameters include the SYNTACTIC POSITION of the demonstrative (adnominal or pronominal) and the NUMBER OF PREVIOUS MENTIONS, which concerns the relative position of a reference with a demonstrative within the sequence of explicit mentions of the same referent. I only distinguish between the second mention that establishes a referent as a new topic, or one of subsequent mentions, cf. Diessel's [1999: 98] "second mentions" and Kibrik's [2011: 441] "introductory antecedent". Note that these parameters are not the only ones which might correlate with the referential choice (see discussion by Kibrik [2011: 402–406]) — I chose them for their relative ease of implementation.

Finally, to calculate anaphoric distance, for each anaphoric use of a demonstrative I annotate the previous overt (e. g. with a noun phrase) or covert reference (e. g. with an anaphoric zero) to the same referent and count the number of finite clauses

² I include the boys together with the protagonists (the boy with the bike and the man collecting pears) as central because they are the most-screened animate referents (and most referred to with demonstratives): the boy and the man each appear for approximately three minutes, while the boys appear for approximately two minutes in total (cf. all other referents that are referred to with a demonstrative at least once, each screened for less than half a minute). Note that, unlike the man and the boy who are present in most of the scenes, the boys appear only episodically in the final scenes. As secondary characters, I include both animate, e. g. 'girl', and inanimate referents, e. g. 'hat'.

between these two references. I use a minimal distance value of zero, rather than one as in Givón’s [1983: 13] approach, in cases where the previous mention of the same referent appears in a non-finite clause preceding the demonstrative. For example, in (3) the medial demonstrative *habišda* ‘they’ refers to the noun phrase *ti χinimer* ‘those boys’ in the preceding non-finite clause denoted by the attributive form *dī?id* ‘go’; thus, the distance value for this occurrence of the medial demonstrative is zero. I exclude anaphoric uses in meta comments and indirect speech from the analysis but count these types of clauses when calculating anaphoric distance.

- (3) Kina Rutul (kna_pears_vdm_3)
- haj-a:*
there(MED)-EL
žig-ij
place-OBL(SUP)
a-gi-r
PV-4.find.PFV-CVB

ti
that(DIST)
riʕ-a
road-IN
*[ha-biš-da]*_{boys}
that(MED)-OBL.HPL-APUD

χini-mer
child-PL
šlapa
hat[R]
that(MED)-OBL.HPL-APUD

d-iʔi-d
HPL-go.IPFV-ATTR
- ‘On the road, where (lit. on the place where) the boys went from there, **they** found a hat.’

4. Distribution of demonstratives in anaphoric uses

In both Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, all demonstratives are attested in an anaphoric function. Table 1 presents the distribution of demonstratives in Pear Stories in each language depending on the syntactic position.

Table 1. Frequency of demonstratives in Pear Stories

	Kina Rutul (n = 181)		Mehweb Dargwa (n = 295)	
	adnominal	pronominal	adnominal	pronominal
proximal	37% (30)	57% (58)	6% (6)	11% (23)
medial	25% (19)	34% (34)	18% (17)	20% (41)
distal	38% (31)	9% (9)	68% (64)	62% (125)

inferior	NA		7% (7)	4% (9)
superior	—		1% (3)	
total	100% (80)	100% (101)	100% (94)	100% (201)

The default anaphoric means (in terms of frequency) varies across languages. In Kina Rutul, the most frequent demonstrative is the proximal (48%, $n = 88/181$), while in Mehweb Dargwa the most frequent is the distal (64%, $n = 189/295$). The least frequent demonstrative in Kina Rutul is the distal (22%, $n = 40/181$), whereas in Mehweb Dargwa the least frequent (non-elevational) demonstrative is the proximal (10%, $n = 29/295$). The proportion of the medial demonstratives is comparable across the two languages: it is the second most frequent non-elevational demonstrative (30%, $n = 53/181$ in Kina Rutul; 20%, $n = 58/295$ in Mehweb Dargwa).

Considering the syntactic position, except for the distal demonstrative in Kina Rutul, overall demonstratives are more frequently used pronominally than adnominally (see Section 5 for a discussion of the predominance of adnominal uses of the distal). In Kina Rutul, unlike Mehweb Dargwa, the choice of demonstrative correlates with the syntactic position:³ in Kina Rutul the proximal is the most frequent demonstrative in pronominal uses, while in adnominal uses it is the distal. This skewed distribution of demonstratives by syntactic position in Kina Rutul – but not in Mehweb Dargwa – may be caused by the availability of an alternative ‘self’-pronoun (not analyzed in this study; see Section 2), which is restricted to pronominal uses and might fulfill functions otherwise performed by demonstratives in this position (as in Mehweb Dargwa).

In terms of discourse prominence, all demonstratives in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa are used to refer to both central and secondary characters; see Table 2 for their distribution.

³ Chi-square tests showed that the correlation between demonstrative type and syntactic position is significant in Kina Rutul ($\chi^2(2) = 23.13$, $p < 0.001$) but not in Mehweb Dargwa ($\chi^2(4) = 4.63$, $p = 0.33$).

Table 2. Discourse prominence of demonstrative referents in *Pearl Stories*

	Kina Rutul (n=181)		Mehweb Dargwa (n=295)	
	central characters	secondary characters	central characters	secondary characters
proximal	53% (82)	23% (6)	13% (28)	1% (1)
medial	25% (38)	58% (15)	17% (37)	26% (21)
distal	22% (35)	19% (5)	63% (135)	67% (54)
inferior	NA		5% (11)	6% (5)
superior			—	
total	100% (155)	100% (26)	100% (214)	100% (81)

In both languages the choice of demonstratives depends on the discourse prominence of the referent.⁴ In Kina Rutul, central characters are most frequently referred to with the proximal, as *mi χinχi* ‘this boy’ in (4), whereas secondary characters are predominantly referred to with the medial demonstrative, as *ha šapkaxa* ‘this hat’ in the same example. In Mehweb Dargwa, the distal is the most frequent demonstrative regardless of discourse prominence. However, similar to Kina Rutul, the proximal in Mehweb Dargwa almost exclusively refers to central characters (93%, n = 82/88 in Kina Rutul; 97%, n = 28/29 in Mehweb Dargwa). Example (5) from Mehweb Dargwa illustrates the proximal demonstrative referring to the boy after he takes the basket from the man.

⁴ Chi-square tests show that the correlation between demonstrative type and discourse prominence is significant in both Kina Rutul ($\chi^2(2) = 12.56$, $p = 0.0019$) and in Mehweb Dargwa ($\chi^2(4) = 11.99$, $p = 0.017$). Discourse prominence significantly affects the Kina Rutul proximal ($\chi^2(1)=6.78$, $p=0.0092$) and medial ($\chi^2(1)=10.29$, $p=0.0013$) and the Mehweb Dargwa proximal ($\chi^2(1)=8.02$, $p = 0.0046$).

- (4) Kina Rutul (kna_pears_ldm_04)
[*ha* *šapk'a=xa*]_{hat} *qi-wilc'a-r=a*
that(MED) **hat[R]=ADD** RE-3.give.IPFV-CVB=be
[*mi χinχ-i*]_{boy} *u.*
this child-OBL(SUP) above
'(They) give **that hat** to **this boy**.'
- (5) Mehweb Dargwa (mhb_pears_ptm_8)
ca *zamaj-ze-r* *hune-če*
one time-INTER-F(ESS) road-SUP(LAT)
d-ik-ib [*iši-s*]_{boy} *lisibit'i-če-r*
F-fall.PFV-AOR **this-DAT** bike-SUP-F(ESS)
ca *dursi.*
one girl
'At some moment, on the road, **he** met a girl on a bicycle.'

Finally, Table 3 presents the distribution of demonstratives with respect to the number of previous mentions: whether they are used in second or subsequent mentions.

Table 3. Number of previous mentions of the referent

	Kina Rutul (n=181)		Mehweb Dargwa (n=295)	
	second mention	>second mention	second mention	>second mention
proximal	25% (9)	54% (79)	5% (2)	11% (27)
medial	56% (19)	23% (34)	45% (17)	16% (41)
distal	19% (7)	23% (33)	45% (17)	67% (172)
inferior	NA —		5% (2)	5% (14)
superior			1% (3)	
total	100% (35)	100% (146)	100% (38)	100% (257)

In both languages, the medial demonstrative is (one of) the most common demonstratives in second mentions. By contrast, in subsequent mentions the proximal dominates in Kina Rutul,

whereas the distal dominates in Mehweb Dargwa.⁵ An example of the medial demonstrative referring to the once-mentioned referent is given in (6) from Kina Rutul, where the boy is first introduced with a noun phrase (*χiniχ* ‘boy’), then referred to with the medial demonstrative (*had χinχira* ‘that boy’) which then changes to the proximal (*mid* ‘he’). In the parallel example (7) from Mehweb Dargwa, the medial demonstrative refers to the boy (*hel urši* ‘that boy’) after its first introduction (*ca urši* ‘one boy’) and then switches to the distal (*itini* ‘he’).

(6) Kina Rutul (kna_pears_ldm_4)

<i>tin'-a:</i>	<i>mi-?</i>	<i>ruʔu-r=a</i>	
there(DIST)-EL	this-LAT	1.go.IPFV-CVB=be	
<i>χiniχ,</i>	<i>weliseped-a</i>	<i>ba-na.</i>	
child	bike-OBL(SUP)	SUP.be-CVB	
<i>ji<r>q'i-r,</i>	[ha-d	χinχ-i-ra] _{boy}	
<1>come.PFV-CVB	that(MED)-ATTR	child-OBL-ERG	
<i>mi-?</i>	<i>l-agi-r</i>	<i>ti-?</i>	
this-LAT	UP-1.look.PFV-CVB	that(DIST)-LAT	
<i>l-agi-r,</i>	<i>l-eč'u-r=a</i>	<i>χiʔr</i>	
UP-1.look.PFV-CVB	PV-<IPFV>4.take-CVB=be	pear	
<i>a-d</i>	<i>t'ak</i>	<i>žu-di</i>	
be-ATTR	basket	self.OBL.NF-ATTR	
<i>weliseped-a</i>	<i>u:</i>	<i>li-l-xe-r=a.</i>	
bike-OBL(SUP)	above	UP-IPFV-4.put.IPFV-CVB=be	
<i>u:</i>	<i>l-ixi-r</i>	[mi-d=xa] _{boy}	
above	UP-4.put.PFV-CVB	this-ATTR=ADD	
<i>u:</i>	<i>le-q-eč'u-r</i>		
above	UP-RE-1.move.PFV-CVB		
‘A boy rides up, on a bicycle. That boy came up (to where the man was on the tree), looked here, looked there, takes a bas-			

⁵ Chi-square tests show that the correlation between demonstrative type and the number of previous mentions is significant in both languages: in Kina Rutul ($\chi^2(2) = 14.03$, $p < 0.001$) and in Mehweb Dargwa ($\chi^2(4) = 17.87$, $p = 0.0013$). The number of previous mentions significantly affects the Kina Rutul proximal ($\chi^2(1)=8.01$, $p=0.0046$) and medial ($\chi^2(1)=11.65$, $p=0.0006$) and the Mehweb Dargwa medial ($\chi^2(1)=15.59$, $p < 0.001$) and distal ($\chi^2(1)=6.15$, $p = 0.013$).

ket of pears and puts it on his bike. **He** put it on (the bicycle) and climbed in himself.’

- (7) Mehweb Dargwa (mhb_pears_ptm_8)
- ʔaʳaxa* *ca* *zamaj-ze-w* *w-ak'-ib*
then one time-INTER-M(ESS) M-come.PFV-AOR
lisibit'i-če-w *ca* *urši.* [*hel* *urši*]_{boy}
bike-SUP-M(ESS) one boy **that(MED)** **boy**
lisibit'i-če-la *če-w=ra* *w-arc-ul-le,*
bike-SUP-EL down-M=ADD M-get.PFV-AOR-CVB
lisibit'=ra *musse* *b-ix-i-le.*
bike=ADD on.the.ground(LAT) N-put.PFV-AOR-CVB
hačam [*it-ini*]_{boy} *ca-k'wi-jal* *qʷaʳ?*
first **that(DIST)-ERG** one-two-ORD pear
as-iša *ile* *le-w-re*
take.PFV-FUT.EGO COMP AUX-M-PST
‘Then at one point a boy came on a bicycle. **That boy** got off his bicycle, put it down on the ground. At first, **he** thought he would take one or two pears.’

5. Anaphoric distance

This section analyzes the anaphoric use of demonstratives in terms of anaphoric distance and tests whether the choice of the demonstrative depends iconically on the calculated distances (see Section 1 for the hypothesis). Table 4 presents the average anaphoric distances (measured in clauses) for each type of demonstrative, calculated separately for their adnominal and pronominal uses. Standard deviations (also in clauses) are given in brackets.

Table 4. Average anaphoric distances of demonstratives (in clauses) in *Pear Stories*

	Kina Rutul		Mehweb Dargwa	
	adnominal	pronominal	adnominal	pronominal
proximal	1.8 (1.4)	1.5 (1.2)	2.7 (2.9)	2 (1.5)
medial	1.4 (1)	1.2 (1.1)	2.8 (2.8)	1.2 (0.9)

distal	6.7 (8.4)	1 (1.2)	7.7 (9.6)	1.6 (1.8)
inferior	NA		3.3 (3.1)	2.4 (1.3)
superior	—		7.7 (0.6)	
total average distance	3.6 (5.8)	1.3 (1.2)	6.2 (8.4)	1.7 (1.8)

In terms of anaphoric distance, demonstratives used as noun modifiers show a greater average distance (>3 clauses) than in their pronominal uses (1–2 clauses) in both languages.⁶ These results are in line with the accessibility theory, as definite noun phrases in general mark lower accessibility of the referent than independent anaphoric pronouns and are therefore expected to be used at greater distances [Ariel 1990: 73].

In both languages, in adnominal uses, distal demonstratives show the greatest average distance (>6 clauses) compared to other non-elevational demonstratives (1–3 clauses), whereas in pronominal uses the average distances for all non-elevational demonstratives are similar (1–2 clauses). In both languages, the distance for the medial demonstrative is the smallest (though still close to that of the proximal), except in its adnominal uses in Mehweb Dargwa, where it is slightly higher than that of the proximal.⁷ Thus, while the medial demonstrative in its exo-

⁶ A Mann–Whitney U tests conducted for each language show that in both Kina Rutul (KR) and Mehweb Dargwa (MD), adnominal demonstratives occur at significantly greater distances than pronominal ones (KR: $U = 20468$, $p < .001$; MD: $U = 13642.5$, $p < .001$).

⁷ A Kruskal–Wallis test was conducted on all demonstratives within each syntactic position, and Mann–Whitney U tests were used for pairwise comparisons of demonstratives within the same positions. In Kina Rutul, adnominal demonstratives show significant differences in anaphoric distances ($H = 13.33$, $p = 0.0013$), with the distal occurring at greater distances than the proximal ($U = 1310$, Holm $p = 0.0078$) and the medial ($U = 748$, Holm $p = 0.0054$). Pronominal demonstratives in Kina Rutul do not differ significantly in anaphoric distances ($H = 4.70$, $p = 0.095$). In Mehweb Dargwa, adnominal demonstratives also differ significantly

phoric meaning is usually associated with greater distance from the speaker than the proximal, this primary meaning is not reflected in its endophoric uses: based on the obtained distance values, it signals almost equal (or even higher) accessibility than the proximal in both languages. By contrast, the distal, showing the greatest average anaphoric distance in its adnominal uses, signals the lowest accessibility of the referent compared to other demonstratives, iconically reflecting its exophoric semantics.

The high anaphoric distance of the distal in its adnominal uses arises because it typically reactivates (in terms of Kibrik [2011: 413]) characters who have already been introduced and established in the story but were not active in the immediately preceding context. A typical context for the distal demonstrative is the episode where the children return to the tree, and the man (who was last mentioned at the beginning of the story) discovers the theft of the basket. In both languages, all speakers who retell this scene using a demonstrative to refer to the man employ the distal one (eight speakers in Kina Rutul; six speakers in Mehweb Dargwa), as in (8) and (9); the others use an NP without a demonstrative. Predominance of reactivating uses also explains the higher frequency of adnominal than pronominal uses of the distal in Kina Rutul (see Table 1 in Section 4), since reactivation typically requires the use of a noun phrase [Næss et al. 2020: 10].

(8) Kina Rutul (kna_pears_sai_9)

<i>ma:da</i>	[<i>ti</i>	<i>χiʳ-bir</i>
again	that(DIST)	pear-PL
<i>kʲa-ʁ-aʔa-d</i>		<i>edemi</i> _{manʹ}
CONT-OUT-NPL.do.IPFV-ATTR		man

($H = 8.73$, $p = 0.0127$), with the distal occurring at greater distances than the medial ($U = 319.5$, Holm $p = 0.0252$), while pronominal demonstratives show marginal differences ($H = 7.05$, $p = 0.029$), with the proximal occurring at greater distances than the medial ($U = 648$, Holm $p = 0.0204$). Other pairwise comparisons are not significant.

<i>ha</i>	<i>wayt-ind-e</i>	<i>u:-la</i>	<i>sa-ʔ</i>
that(MED)	time-OBL-IN	above-EL	down-LAT
<i>sa^f-q-a^fɣu-r=a,</i>		<i>mi</i>	<i>χini-mer</i>
DOWN-RE-<IPFV>1.move.IPFV-CVB=be		this	boy-PL
<i>ti-ʔ</i>	<i>qi-d-iʔi-d</i>		<i>wayt-ind-e.</i>
that(DIST)-LAT	RE-HPL-go.IPFV-ATTR		time-OBL-IN

‘Again, **that man who plucks pears**, at this time, comes down from above while the boys pass by.’

(9) Mehweb Dargwa (mhbw_pears_ptm_8)

<i>hanna</i>	<i>hel-di</i>	<i>urš-be</i>	<i>b-ikʼ-ib</i>
now	that(MED)-PL	boys-PL	HPL-come.IPFV-AOR
<i>[it</i>	<i>q^waʳʔ-be</i>	<i>d-irʔ-uwe</i>	
that(DIST)	pears-PL	NPL-gather.IPFV-CVB.IPFV	
<i>uʔ-ub-i</i>		<i>adami-li-šu</i> _{man}	
M.be.PFV-AOR-ATTR		man-OBL-APUD(LAT)	
<i>ite</i>	<i>ɤwetʼ-i-šu.</i>		
there	tree-OBL-APUD(LAT)		

‘Now these boys got to **that man who was picking pears**, to that tree.’

6. Anaphoric uses of demonstratives beyond Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa

This final section summarizes the tendencies observed in the anaphoric uses of Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa demonstratives and compares them with those in other languages, mainly East Caucasian, for which studies of anaphoric demonstratives have been conducted. Table 5 provides a summary of the statistically significant tendencies and average anaphoric distances discussed in Sections 4 and 5. Tendencies suggesting a low level of referent activation, in Kibrik’s [2011: 363] terms, are highlighted in light grey and those suggesting a high level of activation are highlighted in dark grey.

Table 5. Characteristics of demonstratives in anaphoric uses

		Discourse prominence	Number of mentions	Anaphoric distance (adnominal)
proximal	Kina Rutul	cent. ch.	>second	low (1–2 clauses)
	Mehweb Dargwa	cent. ch.	no pref.	low (2–3 clauses)
medial	Kina Rutul	sec. ch.	second	low (1–2 clauses)
	Mehweb Dargwa	no pref.	second	low (2–3 clauses)
distal	Kina Rutul	no pref.	no pref.	high (6–7 clauses)
	Mehweb Dargwa	no pref.	>second	high (7–8 clauses)

The proximal demonstrative in both languages is used when the referent exhibits a high level of activation, typically occurring beyond the second mention (in Kina Rutul), with central characters and at a short anaphoric distance (in both languages). The medial and the distal signal a lower level of referent activation than the proximal, displaying mixed properties with respect to the parameters considered. The medial in both languages is generally used at a short distance, most commonly as the second mention of the referent after its introduction. In Kina Rutul, the medial typically refers to secondary characters. In both languages, the distal is often used to reactivate a referent at a relatively long anaphoric distance from its previous mention. In Mehweb Dargwa, the distal typically occurs beyond the second mention.

In a broader perspective, similar mapping between types of demonstratives (here referred to as proximal, medial, and distal, irrespective of the orientation of the system) and discourse

parameters are attested in other East Caucasian languages for which such data are available (mostly within the Lezgian branch). For example, in Agul [Ganenkova et al. 2009: 17–23], Tsakhur [Toldova 1999: 670–674], Udi [Schulze 2008: 263] and Bagvalal [Ljutikova 2001: 615–680], as in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, the proximal is associated with a higher level of referent activation and more frequently refers to more prominent characters comparing to the distal, which frequently appears in contrastive uses. Unlike in Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa, where the medial is typically used for second mentions, in Agul – for which this parameter is discussed – such uses are fulfilled by the elevational demonstrative ‘below’ [Ganenkova et al. 2009: 20]. Outside East Caucasian, the association of the medial demonstrative with information less familiar to the addressee (secondary characters or recently introduced referents) is attested, for example, in Blackfoot (Algic; [Næss et al. 2020: 9]).

With respect to the default demonstrative in anaphoric uses, even closely related languages show considerable variation, which constitutes a potential topic for further investigation. In Tsakhur, the closest relative of Kina Rutul, the medial is the most frequent anaphoric demonstrative [Sosenskaja 1999: 131], unlike in both Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa where it is the proximal and the distal, respectively. In Agul, as in Kina Rutul, the proximal is the most frequent demonstrative in narrative texts [Ganenkova et al. 2009: 16–17]. Kina Rutul and Mehweb Dargwa (as well as Agul) therefore diverge from the general tendency in three-term systems to recruit the medial demonstrative (rather than the proximal or distal) as the default anaphoric means [Diessel 1999: 39].

7. Conclusion

The present study offers the first comparison of anaphoric uses of demonstratives in two distantly related East Caucasian languages – a topic not previously addressed in research on these languages. Analysis of the distribution of demonstratives

in Pear Stories showed that the default demonstrative in terms of frequency differs across the languages: in Kina Rutul, the most frequent demonstrative is the proximal, while in Mehweb Dargwa it is the distal.

The demonstratives show different tendencies in terms of discourse prominence of the referent and number of its previous mentions. The proximal is often used referring to central characters (both languages) after second mentions (Kina Rutul). The medial typically refers to secondary characters (Kina Rutul) at second mentions (both languages). The distal often appears in mentions beyond the second (Mehweb Dargwa).

In terms of anaphoric distance, adnominal demonstratives tend to be used at greater distances from the previous mention of the same referent than pronominal demonstratives, which supports Givón's [1983: 17, 30] and Ariel's [1990: 73] findings that noun phrases used for reference tracking signal lower accessibility of the referent and therefore occur at greater distances than anaphoric pronouns.

Finally, I tested Ariel's [1990: 55] claim that proximal and distal demonstratives differ iconically in anaphoric distance and, consequently, in the accessibility of their referents, against data from Mehweb Dargwa and Kina Rutul, whose demonstrative systems are organized differently from those of the languages on which the claim was originally based. Building on Ariel's claim, I proposed a hypothesis, according to which the medial demonstrative is expected to occupy an intermediate position relative to the proximal and distal in terms of encoded degree of accessibility. While the iconic link between proximal and distal demonstratives and accessibility is supported for their adnominal uses – in both languages, the distal demonstrative, often used for referent reactivation, shows a greater average anaphoric distance as compared to one to two clauses for the proximal – no difference was found in their pronominal uses, where the anaphoric distance is similar for all demonstratives. The medial demonstrative does not pattern according to its exophoric semantics in terms of anaphoric distance. In both languages, the anaphoric distances associated with the

medial and proximal demonstratives are similar (regardless of the syntactic position), with the distance for the former often being even smaller than that for the latter.

One way to strengthen the results of the study would be to test the hypothesis on data from a language with a three-term monocentric system (as in Spanish [Diessel 1999: 39]). Demonstratives in monocentric systems might behave differently in their anaphoric uses, since their exophoric meanings are more strictly distance-based and can therefore be mapped more directly onto anaphoric distance than those in the polycentric systems examined here.

Abbreviations

1	Gender 1
2	Gender 2
3	Gender 3
4	Gender 4
ADD	additive
ADJ	(co)predicative adjective
AOR	aorist
APUD	spatial domain near the landmark
ATTR	attributive
AUX	auxiliary
COM	comitative
COMP	complementizer
CONT	spatial domain on the surface of the landmark
CVB	converb
DAT	dative
DIST	distal demonstrative
DOWN	direction downwards
EGO	egophoric
ERG	ergative
ESS	essive, static location in a spatial domain
EL	elative, motion from a spatial domain
F	feminine
FUT	future

H	human
HPL	human plural
IPFV	imperfective
IN	spatial domain inside a (hollow) landmark
INTER	spatial domain between multiple landmarks
LAT	lative, motion into a spatial domain
M	masculine
MED	medial demonstrative
MNR	manner
N	neuter
NF	non-feminine
NPL	non-human plural
OBL	oblique
ORD	ordinal numeral
OUT	motion from inside the landmark
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
PST	past
PV	preverb
R	borrowing from Russian
RE	refactive
SIMIL	similative
SUP	spatial domain on the horizontal surface of the landmark
UP	direction upwards

References

Anderson & Keenan 1985 — Anderson S. R., Keenan E. L. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, vol. 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Deixis. Shopen T. (ed.). Cambridge, 1985, 259–308.

Ariel 1990 — Ariel M. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London, 1990.

Boersma & Weenink 2023 — Boersma P., Weenink D. *Praat: Doing Phonetics by Computer* [computer program]. Version 6.4.58, 2023. URL: <https://www.fon.hum.uva.nl/praat/>

Chafe 1980 — Chafe W. *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1980.

Daniel 2015 — Daniel M. Logophoric reference in Archi. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 88, 2015: 202–219.

Diessel 1999 — Diessel H. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, 1999.

Dobrushina 2019 — Dobrushina N. The language and people of Mehweb. *The Mehweb Language: Essays on Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*. Daniel M., Dobrushina N., Ganenkov D. (eds.). Berlin, 2019, 39–72.

Dobrushina et al. 2017 — Dobrushina N., Staferova D., Belokon A. (eds.). *Atlas of Multilingualism in Dagestan Online*. Linguistic Convergence Laboratory, HSE, 2017. URL: <https://multidagestan.com>

Ganenkov 2019 — Ganenkov D. Case and agreement in Mehweb. *The Mehweb Language: Essays on Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*. Daniel M., Dobrushina N., Ganenkov D. (eds.). Berlin, 2019, 189–234.

Ganenkov et al. 2009 — Ganenkov D., Maisak T., Merdanova S. Diskursivnaja anafora v agulskom jazyke [Discourse anaphora in Agul]. *NeFestschrift: Statji v podarok (k jubileju A. Ye. Kibrika)*, 2009. URL: http://otipl.philol.msu.ru/~kibrik/content/pdf/Ganenkov_etal.pdf (In Russ.)

Givón 1983 — Givón T. *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam, 1983.

Kibrik 2011 — Kibrik A. A. *Reference in Discourse*. Oxford, 2011.

Lakoff 1974 — Lakoff R. Remarks on this and that. *Berkeley Studies in Syntax and Semantics*. Fillmore C. J., Lakoff G., Lakoff R. (eds.). Berkeley, 1974.

Ljutikova 2001 — Ljutikova E. A. Anaphoricheskije sredstva [Anaphoric means]. *Bagvalinskij jazyk [Bagvalal language]*. Kibrik A. E. (ed.). Moscow, 2001, 615–702. (In Russ.)

Magometov 1982 — Magometov A. A. *Megebskij dialekt darginskogo jazyka: Issledovanie i teksty* [The Mehweb dialect of Dargwa: Study and texts]. Tbilisi, 1982. (In Russ.)

Maxmudova 2002 — Maxmudova S. M. *Grammaticheskiye klassy slov i grammaticheskije kategorii rutul'skogo jazyka* [Grammatical Word Classes and Grammatical Categories of the Rutul Language]. Makhachkala, 2002. (In Russ.)

Mukhin & Nasledskova 2025 — Mukhin T., Nasledskova P. Demonstrative pronouns in Kina Rutul. *Studies in Language*, 2025, 49(2): 456–477.

Næss et al. 2020 — Næss Å., Margetts A., Treis Y. Introduction: Demonstratives in discourse. *Demonstratives in Discourse (Topics at the Grammar-Discourse Interface 6)*. Næss Å., Margetts A., Treis Y. (eds.). Berlin, 2020, 1–21.

Schulze 2003 — Schulze W. The Diachrony of Demonstrative Pronouns in East Caucasian. *Current Trends in Caucasian, East European and Inner Asian Linguistics*. Holisky D. A., Tuite K. (eds.). Amsterdam, 2003, 291–348.

Schulze 2008 — Schulze W. Deictic Strategies in Udi. *Udin'skiy sbornik: grammatika, leksika, istoriya yazyka* [Udi Collection: Grammar, Lexicon, History of the Language]. Alekseev M. E., Maisak T. A. (eds.). Moscow, 2008, 241–310.

Sosenskaja 1999 — Sosenskaja T. B. Mestoimenija [Pronouns]. *Elementy tsakhurskogo jazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii* [Elements of the Tsakhur language in typological perspective], Kibrik A. E. (ed.). Moscow, 1999, 129–152. (In Russ.)

Testeleets & Toldova 1998 — Testeleets Ya. G., Toldova S. Yu. Refleksivnyje mestoimenija v dagestanskih jazykah i tipologiya refleksiva [Reflexive pronouns in Dagestani languages and reflexive typology]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 1998, 4: 35–57. (In Russ.)

Toldova 1999 — Toldova S. Yu. Mestoimjonnyje sredstva podderzhanija referentsyji [Pronominal means of maintaining reference]. *Elementy tsakhurskogo jazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii* [Elements of the Tsakhur language in typological perspective], Kibrik A. E. (ed.). Moscow, 1999, 629–673. (In Russ.)