A Semantic Study of Tsou Case Markers*

Elizabeth Zeitoun

Tsou (also known as Northern Tsou) differs from the other Formosan languages in having developed a complex system of case markers — divided into two sets: nominative (ʔe, si, ta, na) and oblique (ta, to, no) — which "localize" an object in relation to the speaker/hearer. Traditionally, they are classified according to the following parameters: proximity, visibility and definiteness.

It is our purpose to examine in the present paper the system of Tsou case markers, focalizing our attention on the semantic level.

We first present briefly the structure of the language as well as the syntactic properties of case markers. After having shown the limits of Tung's (1964) analysis, we argue that the speaker adjusts or calculates the position of the object (referred to) in relation to the "here-me-now" of the speech situation. Such an analysis enables us to account for a large range of data. It also enables us to account for (1) the possible and impossible substitutions of case markers with one another and (2) the permissible and non-permissible co-occurrences of case markers with aspectual particles.

* This paper represents a revised version of the last chapter of my MA thesis (1992). We would like to thank Li Jen-kuei, Randy LaPolla, Søren Egerod and Liliane Huang for their comments on an earlier version of this paper — they should not, however, be held responsible for any remaining error — as well as our main informant, Wang Ming-hui for sharing his linguistic intuitions with us.
Introduction

Tsou\textsuperscript{1} is an Austronesian\textsuperscript{2} language spoken in the Southwest of Taiwan. It includes three dialects that are geographically distributed as follows: the Tapangu and the Tfuea\textsuperscript{3} dialects are spoken in villages situated in the district of Alishan (Chia-yi county); the Duhtu dialect is spoken in only one village, located in the district of Hsin-yi (Nantou county).\textsuperscript{4}

While Tsou phonology has been well studied (see Tung, 1964; Ho, 1976; Tsuchida, 1976), many syntactic and semantic aspects of the language are still poorly understood and it is still widely acknowledged that Tung’s descriptive study (op.cit.) represents by far the most comprehensive grammar of the language.

Tsou patterns like other Formosan and extra-Formosan languages (e.g. Atayal, Amis, Bunun, Tagalog) in having a nominal case marking system cross-referenced on the verb, i.e., full NPs are preceded by case markers; the semantic role of the NP selected as the subject of the sentence is (morphologically) marked on the verb by means of an affix. It differs from these languages, however, in having developed a complex (and interrelated) system of auxiliaries and case markers which do not only encode syntactic relations but also contain semantic information.

\textsuperscript{1} Tsou is also known as Northern Tsou, by opposition to Saaroa and Kanakanavu referred to as Southern Tsou.

\textsuperscript{2} The Austronesian family includes a variety of languages spoken not only in Taiwan but also in inland southern Vietnam, Madagascar, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

\textsuperscript{3} Our data is based on this dialect. It was collected at different times in 1991-1992.

\textsuperscript{4} See Li (1979) for a study of the phonological variations found in these dialects.
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In this paper, we will examine the nominal case marking system of Tsou. More specifically, we will show how a semantic study can account for the syntactic distribution of case markers in that language. For the sake of clarity, we will first present a brief account of the structure of the language.

1. Preliminary remarks

We will first deal with Tsou sentential word order before examining the structure of clauses as well as that of noun phrases.

1.1. Word order

Tsou is a verb-initial language. Though word order is relatively free in ditransitive sentences, the permutation of two NPs in monotransitive sentences may either lead to the reinterpretation of the sentence in question as in (2b) or to its ungrammaticality as in (2a). A comparison of (1) and (2) shows that as a rule, the subject (or so-called focused NP\(^5\)) occurs clause-finally, except when followed by spatio-temporal adjuncts.

(1) a. [mo bont ]v [to tacimt ]o [?o amo]s (maitan?e)\(^6\)
   AF eat Obl banana Nm father (today)
   ‘Father ate a banana (today)’

---

5 We follow the conventional usage in using the term ‘focus’ instead of ‘topic’ as others do. It must be understood (here) as referring to the syntactic and semantic relationship established between a predicate and the NP which surfaces as the subject of the sentence (see our discussion below).

6 In our examples, b and d stand for the implosives [ɓ] and [ɗ] respectively. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: Adv: Adverb, AF: Agent Focus, Asp: Aspectual particle, Itr: Iterative, NAF: Non-Agent Focus, Neg: Negation, Nm: Nominative, Obl: Oblique.
b. [i-si ana]v [to amo]o [ʔo tací ml]s (maitanʔe)
NAF eat Obl father Nm banana (today)
'The banana has been eaten by father (today)'

(2) a. * [mo bon|]v [ʔo amo]s [to tací ml]o
AF eat Obl father Nm banana

b. [i-si ana]v [ʔo tací ml to amo]s
NAF eat Nom banana Obl father
'Father's banana has been eaten'

Besides word order, two major syntactic devices — the morphological case marking on the verb and on the noun — fulfill the grammatical coding of the subject in Tsou: the semantic role of the NP selected as the focus of the clause is (morphologically) marked on the verb by means of an affix. The peculiarity of this ‘focus system’ lies in the fact that any NP, whatever its semantic role (e.g. agent, theme, locative, instrument ...) or its syntactic function, may be promoted to subject position. On that basis, we can roughly distinguish two kinds of constructions: in the first, the agent is viewed as the focus of the clause (A(gent) F(ocus) construction). In the second, any other NP can be promoted as subject (N(on)-A(gent) F(ocus) construction), the affix on the verb determining its semantic role (either theme/patient, source/goal/locative or instrument...). This dichotomy is illustrated in (1a)-(1b) above. In Tsou, nominal case marking is obligatory, in other (Formosan) languages it is either optional or non-existent.

1.2. The clause

Tsou differs from the other Formosan languages in that it has developed a complex system of preverbs. The term ‘preverb’ actually refers to different types of particles (e.g. aspecectual markers, modal adverbs and auxiliaries) which occur before the verb in a determined word order. A comparison of
(3a-c) shows that only auxiliaries are obligatory. They usually occur clause-initially.

(3) a. oʔa moso sʔa da etamaku ?o ohaeva
   Neg AF Adv Asp smoke Nm younger sibling
   ‘My younger brother/sister never smoked’

b. * oʔa ʔsʔa da etamaku ?o ohaeva
   Neg Adv Asp smoke Nm younger sibling

c. moso etamaku ?o ohaeva
   AF smoke Nm younger sibling
   ‘My younger brother smoked/was smoking’

Auxiliaries fall into two distinct classes:

(1) some occur only in AF constructions (mio, moso, mi-, mo(h)-), or NAF constructions (i-, o(h)-), while

(2) others occur either in AF or NAF constructions (te, tena, ta, nte, nto, da).

We will first state briefly their syntactic distribution before turning our attention to their semantic function.

From a syntactic point of view, we follow Starosta (1988) in assuming that auxiliaries represent the head of their clause: they can be followed by aspectual markers (cʔu/cu ‘already’, nʔa ‘still’ etc ...) and various adverbs; they can be negated and pronominal clitics must be attached to them. As an illustration, consider (4).

(4) oʔa moh-ta sʔa da ahtuʔ etamaku
   Neg AF-3sg Adv Asp never smoke
   ‘He never smoked’

From a semantic point of view, auxiliaries can be divided according to

---

7 Note that constituents translated as durative and frequentative time adverbs in English function as verbs in Tsou. For a detailed discussion, see Zeitoun (1992: 188-89).
whether they carry temporal/aspectual or modal information. Those belonging to the first group (see the distinction made above) carry temporal and aspectual information. Temporally, *mi*- and *i*- indicate that the events they determine have (still) a certain relevance at Speech time (Immediacy) whereas *mo(h)*- and *o(h)*- locate them in the past (Remoteness), i.e., there is a disconnection (or rupture) between the Event time and the Speech time. Aspectually, with *mi*- and *mo(h)*- situations are viewed as on going at Speech time/Reference time (Imperfective aspect) while with *i*-, *o(h)*- they are envisaged as completed (Perfective aspect). (5) and (6) illustrate this contrast.

(5) a. *mi-ta mimo ta emi*
   AF-3sg drink Obl wine
   ‘He is drinking wine’

   b. *i-ta ima si emi*
   NAF-3sg drink Nm wine
   ‘He has drunk wine’

(6) a. *moh-ta mimo to emi*
   AF-3sg drink Obl wine
   ‘He drank/was drinking wine ...’

   b. *oh-ta ima ?o emi*
   NAF-3sg drink Nm wine
   ‘He had drunk wine’

*Da* refers to the scanning of a class of situations (Iterative/Generic) and by extension to the characteristic of the agent/actor of the sentence (7) while *te, tena, nte* and *nто* can be respectively analysed as deontic and epistemic modals.

(7) *da-ta etamaku*

   Itr-3sg smoke

   ‘He smokes’
1.3. The noun phrase

As mentioned above, Tsou case markers fall into two distinct classes: the nominative case markers ( rè, si, ta, ṭo, na) precede the focused NP, while the oblique case markers (ta, to, no) precede any other NP. They present the following characteristics:

(1) They occur before any simple (8a) or complex (8b) NPs.

(8) a. i-si cobaka ta ino si av?u
   NAF-3sg beat Obl mother Nm dog
   ‘The dog has (just) been beaten by mother’

   b. mo erhova ?e psoevohṣu ci mcoo ta ino?-?u
      AF blue Nm beautiful Rel eyes Obl mother-1sgGen
      ‘The beautiful eyes of my mother are blue’

As a rule, they are obligatory, though with a very restricted class of verbs (eaa ‘have’, mihia 8 ‘buy’), the presence of a case marker produces an ungrammatical sentence. Compare (9)-(10):

(9) a. o?a te-?o mihino to tposi
      Neg will-1sg buy Obl books
      ‘I don’t want to/won’t buy books’

   b. * o?a te-?o mihino Ø tposi
      Neg will-1sg buy Ø books

8 The verb ‘buy’ has the following three inflections:
  mihino, used in AF constructions; mihina and mihia, both used in NAF constructions. A Comparison of (a) and (b) below shows that it is only when a noun follows mihia that it cannot be preceded by a case marker. This syntactic constraint is still ill-understood.

(i) a. i-?o mihia Ø tposi
      NAF-1sg buy Ø book
      I have bought book

   b. *i-?o mihia si tposi
      NAF-1sg buy Obl book
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(10) a. o? a mi-? o s? a eaa Ø oko
    Neg AF-1sg Adv have Ø child
    'I don't have any child'

b. * o? a mi-? o s? a eaa si oko
    Neg AF-1sg Adv have Nm child

(2) In complex NPs, oblique case markers occur in complementary distribution with the nominalizer ci: ta, to or no occur between two nouns while ci occurs between a predicate and a noun. Compare (11a)-(11b):

(11) a. mcoo to ino
    eye Obl mother
    'the eyes of mother'

b. eghova ci mcoo
    blue Rel eye
    'blue eyes'

Having outlined the structure of Tsou, let us now concentrate on the semantic functions of the case markers just mentioned above.

2. Tsou case markers: a semantic approach

We first review Tung's analysis and show that though it is fundamentally correct, it misses a number of generalizations. We then argue that the (whole) speech act situation (which includes three parameters, Speech location, Speech time and Speech act participants) must be taken into account to explain the distribution of Tsou case markers.

2.1. Comments on Tung's (1964) analysis
In his (1964) publication, Tung suggests that (1) Tsou case markers localize the objects referred to with respect to the speaker and the addressee, (2) they should be classified according to the following parameters:
proximity, visibility and definiteness. Below, we reproduce partially the table proposed by Tung (p. 147).

Table 1: A classification of Tsou case markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Nominative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being seen by the speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and the hearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>near</td>
<td>?e</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not being seen by both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but having been seen by the speaker</td>
<td>?o</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and having not been seen by the speaker</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples illustrate the above table:

(12) a. mo boni ta tacimti ?e oko  
     AF eat Obl banana Nm child  
     ‘This child is eating a banana’

b. mo boni ta tacimti si oko  
     AF eat Obl banana Nm child  
     ‘That child is eating a banana’

c. mo boni ta tacimti ta oko  
     AF eat Obl banana Nm child  
     ‘That child (over there) is eating a banana’

d. mo boni to tacimti ?o oko  
     AF eat Obl banana Nm child  
     ‘The child (unseen) is/was eating a banana’

e. mo boni no tacimti na oko  
     AF eat Obl banana Nm child  
     ‘A child is/was eating a banana’

(1) A brief comparison of (12a-e) shows that the co-occurrence of
different case markers with the same auxiliary infers on the meaning of the whole utterance. Compare (12a-c)-(12d) and (12d)-(12e).

(2) Table 1 suggests that there exists an agreement in ‘visibility’ and/or ‘definiteness’ between the nominative and oblique case markers (e.g. if the focused NP is marked by ƙe, si or ta then it seems that the non-focused NP should be preceded by ta).

In complex NPs, there exists such an agreement; however, two distinct NPs may be followed by different case markers (e.g. ƙe and to). Compare the (13b) and (14b).

(13) a. mo eghova ƙe psoevoŋŋu ci mcoo ta ino-ƙu

AF blue Nm beautiful Rel eyes Obl mother-1sg-Gen
‘The beautiful eyes of my mother are blue’

b. *mo eghova ƙe psoevoŋŋu ci mcoo to ino-ƙu

AF blue Nm beautiful Rel eyes Obl mother-1sg-Gen

(14) a. moso eobako ta oko ƙe ino

AF beat Obl child Nm mother
‘This mother/Mother beat the child’

b. moso eobako to oko ƙe ino

AF beat Obl child Nm mother
‘The mother (seen) beat the child (unseen)’

(3) Tung argues that (a) if an NP is preceded by ƙe, si or ta, it indicates that the object referred to is being ‘seen’ by both the speaker and the addressee — note that his analysis presupposes that they are standing side by side and face the object in question — and that (b) if an NP is preceded by ƙo, to, it has not been ‘seen’ by the addressee (i.e. it is thus ‘unknown’ to him). His analysis cannot account for the following examples, though. It
incorrectly predicts that (15b) is grammatical and (16) ill-formed.

(15) a. os-?o\textsuperscript{9} tadi a \ ?e ino-?u
    NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen
    ‘I have thought about my mother’

    b. * i-su \ tadi a \ ?e ino-su
    NAF-2sg think about Nm mother-2sgGen

(16) os-?o \ aiti ?o \ oko-su
    NAF-1sg see Nm child-2sgGen
    ‘I have seen your child’

In order to give a unified treatment of Tsou case markers, it seems that we first have to resolve the apparent contradiction lying in the use of ‘only’ three oblique case markers (ta, to, no) while nominative case markers are ‘so’ numerous (\textit{ze}, si, ta, \textit{zo}, na).

Below, we will try to show that:

(1) there exists a dichotomy between \textit{ze}, si, ta, \textit{zo}, ta, to on the one hand and na and no on the other. The former may be characterized as referential, the latter as non-referential.

(2) with the exception of na and no, nominative and oblique case markers can be (semantically) divided into a binary system: \textit{ze}, si, ta (Nm), ta (Obl) ‘here (visible)’ are opposed to \textit{zo}, to ‘there (invisible)’. This correlates the deictic system of Tsou (cf. \textit{tan}\textit{ze} here, this’ vs. \textit{ta}\textit{ze} ‘there, that (± vis)’) and corresponds respectively to the internal/external sphere of the speaker.

(3) \textit{ze}, si, ta (Nm, Obl) can be further divided into two subgroups: \textit{ze} (Nm), ta (Obl) vs. si/ta (Nm). To fully understand this dichotomy, the location of the speaker with regard to the addressee must be taken into account.

\textsuperscript{9} In the first person (singular), os- is another variant of i-.
If our analysis is correct, it implies that the concept of Time (Immediacy vs. Remotness) parallels that of Space (Internal vs. External sphere of the speaker).

2.2. Referential case markers

Based on the syntactic distribution of the case markers, i.e., their (non)-permissible permutation with one another and their (im)possible co-occurrence with various kinds of preverbs, we will try to prove in this section the validity of the assumptions just mentioned above.

2.2.1. Internal sphere of the speaker: Ṛe(Nm), ta (Obl) vs. si(Nm)/ta (Nm, Obl)

Let us first consider the following examples ((17a-c)=(12a-c)) in which Ṛe, si and ta can substitute for each other.

(17) a. mo bonî ta tacîmî Ṛe oko
       AF eat  Obl banana Nm child
       ‘This child is eating a banana’

       b. mo bonî ta tacîmî si oko
       AF eat  Obl banana Nm child
       ‘That child is eating a banana’

       c. mo bonî ta tacîmî ta oko
       AF eat  Obl banana Nm child
       ‘That child (over there) is eating a banana’

These sentences slightly differ in meaning: in (17a), the speaker points to a child who is located near him; while in (17b-c), he designates a child located at a further distance. The speaker and the addressee may stand side by side, in which case the relation just mentioned holds true; they may face each other or be away from one another, in which case the child in question will be located near the addressee (by opposition to the speaker), as in (21b) or away from both as in (21c).
Based on our foregoing discussion, it seems that the system of definite case markers function according to a four way distinction, i.e. according to the proximal, medial, distal (but still visible), distal (and invisible) location of the object referred to with respect to the Speech act participants. Such an analysis would lead us to make incorrect predictions, however.

Consider first the following pairs of examples:

(18) a. i-ʔɔ tɑ̌ɬa ʔe ʔənɔʔu
     NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen
     ‘I have thought about my mother’

     b. * i-ʔɔ tɑ̌ɬa si ʔənɔʔu
     NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen

     c. * i-ʔɔ tɑ̌ɬa ta ʔənɔʔu
     NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen

     d. i-ʔɔ tɑ̌ɬa ʔo ʔənɔʔu
     NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen
     ‘I have thought about my mother’

If the above mentioned analysis was correct, how could we account for the occurrence of ʔe with the verb tɑ̌ɬa ‘think of/think about’ which entails the absence of the object referred to at Speech time while si and ta yields ungrammatical utterances?

A comparison of (19)-(20) shows that when the speaker and the addressee are viewed as a disjoint reference (i.e. they are not identified one with the other either spatially or metaphorically), the use of ʔe renders the sentence ungrammatical.

(19) a. i-ʔɔ tɑ̌ɬa ʔe ʔənɔʔu
     NAF-1sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen
     ‘I have thought about my mother’

     b. * i-su tɑ̌ɬa ʔe ʔənɔ-su
     NAF-2sg think about Nm mother-2sgGen
(20) a. i-su  tadi'a  ?o ino-su  
NAF-2sg think about Nm mother-2sgGen
'You have thought about your mother'

b. i-su  tadi'a  ?e ino-?u  
NAF-2sg think about Nm mother-1sgGen
'You have thought about my mother'

In (19b), the possessive pronoun su 'your' indicates a disconnection between the speaker and the NP ino (speaker vs. addressee), while the use of ?e points toward their identification; as a consequence, the utterance is ungrammatical. Only ?o — which marks a rupture between the referent and the speaker — can occur in the sentence. In (20b), the use of the possessive pronoun ?u 'my' gives back its well-formedness to the utterance because the addressee is identified with the speaker.

In (21), the use of the oblique case marker ta is ambiguous in that it may either refer to an object belonging to the speaker (by opposition to the addressee) or located somewhere around the speaker and the addressee.

(21) mi-ko mihino ta tposi  
AF-2sg buy Obl book
'Have you bought this/that book?'

We have shown that the speaker and the addressee may or may not be identified spatially/metaphorically. Their location with respect to one another infers on the use of ?e, si and ta (Nm/Obl): if the speaker and the addressee are viewed as a conjoint reference, then ?e, si, ta (Nm/Obl) can be substituted and refer to the Spatial location of the referent with respect to the speech participants. If the speaker and the addressee are regarded as a disjoint reference, ?e — which refer to the location of the speaker — will be used by opposition to si and ta (Nm).
We turn now to a brief account of ṭo and to, in contrast with ḍe, si and ta.

2.2.2. ṭo (Nm) and to (Obl): external sphere of /to the speaker

It has been observed that both ṭo and to belong to a sphere external to that of the speaker. They indicate a rupture in terms of space and time. Our analysis is further supported by the following pairs of examples:

(22) a. da-ta huhucmasi boni to tacīmī
    Itr-3sg everyday eat Obl banana
    'He eats a banana everyday'

    b. * da-ta huhucmasi boni ta tacīmī
       Itr-3sg everyday eat Obl banana

(23) a. da-ta kaebi boni to huvō
    Frq-3sg happy eat Obl orange
    'He likes eating oranges'

    b. * da-ta kaebi boni ta huvō
       Frq-3sg happy eat Obl orange

(24) a. o?a moh-ta s?a da ahtu etamaku to tamaku
    Neg AF-3sg Adv Asp never smoke Obl cigarette
    'He never smoked cigarettes'

    b. * o?a moh-ta s?a da ahtu etamaku ta tamaku
       Neg AF-3sg Adv Asp never smoke Obl cigarette

da functions as an auxiliary in (22)-(23), and as an aspectual marker in (24). Both\textsuperscript{10} da\textsubscript{1} and da\textsubscript{2} indicate a rupture with the Speech time: da\textsubscript{1} refers to the scanning of a class of occurrences or by implication to the characteristic of the agent of a given sentence while da\textsubscript{2} locates events in the past. However, both have aoristic proprieties (i.e. they indicate a rupture with Speech time). As a consequence, in each example, to (but not ta)

\textsuperscript{10} For a justification of this dichotomy, see Zeitoun (1992: 51-56)
can co-occur with *da.

Our analysis accounts also for the ungrammaticality of (25b) and for the semantic variation yielded by the substitution of ta by to in (26b).

(25) a. mi-ʔo nʔa boni ta tacimí
    AF-1sg Asp eat Obl banana
    ‘I’m eating a banana’

b. *mi-ʔo nʔa boni to tacimí
    AF-1sg Asp eat Obl banana
    ‘I’m eating a banana’

(26) a. mi-ʔo cu boni ta tacimí
    AF-1sg Asp eat Obl banana
    ‘I have been eating a banana’

b. mi-ʔo cu boni to tacimí
    AF-1sg Asp eat Obl banana
    ‘I have eaten a banana’

In (25), the aspectual marker nʔa refers to an on-going action. To cannot co-occur with nʔa because it refers to an object located outside the (spatial/communicative) sphere of the speaker.

In (26b), both ta and to can co-occur with cu. Cu is a marker of perfect: it indicates an anteriority (i.e. the event referred to is prior to the time of Speech or to the point taken as Referent time). It also indicates that the event in question (or its result) is still relevant at that time (i.e. Resultant state). It doesn’t enable us to determine whether the situation is past and completed or still on-going. Such an interpretation is implied by the presence of other constituents (e.g. case markers). In (26a), the use of ta indicates that the banana is still being eaten at Speech time while that of to makes the addressee understand that it has already been eaten (Resultant state) in (26b).
Our analysis further accounts for the semantic variations found in the following pair of examples.

(27) a. moso ebako ta oko ?e/si/ta ino
    AF    beat Obl child Nm    mother
   ‘The mother beat the child’ (Both are seen at speech time)

   b. moso ebako to oko ?o ino
    AF    beat Obl child Nm    mother
   ‘The mother beat the child’ (Both are unseen at speech time)

In both examples, *moso* indicates a disconnection between Speech time and the Event time. However, we are able to (correctly) predict that the use of *?e, si, ta* (Obl, Nm) in (27a) entails the presence of both the mother and the child at Speech time while the use of *?o* and *to* in (27b) implies their absence.

Let’s turn now to a treatment of *no* and *na*.

2.3. A unified treatment of no and na

In this section, we demonstrate that both *no* and *na* carry the same semantic function: they both refer to the scanning of a class of elements, the speaker refusing or being unable to pick up any element of this class, by opposition to *?o* and *to*, which indicate that an element of the class has been extracted (i.e., it is identified at least by the speaker). This hypothesis is supported by the following arguments:

(1) A comparison of (28)-(29) and (30)-(31) shows that *na* and *no* do refer to the extraction of (at least) one element of a class but that this element is not / cannot be identified by the speaker. Hence, *no* and *na* cannot co-occur with the possessive pronouns *?u ‘my’ and su ‘your’.
(28) a. mo mọsi ?e oko
   AF cry Nm child
   'This child is crying'

   b. mo mọsi ?e oko-su
   AF cry Nm child-2sgGen
   'Your child is crying'

(29) a. mo mọsi na oko
   AF cry Nm child
   'A child is crying'

   b. * mo mọsi na oko-su
   AF cry Nm child-2sgGen

(30) a. mcoo ta ino
    eye Obl mother
    'the mother's (seen by the speaker/addressee) eyes'

   b. mcoo ta ino-?u
    eye Obl mother-1sgGen
    'my mother's eyes'

(31) a. mcoo no ino
    eye Obl mother
    'a(ny) mother's eyes'

   b. * mcoo no ino-?u
    eye Obl mother-1sgGen

In (32), however, no can co-occur with the possessive pronoun si 'his' because the NP amo 'father' is contextually left undetermined, the father in question being unknown to the speaker.

(32) i-si aiti no amo-si
    NAF-3sg see Obl father-3sgGen
    'He is seen (=looked at ) by his father

(2) both no and na are used in interrogative sentences (i.e. the speaker scans a whole class of elements but being unable to pick up any element, he then asks the addressee to designate the right element), their substitution

— 986 —
with other case markers yielding ungrammatical sentences. Compare (33)-(34). They occur in complementary distribution: *na* appears in NAF constructions (33a) whereas *no* occurs in AF constructions (34b).

(33) a. cuma na i-si ana ta oko
    what Nm NAF-3sg eat Obl child
    ‘What has the child (just) eaten?’

    b. mo boni no cuma si oko
    AF eat Obl what Nm child
    ‘What is that child eating?’

(34) a. *cuma ?e/si/ta/?o i-si ana ta oko
    what Nm NAF-3sg eat Obl child
    ‘What has the child (just) eaten?’

    b. *mo boni ta/to cuma si oko
    AF eat Obl what Nm child
    ‘What is that child eating?’

**Conclusion**

In this paper, we have tried to show that case markers in Tsou not only fulfill a grammatical function but also function as deictics. We argued that in order to give a unified account of this system different factors (Speech time, Speech place and Speech act participants) had to be taken into consideration.
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