

## Procedural encoding of expressivity: The case of the Tunisian Arabic demonstrative *ha-NP*

Amel Khalfaoui  
University of Oklahoma  
[amel.khalifaoui@ou.edu](mailto:amel.khalifaoui@ou.edu)

### ملخص

تحدّد الدراسات السابقة لاسمي الإشارة التقريبيين في العربية التونسية هو *هنا* استخدامًا يقدّم فيه كلا الشكلين كيانًا نشطًا في ذاكرة المخاطب القصيرة المدى ، لكن هذه الدراسات لم تقدّم تفسيرًا للقيود الإضافية التي تحدّد أيّ من اسمي الإشارة يجب على المخاطب اختياره. استنادًا إلى دراسة تجمع بين تحليل مجموعة من النصوص المكتوبة والمسموعة مدعّمة بأدلة قادمة من دراسة استبيان، تجادل هذه الورقة بأن ما يميّز *هنا* عن *هنا* هو أن الأول يتضمّن دلالات عن الموقف التعبيري للمخاطب. من ناحية أخرى فإن *هنا* هو اسم إشارة ذو وظائف نموذجية متنوعة. تقدّم الورقة شرحًا عمليًا للاختيار بين اسمي الإشارة من منظور البراغماتية اللغوية.

### Abstract

Previous accounts of the two Tunisian Arabic proximate demonstratives *ha-NP* and NP *ha:ða* identify a use in which both forms introduce an activated entity in the discourse, but do not provide an explanation for the further restrictions guiding the choice of which one of the two forms to use. Based on a study that combines corpus analysis complemented by evidence coming from native speakers' acceptability judgments, this paper argues that what distinguishes the prenominal *ha-NP* from the postnominal NP *ha:ða* is that the former encodes a procedure which constructs a higher-level explicature obtained by embedding the proposition expressed under a propositional attitude. The demonstrative NP *ha:ða*, on the other hand, is an unmarked demonstrative with a variety of typical demonstrative functions. The paper provides a pragmatic explanation for the choice between the two demonstratives from a relevance-theoretic perspective.

**Keywords:** expressive demonstratives, higher-level explicature, procedural meaning, Relevance Theory, proximate demonstratives, discourse analysis, Tunisian Arabic, evaluative language

## 1. Introduction

Tunisian Arabic (TA) has two proximate demonstrative determiners: the reduced prenominal *ha*-NP and the postnominal NP *ha:ða*. Previous accounts (Khalfaoui 2007; Gundel et al. 2010) analyzed the two TA demonstratives within the Givenness Hierarchy framework<sup>1</sup> (Gundel et al. 1993) and identified a use in which both forms introduce an activated (i.e., in working memory) entity in the discourse, but did not provide an explanation for the further restrictions guiding the choice of which one of the two forms to use. Based on a study that combines corpus analysis complemented by evidence coming from native speakers' acceptability judgments, this paper demonstrates that what distinguishes the prenominal *ha*-NP from the postnominal NP *ha:ða* is that the former is a highly marked demonstrative which signals an expressive meaning in the discourse. The paper argues that *ha*-NP encodes a procedure which constructs a higher level explicature obtained by embedding the proposition expressed under a description of a propositional attitude. The higher level explicature created by *ha*-NP informs the hearer that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the basic proposition expressed. An example of this expressive usage is given in (1). In this example, the speaker addresses a message to people who accuse some political parties of using religious discourse.

- (1) *ma:ðabijja fku:n j-warri:-ni hatta ʕifri:n*  
 want someone 3M-show-me even twenty  
*ʔaw θlaθi:n vi:dju min ha-n-nawʕ*  
 or thirty video of this-the-type  
*w kǎn ma lqa :-f j-ʕi:b-il-na wahda takfi ...*  
 and if NEG find.PST.3MSG-NEG 3M-bring-to-us one enough ...  
 'I would like for someone to show me even twenty or thirty videos of  
this type [of political discourse]; and if he cannot find [this number of videos],  
 one is enough.'

By choosing the demonstrative *ha*-NP, the speaker informs the readers that he has an emotional attitude toward the proposition 'some people could provide videos of this political discourse to prove their claim.' If we replace *ha*-NP with the non-expressive NP *ha:ða*, the

<sup>1</sup> The Givenness Hierarchy (Gundel et al. 1993) is a theoretical framework whose basic premise is that certain referring expressions encode information about the assumed cognitive status (i.e., memory and attention) of a referent for the addressee.

speaker may still achieve an expressive interpretation, but the demonstrative choice will not contribute to the expressivity of the utterance. The theoretical argument that *ha*-NP semantically encodes an expressive meaning is supported by evidence coming from a data corpus and questionnaire studies. The paper shows that a general theory of utterance interpretation such as Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1995) offers a pragmatic explanation for the choice between the two proximate demonstrative forms. By choosing *ha*-NP, the speaker explicitly and overtly informs the hearer of their intention to express an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed in order to achieve optimal relevance. In line with other studies (Lakoff 1974, Naruoka 2008; Bowdle and Ward 1995; Potts and Schwarz 2010; Davis and Potts 2010, Zaki 2012, and Acton and Potts 2014), this study argues for the existence of a class of expressive demonstratives. The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 I discuss previous work on expressive demonstratives; In Section 3 I give an overview of previous work on the TA proximate demonstratives discussed in this study; in Section 4 I propose a procedural analysis of the expressive demonstrative *ha*-NP; in Sections 5 and 6 I discuss the corpus and questionnaire studies designed to support the markedness and expressivity of *ha*-NP relative to NP *ha:ða*; in Section 7 I give a pragmatic explanation for the choice of the two demonstratives from a relevance-theoretic perspective. Concluding remarks are given in Section 8.

## 2. Expressive demonstratives cross-linguistically

Cantarino (1974-75) notes that demonstratives in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) can be used expressively. He points out that “although there is a strong tendency in Modern Arabic to use the demonstrative pronouns with the local meaning only, it still frequently happens that the demonstrative pronouns are used with the psychological standpoint in mind” (p.30). For example, he notes that the proximate demonstrative *ha:ða* (this) “is used for things that are considered more important or more closely related to the person speaking” (p.30). This expressive usage is illustrated in example (2), in which the speaker indicates the importance of the day under discussion.

- (2)    *la:    ja-ðkuru       li-ha:ða l-jawmi    fajʔan*  
          NEG 3M-remember to-this    the-day    thing  
          ‘He does not remember what day it was [the name of that day].’

Lakoff<sup>2</sup> (1974) argues that the English demonstratives *this* and *these* and the distal demonstratives *that* and *those* can have an emotional-deictic use that differs from their referential uses. She characterizes the meaning arising from this expressive use as “generally linked to the speaker’s emotional involvement in the subject matter of his utterance” (p. 347). For instance, in (3) the use of *that* establishes emotional solidarity between the speaker and the hearer by signaling that both participants in the conversation share the same view toward Kissinger.

(3) *That Henry Kissinger is something!*

Lakoff further notes that “if what is being attributed to Henry Kissinger is emotionally colorless *that* cannot be used in this sense” as shown in (4). Lakoff explains that unless being 5’8 tall is admirable or dreadful, expressive *that* is unacceptable in this sentence, because the subject matter of the utterance does not imply that the participants will react emotionally.

(4) *That Henry Kissinger is 5’8” tall.*

More recent work (e.g., Naruoka 2008; Potts and Schwarz 2010; Davis and Potts 2010; Zaki 2012, and Acton and Potts 2014) used corpora to provide evidence for the existence of a class of expressive demonstratives. Naruoka (2008) examines the variants *konna/sonna/anna* of the three Japanese demonstratives *ko-/so-/a-* in a corpus of informal family conversational data. She classifies these forms according to two categories: referential or referential and expressive. She suggests that this variation, unlike *kono/sono/ano* and *kore/sore/are*, has expressive usage since “it expresses the speaker’s emotion and at the same time indicates a referent. The emotions expressed with this variation are ‘negative emotion’ and ‘surprise’” (p. 435). Further, Naruoka explains that in addition to the use of expressive demonstratives, other types of evaluative language “such as intonation, the adjective attached to the expression, and sentence structure are involved in expressing the speaker’s emotion and attitude” (p. 442). For example, she notes that speakers use a non-canonical word order by postposing the demonstrative phrase when it occurs in subject position. She notes that “the non-canonical word order emphasizes the speaker’s emotion together with the choice of the demonstrative forms” (p.438). Naruoka contributes to research that supports the existence of expressive demonstratives and provides evidence from

---

<sup>2</sup> Some of the early works that also recognized the existence of expressive demonstratives are Lyons (1977) on ‘emphatic deixis’ and Fillmore (1982) on ‘social deixis.’

corpus analysis. However, she does not provide any semantic or pragmatic explanation for why these variants, unlike the other variants of the same demonstratives, have expressive meaning.

Zaki (2012) used a data corpus of MSA in order to investigate non-canonical syntactic structures other than the normal Demonstrative + NP structure and explained their behavior from a relevance-theoretic perspective. For example, Zaki points out that when a demonstrative occurs after a definite or a proper noun, its use is optional, and it can create rhetorical and expressive effects in the discourse. She argues that “the stylistic effect of emphasis which they give rise to can be explained in terms of relevant cognitive effects” (p.2). That is, the extra processing effort imposed by the demonstrative in such contexts instructs the hearer to look for extra pragmatic effects such as rhetorical effects or the speaker’s attitude toward the referent as shown in (5) and (6).

(5) *Ka:nat al-fikra ha:ðihi zadi :da li-l-ya:ja*

was the-idea *this* new very

‘This idea was very new.’

(6) *Kari:m ha:ða ʔayrab faxs fi fillati-na*

Karim *this* strangest person in group-our

‘This Kareem is the strangest person in our group.’

In (5) the use of the demonstrative which follows the definite noun creates a rhetorical effect, and in (6) the use of the demonstrative after the proper noun creates expressive effects into the discourse. Zaki points out that in (6), apart from creating an effect of emphasis, the use of the demonstrative “may be said to highlight the speaker's attitude towards a certain aspect of Kareem's personality, i.e., the mysterious aspect which makes him unpredictable to others” (pp. 244-5).

Potts and Schwarz (2010) examined the connection between the use of the demonstrative *this* and evaluative language in a corpus of informal short texts coming from product reviews in order to give evidence for the expressivity of the demonstrative *this*. The types of evaluative language they focused on are general markers of unusualness and surprise such as ‘*what a pleasure/disappointment!*’ and intensifiers such as ‘*wow*’ and ‘*totally*’. Results of their study indicate that the expressive demonstrative *this* and evaluative language occur together more frequently in the one-star and five-star reviews which are full of emotional language than in the two-star to the four-star range which “offer more nuanced opinions, balancing the good and the

bad” (p.16). They point out that “what emerges is a distributional affinity, across these ratings, between clear markers of exclamation and *this*[...]. We thus obtain evidence for Lakoff’s (1974) proposed link between *this* and exclamation, a connection that is unsurprising given the more general correlation between affective uses and evaluativity” (p. 5).

Similarly, Davis and Potts (2010) note that the choice of the morpho-syntactically complex demonstratives instead of the definite articles in online product reviews generate expressive effects. They explain that this finding is the result of a competition between marked meanings and unmarked meanings in the sense of Horn’s division of pragmatic labor (Horn, 1984). That is, “the morpho-syntactically complex, relatively infrequent (marked) demonstratives associate with the emotionally deictic (marked) messages”, while “the definite article plays the unmarked role for form and meaning” (p. 40). A similar study is conducted by Acton and Potts (2014) who examined a corpus of TV interviews to show that former Alaska Governor, Sarah Palin, uses demonstratives to introduce new referents in the discourse more frequently than the other female and male guests. They explain that such use is marked, because when the “demonstrative is morpho-syntactically unnecessary for the purposes of securing reference, it may, by Gricean principles (Grice 1975), come off as especially affective” (p.8).

### **3. Previous accounts of the TA proximate demonstratives and goal of the current study**

Tunisian Arabic (TA)<sup>3</sup> has two proximate demonstrative determiners: the reduced prenominal *ha*-NP and the postnominal NP *ha:ða*. According to Holes (2004), proximate demonstratives in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) and Classical Arabic (CLA) consist of two elements: the prefix *ha*-, which is a proximate marker, and the deictic core *-ða*, which is marked for number and gender. In addition, the typical use of the proximate demonstrative in MSA/CLA is prenominal (e.g., *ha:ða l-kita:b* ‘this book’). Holes indicates that the different Arabic dialects show a variety of morpho-syntactic differences. For example, in some of these dialects only a reduced form of *ha:ða*, *ha*-, is used, and in other dialects both the full form and a reduced form are used. Of particular interest here is that TA has both the full form of *ha:ða* which, unlike in MSA/CLA, occurs postnominally, as well as an invariant reduced form *ha*-NP which occurs

---

<sup>3</sup> It is beyond the scope of this paper to give an overview of the structure of Tunisian Arabic. Some of the works that give descriptive analyses of its linguistic structure are Ritt-Benmimoun (2017), Saada 1967, Stumme (1896), Talmoudi 1980 a & b, and Gibson (1998).

prenominally. The morpho-syntactic features of the two demonstrative forms are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Tunisian Arabic proximate demonstrative determiners

	Singular feminine	Singular masculine	Plural feminine	Plural masculine
<i>ha-NP</i>	<i>ha-l-bnajja</i>	<i>ha-l-wlid</i> <sup>4</sup>	<i>ha-l-bna:t</i>	<i>ha-l-wla:d</i>
	this-the-girl	this-the-boy	this-the-girls	this-the-boys
	‘this girl’	‘this boy’	‘these girls’	‘these boys’
<i>NP ha:ða</i>	<i>l-bnajja ha:ði</i>	<i>l-wlid ha:ða</i>	<i>l-bna:t ha:ðum</i>	<i>l-wla:d ha:ðum</i>
	the-girl this	the-boy this	the-girls these	the-boys these
	‘this girl’	‘this boy’	‘these girls’	‘these boys’

As shown in Table 1, the prenominal demonstrative determiner *ha-NP* does not carry number or gender features. It remains invariant before the singular feminine and singular masculine phrases. The postnominal NP *ha:ða*, on the other hand, is marked for singular number and gender and for plural number. In addition, both demonstratives, like all demonstratives in Arabic, co-occur with the definite article *l-* ‘the.’

In previous accounts (Khalifaoui 2007; Gundel et al. 2010) both forms have been determined within the Givenness Hierarchy framework (Gundel et al. 1993) to require the status Activated (i.e., in working memory). That is, speakers choose the demonstratives *ha-NP* or *NP ha:ða* only when they assume that the entity under discussion is in working memory of the hearer either by recent mention in the discourse or by virtue of being present in the immediate extra linguistic context and activated by a simultaneous gesture or eye gaze. Both demonstratives, therefore, cannot be felicitously used to refer to entities that are only familiar entities. That is, entities assumed to be in memory by virtue of being shared knowledge between the interlocutors, from previous knowledge, or by non-recent mention in the discourse as shown in the examples given in (7) and (2).

<sup>4</sup> Another dialect variant for *wlid* is *wlad*.

(7) [looking at a friend's book]

*mni:n fri:-t-u                      ha-l-ktā:b/      l-ktā:bha:ða?*

where buy-PST-2SG-it this-the-book the-book this

‘Where did you buy this book?’

(8) [The hearer knows the book, but the book has not been recently

*mentioned and is not in the immediate extralinguistic context]*

*mni:n fri:-t-u                      #<sup>5</sup>ha-l-ktā:b?      #l-ktā:b      ha:ða?*

where buy- PST.2SG-it              this-the-book      the-book      this

‘Where did you buy this book?’

Within the Givenness Hierarchy framework, the choice of the two proximate demonstratives in (1) is appropriate because the book is mentioned in the immediate extralinguistic context and can, therefore, be assumed by the speaker to be activated by simultaneous eye gaze. In (2), on the other hand, neither of the two proximate demonstratives is appropriate because the book has not been recently mentioned nor is it in the immediate extralinguistic context, and it can, therefore, be assumed to be familiar but not activated. These previous accounts, however, did not provide an explanation for the further restrictions guiding the choice of which of these forms to use. For instance, it is not clear what determines the choice between *ha*-NP and NP *ha:ða* in (7). Based on a study that combines corpus analysis supported by evidence from native speakers’ felicity judgments, the present study shows that what distinguishes the prenominal variant *ha*-NP from the postnominal NP *ha:ða* is that the former signals an expressive meaning in the discourse. The paper uses Sperber and Wilson’s Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995) to argue that *ha*-NP encodes the expressive meaning as part of its semantic meaning, and further provides a pragmatic explanation for the choice between the two demonstrative forms.

#### 4. A procedural account of the expressive demonstrative *ha*-NP

The current study argues that the expressive meaning that *ha*-NP signals in the discourse is part of its semantic encoding. However, unlike words such as evaluative adjectives (e.g., *beautiful*), *ha*-NP does not encode the expressive meaning it signals as a concept. Rather, it

---

<sup>5</sup> The symbol # indicates infelicity (i.e., unacceptability within the given context)



encodes a procedure that constrains the explicit side of the utterance (i.e., explicature<sup>6</sup>). Wilson and Sperber (1993) explain that the category of explicatures "includes not only the proposition expressed by the utterance but a range of higher-level explicatures obtained by embedding the proposition expressed under an appropriate speech act or propositional-attitude description" (p.14). This study argues that the demonstrative *ha*-NP encodes a procedure which constrains a higher level explicature obtained by embedding the proposition expressed under a description of a propositional attitude. The higher level explicature created by the use of *ha*-NP informs the hearer that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed as illustrated in (9) in which the speaker expresses an opinion about the prime minister's decision to care for the environment. The speaker's choice of the demonstrative *ha*-NP creates a higher level explicature which informs the hearers that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed.

- (9) *Qarara:t min ha-n-nawf t-farhid fa-l-qalb*

decisions of this-the-type 3F-entertain on-the-heart

'Decisions of this type are refreshing.'

*Higher level explicature: the speaker has an emotional attitude toward [decisions of this type are refreshing].*

It is worth noting that some linguistic forms which create higher-level explicatures into the discourse are characterized as conceptual, while others as described are procedural. For example, Wilson and Sperber (1993) argue that illocutionary adverbials such as *frankly* and *seriously*, and attitudinal adverbials such as *unfortunately* "are conceptual and non-truth-conditional: they encode concepts which are constituents not of the proposition expressed but of higher-level explicatures" (p.19). On the other hand, Iten (2005) notes that attitudinal and illocutionary particles and interjections such as *oh*, *eh*, and *alas* do not encode a conceptual meaning. She explains that "it seems clear that any meaning illocutionary and attitudinal particles and interjections encode must be procedural rather than conceptual" (p.100). For example, she notes that the interjection *oh* instructs the hearer that the speaker is surprised by the basic proposition of the utterance. Similarly, Zaki (2012) analyzed the linguistic form *ha:* in MSA as encoding a procedure that constructs a higher level explicature embedding the basic level

---

<sup>6</sup> From a relevance theoretic perspective, an explicature is achieved through linguistic decoding and pragmatic inferences. An implicature, on the other hand, is achieved through pragmatic inferences only.

explicature in a propositional attitude. The higher level explicature created with *ha*: informs the hearers that they should pay attention to the proposition expressed.

The current study argues that the expressive meaning of the demonstrative *ha*-NP<sup>7</sup> is procedural. A procedure instructs the hearers about the inferential route they should follow in order to achieve the intended interpretation. In the case of *ha*-NP, the procedure that it encodes constrains the inferential phase of communication by instructing the hearer about what type of higher-level explicature she is expected to construct. In order to prove that *ha*-NP is procedural, I use two diagnostic tests discussed in Wilson and Sperber (1993) and Iten (2005): ‘accessibility to consciousness’ and ‘truth evaluability’. First, a conceptual account of the expressive meaning that *ha*-NP signals would be difficult because a native speaker cannot access a conceptual representation of the expressive meaning. So, it is much easier for a native speaker to talk about how *ha*-NP is used than to say what it means. Second, hearers cannot object to the higher level explicature constructed with the use of *ha*-NP as shown in (10). In (A), the speaker blames the TV host for defending deposed corrupt judges. As shown in (B), objecting to the expressive meaning that *ha*-NP signals would be unacceptable. However, as shown in (C), a native speaker could object to the explicit content of the basic level explicature.

- (10) A. *ba :hi ja :sir ja si muʕiz*  
 good very VOC mr. Moez  
*t-da :fiʕ ʕla l-quðʕa:t zaʕma ʕla:f*  
 2-defend on the-judges perhaps why  
*ʕla:f ma mʕa:-f sawwir l-maʔa:si*  
 why NEG go.PST.3MSG-NEG videotape.PST.3MSG the-tragedies  
*illi t-sabbu fi:-ha ha-l-quðʕa:t l-mʒarrma*  
 REL 3F-cause in-it this-the-judges the-criminal  
 ‘This is great Mr. Moez, you are defending the judges. Why didn’t he (i.e., Moez) go and videotape the tragedies that these criminals have caused?’  
 B. # that is not true, you do not have an emotional attitude toward [Moez didn’t go and videotape the tragedies that the judges have caused.]

<sup>7</sup>When discussing the procedural expressive meaning of *ha*-NP, the NP that follows the demonstrative *ha*- is not included in the discussion since it encodes a conceptual meaning.

C. That is not true, Moez went and videotaped the tragedies that these criminals have caused.

In the next section, I demonstrate how both the corpus and the questionnaire studies support the claim that *ha*-NP is a marked demonstrative that gives rise to an expressive meaning in the discourse, while NP *ha:ða* is an unmarked demonstrative with a variety of typical non-expressive administrative functions.

## 5. Corpus study

The goal of the corpus study is to give supporting evidence that the demonstrative *ha*-NP is a marked demonstrative that signals an expressive meaning into the discourse, while NP *ha:ða* is an unmarked non-expressive demonstrative. The markedness of *ha*-NP relative to NP *ha:ða* is demonstrated with its frequency of distribution, its association with a non-canonical syntactic structure, and its inability to be used contrastively. The expressivity of *ha*-NP is supported by its frequency in sentiment vs. non-sentiment data and its association with expressive use.

### 5.1 Data

For this study, I collected a corpus with a total of 44,251 words. All the data used for this study come from spoken or written TA. The main criterion used in the corpus compilation is that of sentiment vs. non-sentiment texts. A text is classified as a sentiment text if it is concerned with a topic that triggers emotions and the author is emotionally involved in the subject matter. These texts offer more biased opinions as reflected in the frequent use of evaluative language. All the sentiment texts are collected from online blogs and forums. These are informal platforms where ordinary people can find a space to talk freely about current issues. The sentiment text collection consists of six internet forums and four blogs from the Tunisian Arabic Corpus (McNeil and Faiza 2012) and 135 microblogs<sup>8</sup> posted by two TA native speakers between the years 2011 and 2014. The six forums are concerned with the following topics: young people's use of Facebook, poverty mapping and regional imbalance, paper marriage, the impact of wedding expenses on delaying marriage, elections, and immigration visas. The four internet blogs and microblogs are concerned with the current and deposed presidents of Tunisia, a controversial majority in the

---

<sup>8</sup> Unlike traditional blogs, microblogs are shorter texts which are delivered in a quicker way to groups of people on social media platforms such as Twitter or Facebook.

parliament, differences in political opinions, the economic situation of the country, political corruption, and controversial people in the entertainment industry.

Part of the non-sentiment text collection comes from four online blogs that address non-controversial topics that generally do not generate emotions. In three of these blogs, the writers explain the meaning of certain difficult concepts related to immigration and “knowledge societies” in order to make them more accessible to the readers. In the fourth blog the author reports on an economic forum and how it can create partnership opportunities between the participating countries. Because the majority of the online platforms discuss controversial issues and are therefore highly expressive, and in order to have a balance in the size of the two data sets, I supplemented the non-sentiment text collection with data that is not originally written online. These texts consist of one recorded conversation between two young male speakers discussing three blueprints for building a house, a radio interview with a book publisher who talks about the areas in which his company publishes, the first eight chapters of a play entitled *zunu:n* ‘insanity’ (Baccar 2001), which is about a female doctor who uses an alternative approach to treat a mentally ill man, and three folk tales told by Tunisian journalist and radio host Abdelaziz El Aroui. One of the three folk tales comes from El Aroui (1989). Two of the folk tales and the radio interview come from the Tunisian Arabic Corpus, and the rest of the data is collected by the author of this paper. In contrast to the sentiment texts, the texts in the non-sentiment collection offer more balanced opinion and the language are significantly less evaluative

One way to show that the sentiment vs. non-sentiment classification of the corpora is meaningful is to compare the distribution of evaluative language in both text types. For example, Davis and Potts (2010) examined the distribution of exclamative expressions such as ‘wow’ in online product reviews associated with star ratings. Their results show that “exclamatives are much more frequent at the extreme ends of the rating scale than in the middle” (p.45). Therefore, if the classification of the texts into sentiment vs. non-sentiment in the current study is meaningful, we expect evaluative language to be significantly more frequent in the sentiment texts than in the non-sentiment texts. Given that the data includes different genres and to keep the analysis manageable, I chose four types of evaluative language that can occur across the different genres used in this study: evaluative noun phrases, evaluative adjective phrases, exclamation marks, and rhetorical questions. The four types of evaluative language are illustrated in examples (11) and (12). The example in (11), in which the speaker directs his message at someone who

questions paying housing expenses to members of parliament, contains a rhetorical question, exclamation marks, and two evaluative noun phrases: *si l-msattik* (Mr. stupid) and the derogatory word for mouth, *zalyt-ik* (your big mouth). The example in (12) contains a rhetorical question and the evaluative phrase *ʕqal-ha asyar* (more immature, literally, with a smaller mind).

- (11) *ja si l-msattik aʕbi:k ma halli-t-f zalyt-ik*  
 VOC Mr. the-stupid why NEG open-2.SG-NEG big.mouth-your  
*ki ka:n-u ʕa:xi:n fi l-witla b-flu:s f-ʕaʕb??!!!*  
 when be-PSt.3.PL enjoy.PERF in the hotels with-money the-people??!!!  
 ‘Mr. stupid, why didn’t you open your big mouth when they were staying in hotels  
 and enjoying themselves with the people’s money??!!!’
- (12) *rit-u:-fi huku:ma ʕqal-ha asyar min hakka?*  
 see-PSt.2PL-Q government mind-her smaller from this?  
 ‘Have you ever seen a more immature government?’

The distribution of evaluative language in the two text collections is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Distribution of evaluative language in the two text collections

Type of evaluative language	Non -sentiment texts	Sentiment texts	Total
evaluative Noun Phrases	43 (16%)	227 (84%)	270
evaluative Adjective Phrases (predicative adjectives)	25 (45%)	31 (55%)	56
exclamation marks	31 (21%)	114 (79%)	145
rhetorical questions	31 (16%)	163 (84%)	194

As shown in the table, the overall number of occurrences of evaluative language used in the sentiment texts is significantly more frequent than that in the non-sentiment texts. This distribution provides evidence that the classification into sentiment vs. non-sentiment text types described earlier is meaningful.

## 5.2 Methodology

First, I identified all the occurrences of the two demonstratives *ha*-NP and NP *ha:ða* in the two text collections (i.e., sentiment vs. non-sentiment). A total of 243 demonstrative tokens were identified in the data. If the claim that *ha*-NP is an expressive demonstrative, we expect it to occur more frequently in the sentiment data. On the other hand, we expect the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* to occur more frequently in the non-sentiment data. Further, if the markedness claim is true, we expect the demonstrative *ha*-NP to occur less frequently in the overall data than NP *ha:ða*. Second, I examined both demonstratives according to correlation with expressive use. Expressive use is determined in two ways: 1) The identification of at least one occurrence of evaluative language surrounding the demonstrative, including explicit evaluative language such as the use of evaluative verbs, evaluative nouns, evaluative adjectives, rhetorical questions, exclamation marks, and internet acronyms, such as *lol*; or implicit evaluative language, such as the use of sarcasm and evaluative metaphors; 2) contextual assumptions derived from the previous utterance and background knowledge indicating that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed. A strong link between the choice of *ha*-NP and expressive use will support the claim that *ha*-NP specializes in expressive use. On the other hand, we expect the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* to occur mostly in non-expressive utterances. An example of categorizing demonstrative phrases according to expressive vs. non-expressive use is given in (13). In this example, the blogger is expressing his opinion about the leading actor in a movie he has recently seen.

- (13) *ʕla fikra t-taksi:st batʕal l-fi:lm ha:ða*  
 on idea the-taxi.driver leading.actor the-movie this  
*ka:n huwa bi:du batʕal l-fi:lm l-masraħijja ʒunu:n [...]*  
 was he himself protagonist the-movie the-play insanity  
*w bsʕara:ħa maðabija ni-fhim s-sir*  
 and frankly interested I-understand the-secret  
*wra ha-l-istiħwa:ð ʕla f-fa:fa l-kabi:ra min tʕaraf*  
 behind this-the-monopoly on the-screen the-big from part  
*ha-l-wʒajjih ʕlaxa:tir tamθi:l-u ta:ʕib fwajja*  
 this-the-face.DIM because acting-his tired little  
 ‘And by the way the taxi driver the one with the leading role in this movie is the

same one who took the leading role in the movie-play *Ṣunu:n*, and frankly, I am interested in knowing the secret behind this monopoly of the Big Screen by this little face, because his acting is poor.’

At first, the blogger uses NP *ha:ða* to refer to the movie, because the contextual clues in the previous utterance and the utterance that contains the demonstrative indicate that he does not have the intention to express an attitude toward the movie. But then when he starts talking about the leading actor, he chooses a variety of evaluative language such as the phrase *ha-l-istihwa:ð ʕla f-fa:ʕa l-kabi:ra* ‘this monopoly of the Big Screen’ to express disapproval of the actor’s taking too many leading roles in films. As shown in the example, the speaker also uses the diminutive *ha-l-wʒajjih* ‘this little face’ to express an attitude of disapproval toward the actor. He also uses the expression *ta:ʕib fwajja* ‘poor’ (literally, a little tired) to describe his acting.

### 5.3 Results and discussion of the corpus study

Table 3: Distribution of the two demonstratives in the two data sets.

	Sentiment data	Non-sentiment data	Total
Size (in words)	24,186 (50%)	24,963 (50%)	49,149 (100%)
Number of <i>ha-NP</i> phrases	45 (70%)	19 (30%)	64 (100%)
Number of NP <i>ha:ða</i> phrases	32(18%)	147(82%)	179(100%)

As shown in Table 3, the overall distribution of both forms in the corpus shows that *ha-NP* is significantly less frequent than NP *ha:ða*. As shown in the table, out of the 243 demonstrative tokens identified in the data, 179 (74%) are NP *ha:ða*, but only 64 (26%) are *ha-NP*. The infrequency of *ha-NP* relative to NP *ha:ða* supports the markedness claim made in this study. The data analysis reveals further evidence for the markedness of *ha-NP*. When *ha-NP* is mentioned in subject position in a nominal (i.e., verbless) sentence, the subject must be postposed as demonstrated in(14) in which the speaker is commenting on a controversial TV host.

- (14) *a. ja:sir silʕa ha-nawfil ra:s l- bagga:ri loooool*  
very trivial this-Nawfil head the-cow loooool  
‘This dumb Nawfil is so trivial loooool (Literally, so trivial is this dumb Nawfil)’

- b. \* *ha-nawfil ra:s l- bagga:ri ja:sir silʃa loool*  
 this-Nawfil head the-cow very trivial loool  
 ‘This dumb Nawfil is so trivial loool.’

As shown in the example, the subject *ha-Nawfil ra:s l- bagga:ri* ‘this dumb Nawfil’ is postposed to a non-canonical syntactic position in the sentence. As shown in (15), reversing the sentence order to the typical unmarked subject-initial position results in ungrammaticality. Notice that the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* is acceptable in both the canonical and the non-canonical structure.

- (15) a. *ja:sir silʃa nawfil ra:s l- bagga:ri ha:ða loool*  
 very trivial Nawfil head the-cow this loool  
 ‘So trivial, this dumb Nawfil loool’  
 b. *nawfil ra:s l- bagga:ri ha:ða ja:sir silʃa loool*  
 Nawfil head the-cow this very trivial loool  
 ‘This dumb Nawfil is so trivial loool.’

The connection between marked demonstratives and non-canonical syntactic structure is not unique to *ha*-NP. For example, as discussed in Section 2, Zaki (2012) and Naruoka (2008) note that there is a connection between non-canonical syntactic structures and expressive uses of demonstratives.

Further evidence for the markedness of *ha*-NP is its unacceptability to be used contrastively. The data analyzed in this study show that both *ha*-N and NP *ha:ða* are not restricted in terms of the type of the entities they refer to. They can both refer to entities or situations in the immediate spatio-temporal context or to entities mentioned earlier in the discourse. Results, however, revealed that *ha*-NP, unlike NP *ha:ða*, cannot be used contrastively as illustrated in example (16). In this example, two people are discussing three house blueprints for a house they plan to build.

- (16) *bɛ:f n-kallm-u ʃla l-plã ha:ða / # ha-l-plã*  
 FUT 1SG-talk-him about the-blueprint this this-the-blueprint  
 ‘I will talk to him [the neighbor] about this blueprint.’



One of the two speakers tells the other one that he wants to discuss *l-plā ha:ḏa* ‘this blueprint [and not the other two]’ with the neighbor. The choice of NP *ha:ḏa* is appropriate because it can be used contrastively. As demonstrated in the example, the use of *ha*-NP in this context results in infelicity not only because it gives rise to an unexpected expressive meaning, but also because it cannot be used to contrast the blueprint under discussion with the other two blueprints. Because contrastive use is characterized as one of the functions of demonstratives (Diessel 1999), this indicates that the demonstrative functions of *ha*-NP, unlike NP *ha:ḏa*, are weakened. A possible explanation for this is that *ha*-NP is in the process of transitioning from a demonstrative to a full attitudinal marker. A similar observation is given by Zaki (2012) about attentional *ha*: discussed earlier in Section 3. She notes that “the deictic value of *ha*: “is weakened in favor of a discourse function that is manipulated by the speaker to create certain emotive effects” (p.184). In the remainder of this section, I discuss how the corpus analysis also gives ample evidence of the expressivity of *ha*-NP relative to NP *ha:ḏa*.

As shown in Table 3, while both demonstratives occur in both the sentiment and the non-sentiment texts, their distribution in the two text collections differ. Of the 64 *ha*-NP tokens identified in the data, 45 (70%) occur in the sentiment data and 19 (30%) in the non-sentiment data. On the other hand, of the 179 of NP *ha:ḏa* tokens identified in the data, 147 (82%) occur in the non-sentiment data, and only 32 (18%) occur in the sentiment data. This distribution shows that *ha*-NP occurs more frequently than NP *ha:ḏa* in sentiment texts further supporting the expressivity claim made in this study. The distribution of both demonstratives according to expressive use vs. non-expressive use is given in Table 4.

Table 4: Distribution of the two demonstratives according to expressive use

	Expressive use	Non-expressive use	Total
<i>ha</i> -NP	64 (100 %)	0	64 (100%)
NP <i>ha:ḏa</i>	22 (12%)	157 (88%)	179 (100%)

As shown in the table, all the tokens of *ha*-NP phrases identified in the corpus are used in contexts where the speaker expresses an emotional attitude. These results further support the claim that the choice of *ha*-NP is determined by the speaker’s intention to express an emotional attitude. In contrast, 157 (88%) tokens of NP *ha:ḏa* occur in non-expressive utterances while only 22 (12%) occur in expressive utterances, further supporting the claim that this demonstrative is

typically used for non-expressive functions. An illustration of the demonstrative correlation with expressive vs. non-expressive use is given in examples (17)-(21). In (17) from a blog post, the speaker is expressing his bitterness about the cultured elite who received special privileges in return for favors for the deposed Tunisian president Ben Ali.

- (17) *n-naʒʒim n-sa:miħ benʕli ʕla kul ʃaj*  
 1SG-can 1-forgive Ben Ali on every thing  
*ʔilla ʕla l penalizasjō mtaʕ*  
 except on the penalization of  
*l-ʕuhr l-fikri w l-fanni! [...]*  
 the-prostitution the-intellectual and the-artistic  
*milli l-kaθi:r mi-l-muθaqqafi:n*  
 since the-many of-the-cultured  
*xta:r-u ju-rqdu mʕa benʕli*  
 choose-PST.3PL 3-sleep with Ben Ali  
*bε:f Ø ja-qmaʕ illi ji-byu*  
 so Ø 3M-oppress REL 3M-want  
*w ji-stqa:tu min ha-s-sanʕa*  
 and 3M-make.a.living from this-the-skill  
*qʕad-na ya:di w walle:-t ha:ʒa ʕa:dijja!*  
 remain-PST.1PL there and become-PST.3FSG something normal  
 ‘I can forgive Ben Ali for everything except for not penalizing the arts and intellectual prostitution! [...]. Since many of the intellectuals chose to sleep with Ben Ali so he could oppress whoever they wanted, and [they] made a living out of this skill, we stayed in this situation, and it became a normal thing!’

In addition to choosing the demonstrative *ha*-NP, the blogger uses an evaluative metaphor to describe this situation as a type of artistic and intellectual prostitution, and later refers to it as *ha-s-sanʕa* ‘this craft.’ Similarly, in (18) from a microblog, the speaker asks the people who keep saying that the government is unsuccessful to prove that it (i.e., the government) is responsible for some pre-existing problems, which he lists in a subsequent utterance not included in the example.

- (18) *ʕandi suʔa:l na-sʔl-u l-kul wa:hid j-laklik*  
 have question 1-ask-it to-every one 3M-chew  
*fi ha-l-luba:na mtaʕ l-ħku:ma fa:fla j-qul-l-i*  
 in this-the-gum POS the-government loser 3M-say-to-me  
*ʔafnuwwa dawr ha:ðu:ma fi l-faʕal*  
 what role these in the-failure  
 ‘I want to ask everyone who is repeating over and over this story that the government is unsuccessful: What is the role of these [problems] in its failure?’

In addition to choosing the demonstrative *ha*-NP, the blogger uses figurative language in the expression *jlaklik fi ha-l-luba:na mtaʕ l-ħku:ma fa:fla* ‘repeating over and over, [literally, chewing on this gum], this story that the government is unsuccessful.’

It is also worth noting that while out of the 64 tokens of *ha*-NP identified in the data, 60 are used to express a negative attitude such as bitterness or disapproval; I identified four examples in which the speakers express a positive attitude as illustrated in (19) in which the speaker is expressing approval of the prime minister’s decision to care for the environment. As shown in the example, in addition to the use of the demonstrative *ha*-NP, the speaker uses the expression *t-farhid ʕa-l-qalb* ‘refreshing.’

- (19) *qarara:t min ha-n-nawʕ t-farhid ʕa-l-qalb*  
 decisions of this-the-type 3F-entertain on-the-heart  
 ‘Decisions of this type are refreshing.’

If we replace the demonstrative *ha*-NP with NP *ha:ða* in examples(17)-(19), the addressee may still achieve an expressive interpretation based on the contextual clues from the previous utterance and the use of evaluative language. However, NP *ha:ða* does not explicitly inform the hearer that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed. As discussed earlier in this section, 12% of the tokens of NP *ha:ða* identified in the data occurred in expressive utterances as illustrated in (20).

- (20) *fi l-mana:x s-sija:si l-mitʕaffin ha:ða*  
 in the-environment the-political the rotten this  
*mustaħi:l famma ħizb j-naʕʕim ja-ʕmil ħa:ʕa ...*  
 impossible there.is party 3M-can 3M-do thing

‘In this corrupt political environment, it is impossible to find a political party which can do something.’

The speaker uses the phrase *l-mana:x s-sija:si l-mitʕaffin ha:ða* ‘this corrupt political environment’ in order to express his views about the political environment in the country. In Section 7, I will provide a pragmatic explanation for why speakers may choose the non-expressive demonstrative NP *ha:ða* in expressive utterances.

As expected, Table 4 also shows that the majority (88%) of the uses of NP *ha:ða* occurred in non-expressive utterances as demonstrated in example (21), in which the blogger’s goal is to inform the readers about the concept ‘knowledge society’ and related concepts without the intention to express an emotional attitude.

- (21) *w l-ʔaki:d rahu famma ʃku:n qal-l-kum*  
 and the-sure EMPH there who tell.PST.3SGM-to-you  
*ʔanna l-mafa:hi:m ha:ði/#ha-l-mafa:hi:m hija mifta:h t-taqaddum [...]*  
 that the-concepts this/this concepts is key the-advancement  
*l-muʔi:d bɛ:f ma n-tʕawwil-f ʕli:k-um*  
 the-important in.order.to NEG 1s-make –NEG on-you  
*l-ju:mn a-ħki:-l-kum ʕla l-mafa:hi:m ʒ-ʒdi:da ha:ði/#ha-l-mafa:hi:m ʒ-ʒdi:da*  
 today 1SG-talk-to-you about the-meanings the-new/ this this-the-meaning the-new  
*bɛ:f ma ta-bdaw-f ɔʕa:ʃfi:n ʃi:-ha ki:f ti-smʕu*  
 so NEG 2PL-start-NEG lost in-it when 2PL- listen  
*l-ħka:ja:t ha:ði/#ha-l-ħka:ja:t fi l-mustaqbil*  
 the-stories this/ this-the-stories in the-future  
*w na-bdaw bkul-na na-ħkiw nafs l-lu:ya*  
 and 1PL-start all-us 1PL-talk same the-language  
*bixtisa:r ʃadi:d muʒtamaʕ l-maʕrfa ha:ða/#ha-muʒtamaʕ l-maʕrfa*  
 briefly big society the-knowledge this/ this-society the-knowledge  
*hua l-muʒtamaʕ illi l-maʕrfa w l-maʕlu:ma:t*  
 is the-society REL the- knowledge and the-information  
*ʕandha ʃi:-h qi:ma kbi:ra*  
 has in-it importance big

‘For sure, someone must have told you that these concepts are the key to advancement [...]. Anyway, to make a long story short, today I wanted to talk to you about these new concepts so you won’t be lost when you hear about this topic in the future, so we can all speak the same language. In short, this knowledge society is a society in which knowledge and information are highly valuable.’

In this example, the speaker uses the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* four times in the phrases *l-mafa:hi:m ha:ði* ‘these concepts’, *l-mafa:hi:m ʒ-ʒdi:da ha:ði* ‘these new concepts’, *l-hka:ja ha:ði* ‘this topic’, and *muʒtamaʃ l-maʃrfa ha:ða* ‘this knowledge society.’ The demonstrative NP *ha:ða* is used for referential purposes only. That is, it signals the cognitive status of the referent. The context of the utterance indicates that the speaker is not emotionally involved in the subject matter. Further, we can see that the utterance does not include the kind of evaluative language that is typical of utterances in which expressive uses appear. As shown in the example, replacing the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* with *ha*-NP results in infelicity because it would signal an inappropriate expressive meaning.

To sum up, the corpus study has provided extensive evidence to the claim that the demonstrative *ha*-NP is a marked demonstrative that signals an expressive meaning in the utterance, while NP *ha:ða* is an unmarked demonstrative that is typically used in non-expressive contexts. In the next section, I show how the questionnaire study further supports these results by showing that native speakers find *ha*-NP unacceptable in non-expressive utterances.

## 6. Questionnaire study

The primary goal of the questionnaire study is to further support the claim that the demonstrative *ha*-NP is a marked demonstrative which use is determined by the speaker’s intention to express an emotional attitude, while NP *ha:ða* is an unmarked non-expressive demonstrative. The claim that *ha*-NP is restricted to expressive use is tested by looking at this form in contexts where the speaker is not assumed to be emotionally involved in the subject matter. If the use of *ha*-NP in such contexts is determined to be unacceptable, this would provide strong evidence that this form is used exclusively for expressive purposes. Another goal of the questionnaire is to directly explore the respondents’ justification of the choices they make, something that a corpus study cannot provide.

## 6.1 Methodology

The questionnaire designed for this study consists of six questions. Each question consists of an utterance with a blank space in which the speaker is sharing or asking for information about a particular entity. The six utterances include a variety of contexts and different types of referents. Further, in two of the six questions, the referent of the entity under discussion is contrasted to a set of referents. In the questionnaire, I use two types of data: 1) six fill-in-the-blank sentences in which respondents are asked to choose between a phrase introduced with *ha*-NP, a phrase introduced with NP *ha:ða*, both phrases, or neither. The goal of this part is to provide evidence that *ha*-NP is not acceptable in neutral non-expressive contexts; 2) a follow-up part in which respondents are asked to justify their choice. These justifications are very important because they can give supportive evidence that the constraints on *ha*-NP involve expressivity.

In designing the questionnaire, a conscious effort was made to create neutral contexts in two ways. First, it was explicitly stated in the general instructions that the speaker in each one of the six sentences is emotionally neutral and is just giving or asking for information. Second, in each question, no evaluative language or other indicators that the speaker is being emotionally involved are included. The sentences do not require knowledge of any jargon or technical language. All the instructions and the sentences are written in TA.

The questionnaire was administered in written form to 18 respondents, 9 females and 9 males aged between 20 to 50 years old. All respondents are native speakers of Tunisian Arabic, specifically, the dialect of the Greater Tunis area. None of them has ever lived outside Tunisia and they can all read and write in Arabic. Each respondent is asked to first read the instructions and the utterance with the blank space and then decide whether *ha*-NP, NP *ha:ða*, both, or neither of them is appropriate in the blank space. Besides, each respondent is asked to write down a justification for their choice(s). An example of the sentences given in the questionnaire is given in (22).

- (22) *waħd-a ti-t-farriʒ hija w sʕa:hbit-ha fi fi:lm*  
 one-FSG 3FSG-REFL-watch she and friend-her in film  
*jexi sʕa:hbit-ha qa:l -t l-ha*  
 so friend-her say-PST.3FSG to-her  
 “*t-farriʒ-t fi:-h qbal\_\_\_\_\_.*”  
 REFL-watch-PST.1SG in-it before \_\_\_\_\_

‘A woman is watching a film with her friend, and her friend told her “I watched \_\_\_\_\_ before.”’

1. *l-fi:lm*      *ha:ða*

the-movie this

‘this movie’

2. *ha-l-fi:lm*

this-the-movie

‘this movie’

3. *hatta waħda*

no one

‘no one’

*ma xtar-t-if*      \_\_\_\_\_ *ɕla xa:tir* \_\_\_\_\_

NEG choose-PST.1SG-NEG \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_

‘I did not choose \_\_\_\_\_ because \_\_\_\_\_.’

## 6.2 Results and discussion of the questionnaire study

Table 5: Demonstrative choices

<i>ha</i> -NP	NP <i>ha:ða</i>	Both demonstratives	None	Total
0 (0%)	97 (90%)	1 (1%)	10 (9%)	108 (100%)

As indicated in the results given in Table 5, out of the 98 answers in which respondents chose a demonstrative to be placed in the blank space, 97 are NP *ha:ða* and only one is both demonstratives. Since all the utterances given in the six questions include neutral non-expressive contexts, these results strongly support the results achieved in the corpus analysis that speakers choose *ha*-NP only when they intend to express an emotion or an attitude. Results also indicate that in 10% of the answers, respondents chose option 3 (i.e., neither of two demonstratives is acceptable). In the remainder of this section, I discuss the justifications that the respondents gave for the choices they made.

Table 6: Justifications of demonstrative choices given by the respondents

	Expressive justification	Contrastive justification	Other justification	No justification	Total
<i>Ha</i>	0	0	0	0	0 (100%)
<i>ha:ða</i>	21 (22%)	20 (21%)	41 (42%)	15 (15%)	97 (100%)
<i>ha</i> and <i>ha:ða</i>			1 (100%)		1 (100%)
None			10 (100%)		10 (100%)

Respondents provided various types of justifications for choosing NP *ha:ða* instead of *ha*-NP to fill in the blank spaces. First, as shown in Table 6, in 21 answers (22%) the justifications for not choosing *ha*-NP are related to expressivity. That is, respondents explained that *ha*-NP would signal an emotional attitude that would not be appropriate in these contexts. An English translation of these justifications and the number of answers that correspond to each category are given in Table 7.

Table 7: Expressive justifications for not choosing *ha*-NP

Justifications	Makes the expression insulting/negative/vulgar	Indicates that the speaker is angry/ complaining	Renders the entity under discussion bad/less important
Number of answers	6 (28%)	4 (19%)	11 (52%)

As shown in the table, respondents gave three types of justifications related to expressivity for not choosing *ha*-NP. These justifications are significant because they give supportive evidence that *ha*-NP signals an expressive meaning in the utterance. What is interesting is that all these justifications involve negative reasons, further supporting the results of the corpus analysis, which indicate that *ha*-NP is mostly used when the speaker intends to express a negative attitude.

Table 6 also shows that in 41 out of the 97 answers in which respondents chose the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* over *ha*-NP, respondents gave justifications that did not point directly to an expressive meaning. An English translation of these justifications and the number of answers that correspond to them are summarized in Table 8.



Table 8: Non-expressive justifications for not choosing *ha*-NP

Justification	That is the way I speak	<i>ha</i> -NP makes the utterance sound heavy/awkward	NP <i>ha:ða</i> conveys the message faster and easier/makes the expression clearer to the hearer
Number of answers	4 (10%)	15 (36%)	22 (54%)

Table 8 supports the claim that the demonstrative *ha*-NP is unacceptable in non-expressive contexts. The table also provides convincing evidence for the markedness of *ha*-NP. As shown in the table, respondents found *ha*-NP to be “heavy/awkward” for referential purposes only. On the other hand, respondents explained that NP *ha:ða* “conveys the message faster and easier/makes the expression clearer to the hearer.” The table also shows that in 15 out of the 97 answers in which respondents chose NP *ha:ða* over *ha*-NP, respondents did not provide any justification for their choice.

Although the results given in Table 7 and Table 8 show that respondents did not point directly to a justification related to expressivity, they confirmed the claim that *ha*-NP is unacceptable in non-expressive utterances. It is not surprising that respondents in the questionnaire study did not always point directly to a justification related to expressivity given the procedural nature of the expressive meaning that *ha*-NP encodes discussed in Section 4. That is, it is difficult for a native speaker to access a conceptual representation of the expressive meaning when they want to define the demonstrative *ha*-NP. So, it is much easier for a native speaker to say whether *ha*-NP is acceptable in a given utterance than to point directly to an expressive interpretation.

Further, results given in Table 6 indicate that in 20 of 96 answers in which respondents chose the demonstrative NP *ha:ða* over the demonstrative *ha*-NP, they gave a justification related to contrast by explaining that the speaker intends to emphasize that it is the entity under discussion and not another entity. These justifications are also expected since, as discussed earlier, *ha*-NP, unlike NP *ha:ða*, is not acceptable when the entity under discussion is being contrasted to another entity or a set of entities.

Finally, as shown in Table 8, in 10 (9%) out of the 108 answers, respondents did not choose either of the two demonstratives. They justified this by pointing out that: 1) both demonstratives are unnecessary because an eye gaze or hand gesture would be sufficient to point to an item in front of the speaker, 2) they did not agree with the spelling of the demonstrative *ha:ða* and decided not to make a choice. These justifications do not contradict the expressive claim made in this study and are beyond the scope of this discussion.

## **7. The choice between the two demonstrative forms from a pragmatic perspective**

Within the framework of Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson, 1995), the human cognitive system is geared towards the maximization of relevance. That is, humans pay attention only to relevant information. A piece of information is relevant to an individual if it yields the most positive cognitive effects (worthwhile information) with the least processing effort. This universal tendency to maximize relevance is captured in the *Cognitive Principle of Relevance*.

Further, Sperber and Wilson explain that the human tendency to maximize relevance has consequences on communication. Being aware of the addressee's tendency to select the most relevant input, communicators put in the effort to engage ostensive-inferential communication. That is, they do not only inform the hearer of the set of assumptions they intend to communicate, but they produce ostensive stimuli that overtly and explicitly attract the hearer's attention to those assumptions. As Wilson and Sperber (2006) point out, "According to relevance theory, use of an ostensive stimulus may create precise and predictable expectations of relevance not raised by other inputs" (p.611). This is the basis for Sperber and Wilson's *Communicative Principle of Relevance*: every ostensive stimulus conveys a presumption of its own optimal relevance. That is, the audience of an ostensive stimulus is entitled to expect it to be optimally relevant. An ostensive stimulus is optimally relevant if and only if (a) it is relevant enough for it to be worth the addressee's effort to process it, (b) it is the most relevant one compatible with the communicator's abilities and preferences (Sperber and Wilson 1995, p.270). According to clause (a) of the definition of optimal relevance, speakers should produce stimuli that are at least relevant enough to be worth the addressee's comprehension effort. Clause (b) states that it is in the interest of the communicator to aim for the highest degree of relevance that they are capable and willing to achieve. For example, communicators may provide more specific information that

will hold the addressee's attention and makes it easier for them to achieve the intended interpretation. However, according to clause (b) communicators will choose the most relevant stimulus that they are willing and able to produce. For example, a speaker may choose to withhold information that they believe to be unnecessary to share with the addressee. By the same token, Sperber and Wilson (1995) explain that a rational addressee is entitled to expect "the highest level of relevance that the communicator was capable of achieving given her means and goals" (p. 271).

I now turn to show how the *Cognitive Principle of Relevance* and the *Communicative Principle of Relevance* account for the choice between the demonstratives *ha*-NP and NP *ha:ða*. The choice of the marked demonstrative with weakened demonstrative functions *ha*-NP in non-expressive contexts is not optimally relevant because the extra expressive meaning imposes unnecessary processing effort on the hearer. Thus, when speakers choose the marked *ha*-NP instead of NP *ha:ða*, the addressee's expectation is that the speaker has more cognitive effects to communicate beyond reference. In the case of *ha*-NP, its choice instead of NP *ha:ða* signals to the hearer that the speaker intends to express an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed. For example in (23) from the play script *Žunu:n* 'insanity', a man who has just had an argument with his mother turns to his brother's doctor and expresses his emotions about his toxic family environment.

- (23) *ri:-t*                      *ha-l-was'at*                      *l-xa:miʒ*    *ja*    *mada:m ?*  
 see-PST.2SG    this-the-environment    the-dirty    VOC    madam  
 'Do you see this toxic environment madam?'

The choice of the demonstrative *ha*-NP here explicitly and overtly informs the hearer that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the basic proposition *this is a toxic environment*. In relevance-theoretic terms, the choice of *ha*-NP creates precise and predictable expectations of relevance not raised by NP *ha:ða*. Thus, by choosing *ha*-NP, the speaker engages in inferential-ostensive communication by choosing the most relevant form that is compatible with his abilities and preferences.

As shown in Table 6, 12% of the occurrences of the unmarked demonstrative NP *ha:ða* were identified in expressive utterances as illustrated in example (20) repeated here in (24).

- (24) *fī l-mana:x s-sija:si l-mitšaffin ha:ða*  
 in the-environment the-political the rotten this  
*mustaħi:l famma ħizb j-naʒʒim ja-ʕmil ha:ʒa ...*  
 impossible there.is party 3M-can 3M-do thing  
 ‘In this corrupt political environment, it is impossible to find a political party  
 which can accomplish something.’

The use of evaluative language such as the adjective phrase *l-mitšaffin* (the corrupt) as well as the use of the adverb phrase *mustaħi:l* (never) to predict that the political parties will not be able to accomplish anything indicates that the speaker is expressing an emotional attitude. However, as shown in the example, the speaker did not choose the most relevant demonstrative form *ha*-NP, indicating that he is not willing to show full emotional involvement in the subject matter. The choice of the non-expressive form can be explained by clause (b) of the *Communicative Principle of Relevance*. From a relevance perspective (Sperber and Wilson, pp. 270-278), if it is mutually manifest to the speaker and the hearer that the choice of the non-expressive demonstrative is meant to contribute to the relevance of the utterance, the addressee will derive the implicature that the speaker is reluctant to show full emotional involvement in the subject matter. The derivation of this extra layer of information will lead the hearer to conclude that the speaker has chosen the most relevant form that is compatible with his abilities and preferences.

## 8. Concluding remarks

Based on a corpus analysis complemented by a questionnaire study, the current study has shown that the choice between the two Tunisian Arabic proximate demonstratives *ha*-NP and NP *ha:ða*, both of which require the cognitive status Activated, is not arbitrary. Rather, it is motivated by the speaker’s intention to express an emotional attitude. The paper argues that *ha*-NP encodes a procedure which constructs a higher level explicature obtained by embedding the proposition that contains *ha*-NP under a description of a propositional attitude. The higher level explicature created with the use of the demonstrative *ha*-NP informs the hearer that the speaker has an emotional attitude toward the proposition expressed. The demonstrative NP *ha:ða*, on the other hand, is an unmarked demonstrative with typical demonstrative functions. From a pragmatic perspective, the choice between the two forms is explained by the *Cognitive Principle*

of *Relevance* and the *Communicative Principle of Relevance*. When a speaker intends to express an attitude, she chooses *ha*-NP in order to engage in ostensive-inferential communication. That is, she chooses an ostensive stimulus that explicitly and overtly informs the hearer that the speaker has an attitude toward the proposition expressed. In doing so, the speaker aims at optimal relevance. However, a speaker may choose the unmarked NP *ha:ða* in expressive utterances. If it is mutually manifest to the speaker and the hearer that this choice will contribute to the relevance of the utterance, the choice of the non-expressive demonstrative implicates that the speaker is reluctant to show full emotional involvement in the subject matter.

## References

- Acton, E. K., & Pott, C. (2014). That straight talk: Sarah Palin and the sociolinguistics of demonstratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 18 (1), 3–31.
- Baccar, J. (2001). *ʒunu:n*. Tunis: da:r al-zanu:b li-nnafr.
- Bowdle, B. F. & Ward G. (1995). Generic demonstratives. *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Historical Issues in Sociolinguistics/Social Issues in Historical Linguistics* (pp. 32–43). Berkeley CA.
- Brustad, K. E. (2000). *The syntax of spoken Arabic: A comprehensive study of Moroccan, Egyptian, Syrian, and Kuwaiti dialects*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Cantarino, V. (1974-75). *Syntax of modern Arabic prose*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Davis, C., & Potts C. (2010). Affective demonstratives and the division of pragmatic labor. In M. Aloni, Harald B., Tikitu d. J., & K. Schulz (Eds.), *Logic Language and Meaning, Amsterdam colloquium 2009* (pp.42–52). Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.
- Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- El-Aroui, A. (1989). *ħika:ja:t el-šarwi* (2nd ed.). Tunis: ad-da:r at-tu:nisijja li-nnafr.
- Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Towards a descriptive framework of spatial deixis. In R. J. Jarvella & W. Klein (Eds.), *Speech, place, and action: studies in deixis and related topics* (pp. 31–59). New York: Wiley.
- Gibson, M. (1998). *Dialect contact in Tunisian Arabic: Sociolinguistic and structural aspects*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Reading.

- Grice, P. H. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 43–58) (3). New York: Academic Press.
- Gundel, J. K., Zacharski, R., & Hedberg, N. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in *discourse. Language*, 69 (2), 274–307.
- Gundel, J.K., Bassene, M., Gordon, B., Humnick, H. & Khalfaoui, A., (2010). Testing predictions of the Givenness Hierarchy framework: A crosslinguistic investigation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42, 1770–1785.
- Holes, C. (2004). *Modern Arabic: Structures, functions, and varieties* (2nd ed.). Washington, D C: Georgetown University Press.
- Horn, L R. (1984). Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In D. Schiffrin (Ed.), *Meaning, form, and use in context: Linguistic applications* (pp. 11–42). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Iten, C. (2005). *Linguistic meaning, Truth conditions and relevance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Khalifaoui, A. (2007). A cognitive approach to analyzing demonstratives in Tunisian Arabic. In Mustafa. M. A. (Ed.), *Perspectives on Arabic Linguistics XX* (pp. 170–186). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lakoff, R. (1974). Remarks on “this” and “that”. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, (345–356).
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McNeil, K., & Faiza, M. (2012). Tunisian Arabic Corpus 2012. *Tunisian Arabic Corpus*. Available at: <http://www.tunisiya.org/>.
- Naruoka, K. (2008). Expressive Function of Japanese Adnominal Demonstratives Konna/Sonna/Anna. In Mutsuko E. H., Peter S., & Sun-Ah J. (Ed.), *Japanese/Korean linguistics* (PP. 433–444). Chicago: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Potts, C. & Schwarz, F. (2010). Affective “this.” *Linguistic issues in language technology*, 3 (5), 25–30.
- Ritt-Benmimoun, V. (2017). Agreement with Plural Heads in Tunisian Arabic: The Bedouin South. In Veronika R. B. (Ed.), *Tunisian and Libyan Arabic Dialects: Common Trends - Recent Developments - Diachronic Aspects* (PP. 261–282). Zaragoza: Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.

- Saada, H. M. 1967. *The verb in Tunisian Arabic. Master's Thesis*. University of Minnesota.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication & cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stumme, H. (1896). *Grammatik des tunisischen Arabisch, nebst Glossar*. Leipzig: Henrichs.
- Talmoudi, F. (1980 a). *The Arabic dialect of Sūsa (Tunisia)*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- . (1980 b). *A morphosyntactic study of Romance verbs in the Arabic dialects of Tunis, Sūsa, and Sfax*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber, D. (1993). Linguistic form and relevance. *Lingua* 90, 1-25.
- Wilson, D. & Sperber D. (2006). Relevance Theory (in Laurence H. and Gregory W. (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 607-632). Wiley-Blackwell: Massachusetts/Oxford/Victoria.
- Zaki, M. (2012). *A procedural account of demonstratives in English and Arabic: A corpus-based study*. Lap Lambert Academic Publishing.