WHEN TRADITIONS MEET DIFFERENT APPROACHES:
THE CASE OF EXOPHORIC LITHUANIAN DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS

Gintarė Judžentytė-Šinkūnienė
Department of Lithuanian Language
Institute of Applied Linguistics
Faculty of Philology
Vilnius University
gintare.judzentyte@flf.vu.lt

1. Introduction

When it comes to research on the demonstrative pronouns in the exophoric use, it is obvious that everything must be taken into consideration: the utterance, gestures (hand or eye movements, etc.), the position of the interlocutors, the entity in space, etc. Unfortunately, all existing studies on the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns usually provide interpretations taken from fiction of XX c. Lithuanian authors, which let us believe that the analysed data reflects the situation of that time. Hence, it seems that the main attention is focused on the endophoric use. Finally, the pragmatic aspect in the existing studies is almost ignored.

This paper aims to review the existing research on the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns and to give a short review of other possible parameters alongside the distance that influences the choice of demonstratives as well as the applied methods in the field. It also suggests some key aspects for the analysis of the exophoric use of demonstrative pronouns.

2. Traditional analysis of the demonstrative pronouns in Lithuanian linguistics

The system of the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns was shortly described by Kazimieras Ulvydas in 'Lietuvių kalbos gramatika' (*A Grammar of Lithuanian*).[1] According to it, the system of demonstrative pronouns in standard Lithuanian consists of three members, whereas *šis*, *šitas* means 'near the speaker', *tas* – 'not near the speaker', and *anas* – 'not near the speaker, at the longest distance from the speaker' (Ulvydas 1965, 678–679). As *šitas*, *šis* and *anas* indicate

---

[1] The main Lithuanian grammars were selected for this paper, as in others the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns are presented without any detailed research.

the most distant objects from each other in perspective of space and time, they are usually opposed in different contexts (Ulvydas 1965, 679).

The Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns, their relationships and the whole system of the demonstrative pronouns were thoroughly investigated and presented by Albertas Rosinas (Rosinas 1988, 51; Rosinas 1996, 57–59). The chapter on the demonstrative pronouns in 'Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika' (*A Grammar of Modern Lithuanian*) (Ambrazas 2006) is based on this research.

According to Rosinas (Rosinas 1988, 51; Rosinas 1996, 57–59), the system consists of the opposition 'near the speaker' (*šis*, *šitas*; *tas*)/'not near the speaker' (*anas*; *tas*): *šis* is a proximal deictic, *anas* is distal, however *tas* can be used to indicate both – a proximal object ('near a speaker') and a distal object ('not near a speaker') in Lithuanian. Rosinas' studies are widely presented and discussed in Gintarė Judžentytė's research (Judžentytė 2017; 2018a; 2018b); therefore, in this paper the attention is paid just to several important aspects. First, Rosinas still uses the definition of a ternary system, which is relevant from the perspective of members (*šis*, *tas*, *anas*), yet he provides examples that support a binary opposition: *šis/anas*, *tas/anas*, *šis/tas*. This is considerably different from Ulvydas' system, where the three mentioned members are distributed gradually and, what is most important, the demonstrative pronoun *tas* takes the middle position from the perspective of the speaker. Meanwhile, Rosinas after analysing the semantic structure of the pronouns *šis*, *tas,* and *anas*, concludes that all these three Lithuanian pronouns can be described as follows:

šis: 'deictic', 'unemphatic', 'identical', 'demonstrative', 'direct', 'distant', 'proximate'.

tas: 'deictic', 'unemphatic', 'identical', 'demonstrative', 'direct', 'non-distant';

anas: 'deictic', 'unemphatic', 'identical', 'demonstrative', 'direct', 'distant', 'non-proximate (far)'.

As the given data shows, the system that used to be ternary with a three-way contrast between 'proximal' (*šis*), 'medial' (*tas*), and 'distal' (*anas*) (extremely far from the speaker and/or the addressee) has changed to the system with a two-way contrast between 'proximal' and 'distal'; however, it has remained ternary from the perspective of quantity of the system components (*šis*, *tas*, *anas*).

Rosinas investigated the systems of demonstrative pronouns in the Lithuanian dialects as well (Rosinas 1982, 141):

– the Eastern dialects: *itas*, *ito(j)* 'proximal'/*tas*, *to(j)* 'distal'. = *šitas*;

– some Samogitian dialects: *tas*, *ta* 'proximal'/*anas*, *ana* 'distal'.

According to him, the deictic system of two members usually shifts to a one-member system in most of Samogitian dialects: *šitai tas*, *tas šitai* 'proximal' / *antai tas*, *tas antai* 'distal'.

When it comes to the actual language, it is obvious that the given explanations of the use of the Lithuanian demonstratives are not enough. The latest study on the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns by Judžentytė (2017) showed that the system in spoken Lithuanian may already have changed – the demonstrative pronoun *tas* most likely has substituted the demonstrative pronoun *anas* and the system has become binary in all respects. The same author shortly discussed other disadvantages of the traditional analysis (Judžentytė-Šinkūnienė 2018): the previous research concentrates on examples that do not illustrate all pragmatic uses; examples are outdated (all taken from XX century fiction); the term three-way contrast is confusing; there are not enough arguments to state that the pronoun *tas* has a neutral meaning and is 'non-distant'.

Moreover, structural semantics is not able to explain the cases, when the speaker makes a different choice. For instance, by saying (1) *Tas atrodo geresnis* 'That one looks better' the speaker refers to an object located at distance of one meter from the interlocutors; yet by questioning (2) *Kam priklauso šis namas?* 'Who owns this house?' he points out to the visible referent about one kilometre away.

In other words, a traditional belief that a proximal demonstrative is used to refer to an entity close to the speaker, whereas a distal demonstrative is used to refer to an entity in a distance (Fillmore 1971/1997; Lyons 1977) nowadays is perceived as too simplistic.

Thus, taking the above into account it can be stated that the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns in the exophoric usage have been studied insufficiently[2].

---

[2] Regarding other studies on the demonstrative pronouns, some other researchers should be mentioned: Ingrida Balčiūnienė discusses how children assimilate demonstrative pronouns (2005), Darija Bartkutė studied demonstratives in translated Lithuanian texts and non-translated English and Lithuanian texts (Bartkutė 2018). A more general spectrum of deictics was investigated in the paper "Adjective Reference as a Means of Character Image Creation in the Dubbed Animated Film Snow Messenger: Comparison of Lithuanian, Russian and English Versions" (Satkauskaitė, Onskulytė, Abraitienė 2015). Several cases of the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns in the exophoric usage were discussed by Gintarė Judžentytė (Judžentytė 2018).

3. Different approaches to the exophoric use of the demonstrative pronouns

3.1 Semantic and pragmatic features

Besides syntactic functions (see Table 1), according to Holger Diesel, demonstratives serve specific semantic and pragmatic functions (Diesel 1999, 2).

Table 1. *Syntax*

Category	Case	Agreement		
pronoun	nom.	(i) *Gender*	(ii) *Number*	(iii) *Case*
determiner	acc.	masc.	singular	nom.
adverb	etc.	fem.	plural	acc.
identifier				etc.

When it comes to the semantic features, they are usually discussed in two different domains: 1) deictic features that indicate the location of the referent in speech situation; 2) qualitative features, which classify the referent (Lyons 1977; Rauh 1983; Diesel 1999).

The deictic features include features indicating if the referent is near, away or far away from the deictic centre; if it is visible or out of sight, at higher or lower elevation, uphill or downhill, or moving toward or away from the deictic centre (Diesel 1999, 35). The qualitative features indicate if the referent is an object, a person or a place; if it is animate or inanimate, human or non-human, female or male; if it is a single entity or a set, or conceptualized as a restricted or extended entity (Diesel 1999, 47) (see Table 2, 3).

Table 2. *Deixis*

Distance	Visibility	Elevation	Geography	Movement
neutral	visible	up	uphill	towards S
proximal	invisible	down	downhill	away from S
medial			upriver	across the visual
Etc.			downriver	field of S

Table 3. *Quality*

Ontology	Animacy	Humanness	Sex	Number	Boundedness
location	animate	human	female	singular	bound
object/person	inanimate	nonhuman	male	plural	unbound
				etc.	

The overall tendency is that the more terms a language has in its demonstrative pronoun system, the more information is provided by demonstratives.

According to Diesel, "All languages have at least two demonstratives that are deictically contrastive: a proximal demonstrative referring to an entity near the deictic centre and a distal demonstrative indicating a referent that is located in some distance to the speaker" (Diesel 1999, 50). If the deictic system involves more than two demonstratives, it can be classified as follows:

1) a distance-oriented system: deictic centre is the only point of reference for the location of the referent (not more than three deictic terms).

2) a person-oriented system: in addition to the deictic centre, the location of the addressee serves as another referent point (up to four deictic terms).

In addition to the influence of the semantic properties on the demonstrative choice, Diessel (1999) proposes that there are pragmatic features that influence the choice between demonstrative pronouns as follows:

(1) The context of use (i.e., whether demonstratives are used in the exophoric, anaphoric, discourse deictic or in recognitional reference);

(2) The nature of reference (i.e., whether the reference is contrastive or non-contrastive; emphatic or non-emphatic; and concrete or vague).

According to Diesel, pragmatic uses can be twofold – exophoric and endophoric (Diessel 1999, 94). As Diesel follows Michael A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan 1976, he uses the term endophoric to name three subcategories: anaphoric, discourse deictic, and recognitional uses.

Exophoric demonstratives focus the addressees' attention on entities in the situation surrounding the interlocutors. They have three distinctive features: they involve the speaker as the deictic centre; they indicate the deictic contrast on a distance scale; and they are often accompanied by a pointing gesture (see Table 4).

Table 4. *Pragmatics*

Use	Reference		
exophoric	(i) *Emphasis*	(ii) *Contrast*	(iii) *Precision*
anaphoric	emphatic	contrastive	precise
discourse deictic	non-emphatic	non-contrastive	vague
recognitional			

These semantic and pragmatic criteria have been explored in various languages using a variety of methods.

3.2 The parameters that influence the demonstrative use and different methods

Although this distance-based approach for the choice of exophoric demonstratives is supported by typological (Diessel 1999; 2005) as well as experimental studies (Coventry et al. 2008; Tóth et al. 2014; Reile 2015), some works suggest that distance is one of the criteria that determine the choice, alongside others, such as perception and projection (Hanks 2011, 320).

In order to understand the cognitive process that determines the demonstrative choice, languages are studied through various concepts: focus (Sidner 1983; Strauss 2002); schematic aspect of deixis (Agha 1996); social deixis (Manning 2001); here-space (Enfield 2003); complex relativistic computation (Rodrigo et al. 2004); speaker's sphere (Marchello-Nizia 2005); reciprocity of perspectives (Hanks 2005; Hanks 2011); joint attentional focus and communicative function (Diessel 2006); intense indicating/neutral indicating (Piwek et al., 2008), etc. Several authors (Laury 1997; Hanks 2005; Marchello-Nizia 2005; Etelämäki 2009) have demonstrated the importance of different contextual frames. Empirical studies have shown that contrast is also an important aspect in determining demonstrative choices (Tóth et al. 2014).

The given studies reveal other, not distance-based, motives for the use of deictic words. They state that the referentiality of demonstratives depends not only on the distance between the speaker and the referent, but most of all on the participants' perception of the environment, the situation and their intentions.

For instance, Nicholas Enfield claims that demonstratives in Lao do not encode "information about distance and only one encodes information about Location" (Enfield 2003, 115). Paul Manning (2001), William Hanks (1990, 2005, 2009), Ritva Laury (1997) and

Christiane Marchello-Nizia (2005) suggest a definition of demonstratives in terms of their communicative function. The practice of demonstratives is 'dynamic', interactive' (Himmelmann 1996; Manning 2001; Hanks 2005) and 'communicative' (Diesel 2006).

Another possible parameter for the demonstrative choice in direct communication is the accessibility of the referent. When it comes to a space deixis and its expression in the exophoric usage, it is important to keep in mind that identification of the referents takes place in the physical world. Daniel Kahnemann (2003) was the first to apply the term accessibility to the identification of referents at the physical level (Piwek et al. 2008, 702). According to him, the accessibility of an object/subject can be assessed when it is in the general focus of the speakers.

Objects/subjects are perceived as low accessible when the speaker, when assessing the situation, thinks that they may be new or unexpected to the addressee. In such contexts, the hearer needs to put more effort into identifying the object. Objects/subjects are perceived as highly accessible when they are already known to the addressee, i.e. they are highly accessible to the speaker and the addressee.

Paul Piwek came to similar conclusions. According to him, new referents are less accessible to the speakers, and referents that are identified in the shared sphere of the speakers or in the joint focus are considered accessible. For the speaker to be in the shared sphere of the speakers, he or she must be mentioned in the previous sentence or be next to the object that was mentioned in the previous sentence (Piwek et al. 2008, 708).

When interpreting the concept of accessibility, other authors do not doubt that the field of view is very important when referring directly to objects (Hanks 2011). By identifying the speakers in his field of vision, the speaker also perceives them as more or less accessible. According to Hanks (Hanks 2011), the assessment of greater or lesser accessibility takes place in the perceptibility domain of the interlocutors.

Based on Hanks' research (Hanks 1990; 2009), Samir Omar Jarbou explains the accessibility of the referents by stating that when identifying objects/subjects, the speaker takes into account the location of the addressee and assesses whether the speaker is more or less available to him (Jarbou 2010, 3088). In his research, the author focuses on the field of vision and the visibility of the referent. According to him, high accessibility of a referent indicates the speaker's belief that the referent is already recognizable or that the addressee will easily recognize it based on well-known contextual circumstances (Jarbou 2010, 3084). Low accessibility of a referent is perceived as the speaker's belief that at the time of the presentation, the addressee

does not have enough contextual hints to identify the speaker. In this case, the speaker makes an effort to have the addressee identify the referent at a particular point in the speech.

For example, in an experiment with English speakers, Kenny Coventry (2014) found that visual accessibility has a significant influence when they choose pronouns *this* and *that*. He performed the experiment by blocking the visibility of the referents.

The author also conducted experiments with English-speaking users to test the concept of mental accessibility presented by Piwek. In an attempt to understand how to apply the concept of mental accessibility in their experiments, the researcher chose the criteria of familiarity and memory. He hypothesized that what the speaker is familiar with and what he remembers from memory (the location of a particular object) will be encoded in the speech by the pronoun *this* 'proximal'.

From what has been said about accessibility, it can be said that the speaker is considered accessible if: 1) he is in the common focus of the speaker and the listener (Piwek et al. 2008; Tóth et al. 2014), i.e., it is mentally accessible; 2) if it is easily recognizable to the addressee (Jarbou 2010), i.e., the referent is visually accessible; 3) if the referent is visible to the speaker (Coventry et al. 2014).

Experiments and natural language research have shown that highly accessible referents are usually coded by so-called 'proximal' demonstratives, and low accessible are coded by 'distal' ones.

Alongside semantic factors (e.g., distance and visibility), pragmatic factors are very important to the choice of demonstrative pronouns as well. The factors, such a contrastive context (when two or more referents are explicitly opposed to each other), influences the demonstrative use. The difference between non-contrastive and contrastive use of demonstratives was revealed by several authors (e.g., Meira & Terrill 2005; Levinson 2006; Diessel 2012):

1. In a contrastive context true distance-neutral demonstratives are not used (Meira and Terrill 2005);

2. Not all the terms in demonstrative pronoun systems are spatially anchored across languages in non-contrastive situations (Levinson 2008a).

3. Demonstrative pronouns in English (*this* and *that*) are "often used interchangeably" in a non-contrastive situation regardless of the location of the referent and, therefore, do not carry an inherent distance feature (Diessel 2012, 2419).

Studies provided in this chapter are usually based on a different methodology. Studies supporting the interaction-based approach in demonstrative research use mostly non-experimental methods (e.g., Laury 1997; Enfield 2003; Etelämäki 2009; Jarbou 2010). Distance-based approach followers, on the other hand, rely more on experimental methods (e.g., Coventry et al. 2008; Bonfiglioli et al. 2009; Luz & van der Sluis 2011).

Piwek at al. (2008, 706) described the differences between these two ways to investigated demonstratives: "Both extremes have their advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, conversation analytical studies involve real world natural conversations but are often difficult to study due to parameters which are hidden from the experimenter. On the other hand, experimental studies provide the experimenter with an extensive insight into the parameters of the situation but can also lead to the study of artificial situations which hardly ever occur in the real world."

Besides these two opposite methods, there is a third way to research "the middle ground" method. Piwek et al. (2008) follow such method by aiming "to study fairly controlled situations which allow the subjects enough room to exhibit natural communicative behaviour" (Piwek et al. 2008, 706).

4. To sum up

It is obvious enough that the Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns in the exophoric usage have been studied in Lithuanian linguistics relatively scarcely. There have been just several attempts to look at the exophoric use and to try to identify parameters other than distance.

Although distance seems to be the most consistent choice that influences parameters across languages, it is not enough to explain some specific cases.

As the long-term experience of these studies in other languages shows, proper analysis of demonstratives in the exophoric usage requires a multimodal database. Collection of relevant material for research can be based on the natural observation method, experimental or quasi-experimental one. The choice of the method tends to depend on semantic or pragmatic functions of demonstratives: semantics factors (i.e. visibility, distance) are usually analysed by experimental methods; interaction-based approach usually relies on non-experimental methods in demonstrative research. On the other hand, the same factor can be verified by either method. Both of them have their advantages and disadvantages.

References

Agha Asif 1996, The emergence of an urban dialect in the Jordanian urban centers, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 5, 53–63.

Ambrazas Vytautas (red.) 2006, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika* (4-as papildytas leidimas), Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Ariel Mira 2001, Accessibility theory: An overview, in Ted Sanders, Joost Schliperoord, Wilbert Spooner (eds.), *Text representation: Linguistic and psycholinguistic aspects*, Oxford: John Benjamins, 29–87.

Bacevičiūtė Rima, Audra Ivanauskienė, Asta Leskauskaitė, Edmundas Trumpa 2004, *Lietuvių kalbos tarmių chrestomatija*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.

Balčiūnienė Ingrida 2005, Parodomųjų įvardžių įsisavinimas, *Lituanistika* 64(4), 45–54.

Bartkutė Darija 2018, Kiekybinė parodomųjų įvardžių vartosena verstiniame ir neverstiniame tekste, *Respectus Philologicus* 39(34), 162–173.

Coventry, Kenny R., Berenice Valdés, Alejandro Castillo, Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes 2008, Language within your reach: near-far perceptual space and spatial demonstratives, *Cognition* 108(3), 889–895.

Coventry, Kenny R., Debra Griffiths, Colin J. Hamilton 2014, Spatial demonstratives and perceptual space: Describing and remembering object location, *Cognitive Psychology* 69, 46–70.

Diessel, Holger 1999, *Demonstratives*, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger 2005, Distance contrasts in demonstratives, in Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer, David Gil, Bernard Comrie (eds.), *World atlas of language structures*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 170–173.

Diessel, Holger 2006, Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar, *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4), 463–489.

DLKŽe – Stasys Keinys et al. (red.), Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas (elektroninis variantas), Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2015 (http://lkiis.lki.lt/dabartinis).

Enfield, Nick J. 2001, 'Lip-pointing': A discussion of form and function with reference to data from Laos, *Gesture* 1(2), 185–211.

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

Etelämäki, Marja 2009, The Finnish demonstrative pronouns in light of interaction, *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(1), 25–46.

Grosz, Barbara, Candace Sidner 1986, Attention, intentions, and the structure of discourse, *Computational Linguistics* 12, 175–204.

Gundel, Jeanette K. 1978, Stress, pronominalization and given-new distinction, *University of Hawai Working Papers in Linguistics* 10(2), 1–13.

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

Halliday, Michael A. K., Ruqaiya Hasan 1977, *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.

Hanks, William F. 1990, *Referential practise: language and lived space among the Maya*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Hanks, William F. 2005, Explorations in the deictic field, *Current Anthropology* 46(2), 191–220.

Hanks, William F. 2009, Fieldwork on deixis, *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(1), 10–24.

Hanks, William F. 2011, Deixis and indexicality, in Wolfram Bublitz, Neal R.Norrick (eds.), *Foundations of pragmatics*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 315–345.

Heigham, Juanita, Robert A. Croker (eds.) 2009, *Qualitative research in applied linguistics*, London: Palgrave MacMillan.

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

Jarbou, Samir Omar 2010, Accessibility vs. physical proximity: An analysis of exophoric demonstrative practice in spoken Jordanian Arabic, *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(11), 3078–3097.

Judžentytė, Gintarė 2017, Spatial deixis in Lithuanian: demonstrative pronouns, in Andra Kalnača, Ilze Lokmane (eds.), *Valoda: nozīme un forma 8: Valodas gramatiskās un leksiskās sistēmas variatīvums = Language: Meaning and Form 8: Grammatical and lexical variance in language system*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 173–193.

Judžentytė, Gintarė 2018a, A pragmatic approach to space deixis in the Baltic languages: a case study of deictic expressions in spoken language, in Pietro U. Dini (red.), *Incontri Baltistici in Pisa: studi e saggi* 2, Novi Ligure: Joker, 65–94.

Judžentytė-Šinkūnienė, Gintarė 2018b, The system of the demonstrative pronouns provided in the grammar of Modern Lithuanian: analysis of traditions, in Andra Kalnača, Ilze

Lokmane (eds.), *Valoda: nozīme un forma 9: Gramatika un pragmatika (Language: Meaning and Form 9: Grammar and pragmatics)*, Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 68–79.

Kahneman, Daniel 2003, A perspective on judgement and choice: Mapping bounded rationality, *American Psychologist* 58(9), 697–720.

Keinys, Stasys (red.) 2011, *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (6-asis leidimas, 3-iasis elektroninis), Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Kemmerer, David 1999, "Near" and "far" in language and perception, *Cognition* 73, 35–63.

Laury, Ritva 1997, *Demonstratives in interaction, Amsterdam and Philadelphia*: John Benjamins.

Larjavaara, Matti 2007, *Pragmasemantiikka*, Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2004, Deixis, in Laurence R. Horn, Gregory Ward (eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 97–121.

LKŽe – Gertrūda Naktinienė et al. (red.), *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, 1–20 (1941–2002): elektroninis variantas, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas, 2005 (www.lkz.lt).

Manning, Paul 2001, On social deixis, *Anthropological Linguistics* 43(3), 55–100.

Marchello-Nizia, Christiane 2005, Deixis and subjectivity: The semantics of demonstratives in Old French (9th–12th century), *Journal of Pragmatics* 37(1), 43–68.

McNeill, David 1992, *Hand and mind: What gestures reveal about thought*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mikulėnienė, Danguolė, Vilija Ragaišienė (sud.) 2013, *Visos tarmės gražiausios... Tarmių medžiagos rinkimo instrukcija*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas. Mittelberg, Irene 2006, Methodology for multimodality, in Irene Mittelberg, Seana Coulson, Monica Gonzalez-Marquez, Michael J. Spivey (eds.), Methods in cognitive linguistics, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Pajusalu, Renate 2006, Death of a demonstrative: Person and time. The case of Estonia too, *Linguistica Uralica* 42(4), 241–253.

Pajusalu, Renate 2009, Pronouns and reference in Estonian, *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 62(1–2), 122–139.

Piwek, Paul, Robbert-Jan Beun, Anita Cremers 2008, 'Proximal' and 'distal' in language and cognition: Evidence from deictic demonstratives in Dutch, *Journal of Pragmatics* 40(4), 694–718.

Querol-Julián, Mercedes, Inmaculada Fortanet-Gómez 2016, Vertinimas konferencijos pranešimo klausimų ir diskusijos dalyje: teoriniai multimodalinės analizės pagrindai, *Kalbotyra* 66, 77–98.

Reile, Maria 2015, Space and demonstratives: An experiment with Estonian exophoric demonstratives, *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 6(2), 137–165.

Rodrigo, Maria José, Angela González, Manuel de Vega, Mercedes Muñetón-Ayala, Guacimara Rodríguez 2004, From gestural to verbal deixis: a longitudinal study with spanish infants and toddlers, *First Language* 24(1), 71–90.

Rosinas, Albertas 1982, Deiktinės sistemos baltų kalbų tarmėse, *Baltistica* 18(2), 140–152.

Rosinas, Albertas 1988, *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

Rosinas, Albertas 1996, *Lietuvių bendrinės kalbos įvardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Sidner, Candace 1983, Focusing in the comprehension of definite anaphora, in James F. Allen, Michael Brady, Robert C. Berwick (eds.), *Computational models of discourse*, 267–330.

Strauss, Susan 2002, This, that, and it in spoken American English: A demonstrative system of gradient focus, *Language Sciences* 24, 131–152.

Tóth, Enikő, Péter Csatár, Arina Banga 2014, Exploring Hungarian and Dutch gestural demonstratives, in Ludmila Veselovská, Markéta Janebová (eds.), *Complex visibles out there. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language Use and Linguistic Structure*, Olomouc: Palacký University, 607–627.

Ulvydas, Kazimieras (red.) 1965, *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika* 1, Vilnius: Mintis.