

In this paper, we focus on the interpretation of proper names modified by adnominal demonstratives (DPNs) in Tzocohuite Nahuatl (TN). To do so, we compare the semantics of DEM + PN sequences to that of bare proper names (BPNs). In TN, there are three adnominal demonstratives: *ni*: (1), *ne*: (2) and *nopa* (3). Note that, in TN, adnominal demonstratives are person-oriented, as shown in (1–3) (see Anderson & Keenan, 1985). In exophoric uses, TN adnominal demonstratives can also convey distal contrasts when they modify a proper name.

- (1) Close to the speaker  
 [ni: okichpil] no-ikni  
 DEM.PROX boy POSR.1SG-sibling  
 ‘This boy is my brother.’
- (2) Far from both the speaker and the hearer  
 [ne: okichpil] i-ikni  
 DEM.DIST boy POSR.3SG-sibling  
 no-wikal  
 POSR.1SG-boyfriend/girlfriend  
 ‘That boy (over there) is my boyfriend’s/girlfriend’s brother.’
- (3) Far from the speaker, close to the hearer  
 [nopa okichpil] i-ikni  
 DEM boy POSR.3SG-sibling  
 no-wikal  
 POSR.1SG-boyfriend/girlfriend  
 ‘That boy (near you) is my boyfriend’s/girlfriend’s brother.’

*Nopa* also displays some of the features expected from a definite marker. For instance, *nopa* has anaphoric uses, both discourse anaphoric ones (4) and associative ones (5). Note that, if *nopa* were always a demonstrative, it should not be able to appear in associative anaphors (Becker, 2021, pp. 110–111; Vázquez Rojas Maldonado et al., 2019, Section 2.2-2.3). However, *nopa* fails the consistency test (6), which is a behavior that is expected from a demonstrative but not from a definite marker (Dayal, 2020, Section 1.1; Löbner, 1985, pp. 283–287). Given this, we suggest that there are two homophonous *nopa*: one is a demonstrative and the other one is a definite marker.

- (4) Discourse anaphora
- a. ya:lwaya tiyankis nikitak para  
 yesterday market S.1SG-O.3-see-PST COMP  
 [se: telpoka-tl]<sub>i</sub> ki-ko:-hi nochi sin-tli  
 one lad-ABS O3-buy-PST all corn-ABS  
 ‘Yesterday, at the marketplace I saw that a lad bought all the corn.’
- b. teipa [nopa telpoka-tl]<sub>i</sub> nohkiya ki-ko:.hi  
 after DEM lad-ABS also O3-buy-PST  
 nochi e-tl  
 all bean-ABS  
 ‘Afterwards, that lad also bought all the beans.’

- (5) Associative anaphora  
ya:lwaya [no-ikni] i:xtlapalwets-ki iwan  
yesterday POSR.1SG-sibling back.fall-PST and  
mo-mamikili-hi ipan [nopa i-tsonteko]  
REFL-hit-PST on DEM POSR.3SG-head  
‘Yesterday, my brother fell on his back and he hit himself on the head.’
- (6) Consistency test: contradictory sentences  
nopa okichpil noikni iwan nopa okichpil  
DEM boy POSR.1SG-sibling and DEM boy  
ax-no-ikni  
NEG-POSR.3SG-sibling  
‘That boy is my brother and that boy is not my brother.’

In this paper, we propose that DPNs are rigid designators, whereas BPNs are non-rigid (Kaplan, 1989). In this regard, note that BPNs can covary with respect to another operator such as a universal quantifier (7). By contrast, a universal quantifier cannot induce the covariation of a DPN (8) (see Jambrović, 2022).

- (7) a. ipan sehse kal-me mo-chantlalia Juan  
on each house-pl refl-inhabit Juan  
‘In each house lives Juan (the same Juan).’  
b. ipan sehse kal-me mo-chantlalia-h Juan  
on each house-pl refl-inhabit-s.pl Juan  
‘In each house lives a (different) Juan.’
- (8) a. ipan sehse kal-me mochantlalia ne: / nopa  
on each house-PL REFL-inhabit DEM.DIST/DEM  
Juan  
Juan  
‘In each house lives that John (the same John)’  
b. Xipan sehse kal-me mochantlalia -h ne: / nopa  
on each house-PL REFL-inhabit-S.PL DEM.DIST/DEM  
Juan  
Juan

The Tzocohuite Nahuatl data is relevant for studying the semantics of determined proper names. Thus far, most of the literature has focused on languages like Spanish in which demonstratives and definite markers are formally distinct. It has been reported that, in Spanish type languages, a proper name modified by a definite marker is not necessarily rigid (see Jambrović, 2022). However, in TN type languages, proper names are always rigid when they combine with a definite marker.

## References

- Anderson, S. R., & Keenan, E. L. (1985). Deixis. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description* (Vol. 3, pp. 259–308). Cambridge University Press.
- Becker, L. (2021). *Articles in the world's languages*. De Gruyter.
- Dayal, V. (2020). *Identifying (In)definiteness: A Questionnaire* [Cuestionario].
- Jambrović, S. (2022). Singular referential names as nonrigid designators and bound variables. In Ö. Bakay, B. Pratley, E. Neu, & P. Deal (Eds.), *NELS 52*:

- Proceedings of the fifty-second annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society* (Vol. 2, pp. 73–86). GLSA.
- Kaplan, D. (1989). Demonstratives. In J. Almog, J. Perry, & H. K. Wettstein (Eds.), *Themes from Kaplan* (pp. 481–563). Oxford University Press.
- Löbner, S. (1985). Definites. *Journal of Semantics*, 4(4), 279–326.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/4.4.279>
- Vázquez Rojas Maldonado, V., Gómez González, N. B., & Rodríguez Corte, A. (2019). *Cuestionario para identificar frases nominales de referencia definida “simple”* [Cuestionario].