ZE LO KAXA 'IT'S NOT LIKE THAT': THE FUNCTIONS OF THE DISCOURSE-DEICTIC *KAXA* 'THUS' IN SPOKEN ISRAELI HEBREW

Leon Shor

Tel Aviv University

The lexeme *kaχa* 'thus', 'in this manner' serves as the primary manner demonstrative in informal Israeli Hebrew. In its basic exophoric function, *kaχa* may be used by the speaker to refer to some visible physical behavior or state of affairs in the speech situation; much more frequently, however, *kaχa* is employed by the interlocutor's discourse deictically, targeting existing or anticipated discourse segments, originating either in the speaker's own speech or in the speech of any of the interlocutors. This study analyzes the functional distribution of the discourse-deictic *kaχa* in spoken Israeli Hebrew, attempting to characterize its possible referents and to identify the pragmatic actions performed by the entire utterance in which *kaχa* is embedded. The results show that as a discourse-deictic manner demonstrative, *kaχa* points – retrospectively or prospectively – to an extended discourse segment which spans either a single utterance or several utterances. This discourse segment typically contains a claim, an opinion or an assessment expressed by one of the interlocutors. In so doing, *kaχa*, together with the entire utterance in which it is embedded, serves different pragmatic purposes. Retrospective *kaχa* utterances typically have an evaluative function – they are used by the next speaker to respond to the prior speaker's stance with regard to some state of affairs, resulting in convergent or divergent alignment with that speaker. Prospective *kaχa* utterances, on the other hand, were found to preface the speaker's upcoming extended turns, functioning as a "floor-claiming" device that draws the recipient's attention to the upcoming turn and heightens his interest in its expected content.

1. INTRODUCTION

The lexeme *kaχa* 'thus', 'in this manner' serves as the primary manner demonstrative in informal Israeli Hebrew.[1] In what probably constitutes its basic meaning, *kaχa* is used exophorically, referring to some visible physical behavior or state of affairs in the speech situation. However, when the distribution of *kaχa* is examined in naturally occurring conversations, it appears that its exophoric function is not particularly common. More often, *kaχa* is employed by the speaker's

---

1 I would like to thank Prof. Shlomo Izreʾel (Tel Aviv University), Prof. Francis Cornish (Université de Toulouse 2-Jean Jaurès), and two anonymous reviewers for their valuable and informative comments on previous versions of this article.

discourse deictically, either retrospectively, targeting prior turns, or prospectively, pointing to upcoming turns. A contextual examination of these discourse-deictic occurrences reveals that each of these uses – the retrospective and the prospective – typically contributes to a different pragmatic function, as part of the utterances in which they are embedded. Retrospective utterances of *kaχa* are typically used by the speaker to respond to the prior speaker's stance with regard to some state of affairs, resulting in convergent or divergent alignment with that speaker (see Du Bois 2007). Such use can be seen in the next example, taken from a conversation between two friends:[2]

Excerpt 1 (Y34_sp1_406–419, sp2_143–146: sp1 is telling a friend about her car)

1   sp1   *ve   ani   lo   ʦriχa   leʃaχnea   otaχ | ʃehaoto   haze   tov |*
          and   I   not   need   to:convince   you | that:this:car   the:this   good|

          'And I don't have to convince you that this car is good,'

2   *speʦifit   hareχev haze | ki   at   nasat   bo   hamon||*
          specifically   the:car   the:this | because   you   you:drove   in:it   a_lot ||

          'this car specifically, since you drove it a lot.'

3   sp2   *m: ||*
          mhm||

          'Mhm.'

4   sp1   *ve | lifnej   ʃavua | (0.4) test | χalak || χalak || ejn   tikunim ||*
          and | before   week | (0.4) test | smooth || smooth || there:is:not   repair ||

          'and a week ago, (0.4) it easily passed the periodic inspection. Easily. No repairs.'

5   sp2   (0.3) *ken ||*
          (0.3) yes ||

          '(0.3) Yes.'

6   sp1   *veχuʦ   mitipulej aseret alafim | vetest | ejn ||*
          and:besides   periodic_maintenance | and:inspection | there:is:not ||

          'And besides doing periodic maintenance and inspection, there is nothing.'

7   [*ejn   baoto   klum ||*
          [there:is:not   in:the:car   nothing ||

          ['The car has no expenses.'

---

2 The examples in this study are taken from the Corpus of Spoken Israeli Hebrew (see Section 4). Audio files of the examples can be downloaded from <telaviv.academia.edu/LeonShor>.
Transcription conventions: | minor prosodic boundary; || major prosodic boundary; / major prosodic boundary carrying an "appeal" tone; - truncated word; <creak> non-verbal sounds; ::: elongation; (pauses in seconds); [overlap]. The gloss conventions follow Rule 4C (Optional) of the Leipzig Glossing Rules used in this journal: "If an object-language element is formally and semantically segmentable, but the author does not want to show the formal segmentation (because it is irrelevant and/or to keep the text intact), the colon may be used." Since this paper deals mainly with pragmatic phenomena related to reference, many morphological features are ignored, and some are translated in the gloss rather than represented.

8   sp2   [*ken* || *gam ani* **kaχa** ||
             [yes || also I   **thus** ||

             ['Yes. I am also **like that**.'

Prior to this excerpt, sp1 argued that Japanese cars are better than European cars. To support her argument, she positively evaluates her own car by invoking sp2's personal experience with that car (lines 1–2), and by describing its low cost of maintenance (lines 4, 6, 7). Throughout the segment, sp2 displays engaged listenership by employing the back-channels *m*: 'mhm' and *ken* 'yes' (lines 3, 5, 8), followed by the utterance *gam ani kaχa* || 'I am also like that.', which expresses a convergent stance with the one previously expressed by sp1. Through this stance utterance, sp2 builds her stance on sp1's stance – the focus particle *gam* 'also' functions as an "intersubjective alignment marker" that anticipates sp2's convergent alignment (Du Bois 2007: 162), and the manner demonstrative *kaχa* points to sp1's prior evaluation, roughly paraphrased as "the way you have just evaluated".

Prospective *kaχa* utterances, by contrast, are typically used by the speakers to preface their own extended turns, and thus can be seen as a projecting device that allows the speaker to claim the floor for as long as the projected turn is not completed (Schiffrin 1980: 205–209; Goodwin 2002; Liddicoat 2007: 74–75).[3] Consider the following example, taken from a conversation between two friends about an apartment they had recently seen:

Excerpt 2 (C842_sp2_144–146, sp1_138–146: two friends are discussing an apartment they had seen)

1   sp2   *ʃel avi ze   baemtsa || naχon /*
             of Avi   this in:the:middle || right   /

             'Avi's (room) is in the middle. Right?'

2   sp1   *lo || ʃel avi | (0.7) ze   mul   haχeder ʃel gadi* ||
             no || of Avi | (0.7) this in_front_of the:room of Gadi ||

             'No. Avi's room is in front of Gadi's room.'

3   (0.3) *ze   holeχ **kaχa** ||*
             (0.3) this go   **thus** ||

             'It goes **like this**.'

4   *eχ   ʃeniχnasim | ken / (0.5) jeʃ misdaron || naχon / niχnasim lamisdaron ||*
             how that:enter | yes / (0.5) EXT corridor || right / enter   to:the:corridor ||

             'When you enter, right? (0.5) There is a corridor. Right? You enter the corridor.'

5   sp2   *ken* ||
             yes ||

             'Yes.'

             (sequence continuation: sp1_146–173, sp2_147–162)

Prior to the excerpt, the speakers were discussing their friends' apartment with the intention of renting a room. Trying to recall which room belongs to whom, sp2 suggests a location of Avi's room (line 1), to which sp1 objects, providing an alternative location (line 2). In order to provide an epistemic grounding in support of his claim, sp1 initiates an extended co-remembering turn in which he recreates the structure of the apartment (Bolden & Mandelbaum 2017). This extended turn is introduced by the metalinguistic utterance *ze holeχ kaχa* || 'It goes like this', which serves to direct the addressee's attention to an upcoming extended turn, which turns out to convey an account for the speaker's disagreement.

These two first excerpts demonstrate that, although both prospectively and retrospectively *kaχa* points to contextually relevant discourse segments, the pragmatic function of the utterances in which *kaχa* is embedded is different in each of these uses. By analyzing the functional and distributional properties of *kaχa* in spoken Israeli Hebrew, this study aims at describing the pragmatic functions of discourse-deictic occurrences of *kaχa*, and it attempts to characterize *kaχa*'s typical referents. The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 will present an overview of the Israeli Hebrew manner demonstratives. Section 3 will describe the discourse-deictic function of demonstratives in general, and that of manner demonstratives in particular, followed by Section 4, which will describe the data utilized in this study. Finally, Sections 5–7 will present a detailed analysis of discourse-deictic occurrences of *kaχa* by providing a functional and distributional analysis.

2. THE ISRAELI HEBREW MANNER DEMONSTRATIVES

Israeli Hebrew possesses two main manner demonstratives – *kaχa* and *kaχ* – each of which are inherited from both strata of Classical Hebrew and can be translated roughly as 'in this manner' or 'that is how' (Joüon & Muraoka 2003: 332; Azar 1995: 226, 310–311). Synchronically, the choice between these forms depends mainly on the level of formality assumed by the speaker – *kaχa* is characteristic of less formal registers, most typically spontaneous conversation, whereas *kaχ* is restricted to a more formal, or literary, style. Although *kaχa* has occasionally been mentioned in grammatical treatments of Israeli Hebrew (e.g. Glinert 1989: 58–59), its complete range of functions has escaped detailed analysis, probably since grammatical research has traditionally been inclined toward the written varieties of Hebrew, of which, as mentioned before, *kaχa* is not characteristic.

Other demonstrative expressions, however, have attracted attention from scholars in relation to their functions in spoken Israeli Hebrew. These include the demonstrative pronoun *ze* 'this-ᴍ' (Halevy 2006; Borochovsky Bar-Aba 2010: 183–207), the pro-adjective *kaze* 'like this' (Henkin 1999; Ziv 1998; Maschler 2001), and the temporal pro-adverbs *az* 'then' and *aχʃav* 'now' (Livnat & Yatsiv 2006; Gonen, Livnat & Amir 2015; Livnat, Amir & Gonen 2016).

Nevertheless, several scholars have briefly mentioned that *kaχa* introduces discourse segments in some of its functions. For example, it may be used as a quotative marker, which is possibly interchangeable with other forms that also express similarity and comparison, such as the pro-adjective *kaze* 'like this' and the counterfactual marker *keilu* 'as if' (Henkin 1999: 112–113; Ziv 2006: 149–151). In addition, speakers may also use *kaχa* to preface an extended, and possibly complex, segment of speech. This use was noted briefly by Maschler

(2009: 23), who found one such instance in her database, classifying it as a structural discourse marker with the function of "introducing an action".[4]

3. DISCOURSE-DEICTIC FUNCTION OF (MANNER) DEMONSTRATIVES

Past research has extensively discussed the discourse-deictic use of demonstrative expressions (Webber 1991; Himmelmann 1996; Laury 1997; Diessel 1999; Levinson 2004; Cornish 2011). In this type of usage, the demonstratives point toward an existing, or an anticipated, representation in surrounding discourse, requiring the recipient to operate upon that representation in order to create a referent that was not present initially (Cornish 2011: 759–761). Accordingly, a discourse-deictic demonstrative pointing toward the same textual segment may give rise to different referents, depending on the local context of that demonstrative. For instance, the utterance *They've promoted Fred to second vice president* may yield (at least) the following referents when subsequently pointed to by the demonstrative *that*: the speech act performed by the utterance, as in *That's a lie*, the proposition conveyed by the utterance, as in *That's false*, or the event denoted by the utterance, as in *When did that happen?* (adapted from Webber 1991: 111–112).

Studies focusing on discourse deixis in spoken language have shown that speakers use discourse-deictic demonstratives in order to achieve various interactional goals. Prospective discourse deixis directs the listener's attention to an upcoming stretch of discourse, enabling the speaker to buy time to plan what he or she is going to say next, as well as facilitating the listener's processing of the upcoming extended segment (Schiffrin 1980: 209–210; Deroey 2015: 66–67). This seems to be the function of the discourse-deictic demonstrative phrase *this way* in the utterance *I'll answer it this way*, which was uttered after the speaker was asked how he felt about marriage between blacks and whites (adapted from Schiffrin 1980: 205–206). Retrospective discourse deixis, on the other hand, is employed in order to comment on, conclude, or evaluate a topic that one of the speech participants may have raised during the conversation, thus displaying alignment or disalignment with that speaker (Laury 1997: 102; Hopper 2014: 291–292). This is arguably the function of the demonstrative *that* in the utterance *That's just sick*, which was uttered as a response to a narrative told by the previous speaker (adapted from Hopper 2014: 292).

Within the class of demonstratives, the subclass of manner demonstratives is one of the least studied. In his recent typological study of manner deixis, König (2015: 55) pointed out that manner demonstratives are "almost completely neglected in the literature on deictic expressions and demonstratives".[5] This scholarly neglect of manner-referring demonstratives can be partly attributed to the fact that Indo-European languages, which have attracted the bulk of linguistic scholarly interest, do not seem to possess rich manner-demonstrative paradigms. The manner demonstratives in these languages are rarely differentiated according to the location of a referent relative to the center of orientation, as opposed to their pronominal and locative counterparts, and typically consist of a single lexeme expressing 'thus/in this manner': for example, *tak* (Russian), *so* (German), *así* (Spanish), and *sīc* (Latin). Other languages, by contrast, display manner-demonstrative paradigms that manifest a three-term distinction between proximal, medial, and distal demonstratives: for example, *näin-noin-niin* (Finnish),

---

4 Maschler's study is based on the Haifa Corpus of Spoken Israeli Hebrew, comprised of casual Hebrew conversations among college-educated Israelis, which were recorded over the years 1994–2002 (Maschler 2009: 9).
5 Exceptions to this tendency are König (2012; 2015) and König & Umbach (forthcoming).

így-úgy-amúgy (Hungarian), and *koo-soo-aa* (Japanese) (König 2015: 38–39). Furthermore, as Nogué-Serrano (2015: 235) has pointed out, English, which served as the basis for a great number of deixis studies, has not fully grammaticalized the category of manner demonstratives (his "modal deixis"), which is expressed in English by analytical expressions, formed by a demonstrative and a noun with a general meaning of manner (*this/that way*), or by a preposition *like* followed by a demonstrative (*like this/that*).[6]

Unsurprisingly, apart from a number of mentions, the discourse-deictic function of manner demonstratives has remained practically unaddressed. Nevertheless, it has been noted in the typological literature that manner demonstratives may be used as discourse deictics, a function that is commonly viewed as an extension of their more basic situational use. Functioning retrospectively, manner demonstratives may refer to referents conveyed by sentences, clauses, and predications, such as the Russian *tak* 'thus' in *tak polagajut mnogie učenyje* 'many scholars think like this/so' (König 2015: 44). Functioning prospectively, manner demonstratives refer to an anticipated unit of action, typically direct or indirect speech, such as the German *so* 'thus' in *er hat das so formuliert* 'he puts it this way' (König 2015: 49).

In addition to simply referring, discourse-deictic manner demonstratives have been shown to fulfill several interactional functions. In Cirebon Javanese, for example, such demonstratives frequently mark the end of a prosodic cluster, thus projecting a possible end of turn (Ewing 2014: 58–60). This tendency of manner demonstratives to be realized at major discourse junctures is also evident in their cross-linguistic tendency to mark a transition from one activity to another. This is the case in Estonian, in which the manner demonstratives *nii* and *soo* 'like that', 'in this way', 'so' are used to mark transitions between conversational activities (Keevallik 2005; 2010a; 2010b). By marking a certain activity as being terminated, speakers can achieve several pragmatic goals, such as claiming authority over the agenda, marking a return to the main activity, and issuing a general call that summons the participants to be attentive to the transition (Keevallik 2010a: 360).[7]

4. DATA

The data for this research were obtained from the Corpus of Spoken Israeli Hebrew (CoSIH) database.[8] The CoSIH database includes recordings of spontaneous Israeli Hebrew conversations that were made during 2001 and 2002. By focusing on naturally occurring conversations, this study takes a "usage-based" perspective of language by examining how collaborative and situated interactions influence linguistic patterns in everyday conversation. It should be mentioned, however, that the use of recorded data is inherently limited in that it only provides access to the linguistic and para-linguistic dimensions of the interaction, but not to other, no less significant aspects of interaction, such as gaze, gesture, and posture.

There are 83 occurrences of *kaχa* in the CoSIH database, the overall picture of which is presented in Table 1:

---

6 As König (2015: 39) pointed out, the English *so* is not a typical representative of a manner demonstrative since it has almost completely lost its exophoric use.

7 Keevallik also discussed manner pro-adverbs from several languages – German *so*, Swedish *så*, Russian *tak*, Finnish *nii*(*n*), Dutch *zo*, English *so*, and Japanese *sate* – showing that pro-adverbs of manner are one of the linguistic items that are typologically recruited for marking transitions.

8 Available at <cosih.com/english/index.html>.

Table 1 Distribution of *kaχa* occurrences according to function

Exophoric reference	Retrospective discourse deixis	Prospective discourse deixis	Lexical uses	Total
15 (18%)	41 (49%)	14 (17%)	13 (16%)	83 (100%)

Since this paper only addresses the discourse-deictic functions of *kaχa*, I will not discuss its other uses, namely the exophoric and the lexical ones. Accordingly, the following sections elaborate on the retrospective and prospective discourse-deictic functions of *kaχa* and illustrate the various interactional functions that utterances containing *kaχa* achieve.

5. RETROSPECTIVE *KAXA* – CONVEYING STANCE

In this section, the function of retrospective *kaχa* utterances is presented and discussed. In order to analyze this function, I follow Du Bois (2007: 163), who defines stance as "a public act by a social actor, achieved dialogically through overt communicative means, of simultaneously evaluating objects, positioning subjects (self and others), and aligning with other subjects, with respect to any salient dimension of the sociocultural field". This definition of stance allows us to interpret the diversity of stances not as distinct types of a stance, but as different facets of a unified stance act that includes three components – evaluation, positioning, and alignment (Du Bois 2007: 144–145).

Throughout the corpus there were 41 instances of *kaχa* pointing retrospectively to a contextually relevant discourse segment. In most of these instances, the prior discourse segment expresses some kind of stance in relation to a particular state of affairs. The evaluative component of that stance is subsequently pointed to by *kaχa*, embedded in an utterance that responds to that stance.

In Section 1, we have already seen an instance where the second speaker expresses a convergent stance with the prior speaker by pointing to the evaluative component of the prior speaker's stance act. The following excerpt, by contrast, demonstrates an instance of a divergent stance. In this case, the utterance containing *kaχa* is used by the second speaker to object to an evaluation of some state of affairs made by the previous speaker:

Excerpt 3 (C1624_sp3_029–047, sp1_073–089: a conversation between a Jewish man and an Arab woman)

1 sp3 *ma lamadt ‖ at lamadt et ha | bajbel / et ha | brit haχadaʃa /*
what you:studied ‖ you you:studied ACC the| Bible / ACC the| New Testament/
'What did you study? You studied the Bible? The New Testament?'

2 sp1 *<laughter> al tazkir li ‖*
<laughter> not remind to:me ‖
<laughter> 'Don't remind me.'

3 (sp3_034–045, sp1_074–082 omitted – side-sequence in which sp3 accounts for his questions by claiming he does not know any Arabs personally)

4 sp1 (3.7) *ma ʃaalta / ah ‖ ken ‖ lamadti et ze ‖*
(3.7) what you:asked / oh ‖ yes ‖ I:studied ACC that ‖
'(3.7) What did you ask? Oh. Yes. I studied that.'

5 sp3   *vehem   keilu lamdu   et   hakuran /*
                 and:they   like they:studied ᴀᴄᴄ the:Quran /

                 'And they (= Muslim Arabs) like studied the Quran?'

6   *keilu hem lomdim et   hakuran* [*veatem et   habrit   haχadaʃa* ||
                 like they study   ᴀᴄᴄ   the:Quran [and:you ᴀᴄᴄ the New Testament||

                 'I mean, they study the Quran [and you study the New Testament.'

7 sp1   [*lo* | *ze lo **kaχa** *|| ze kaʃur   leejze   betsefer ata holeχ* ||
                 [no | this not **thus** || this is:related to:which school you go ||

                 ['No, it is not **like that**. It depends on what school you attend.'

The excerpt is taken from a conversation between a Jewish man and an Arab woman.[9] At the beginning of the excerpt, sp3 asks sp1 whether as a Christian Arab she used to study the New Testament in high school. Sp1's humorous response in line 2 leads sp3 to account for his question by saying that he has never truly spoken with an Arab person, which leads to a short exchange that suspends the development of the topic sp3 had raised.[10] Following a considerable pause, sp1 resumes that topic in line 4 and provides a positive answer to sp3's prior question. This leads sp3 to pose another question that reflects his evaluation that the nature of religious studies in high school is determined by the student's religion (lines 5–6). In response, sp1 expresses a divergent stance with the utterance *lo* | *ze lo kaχa* || 'No, it is not like that.' She then explains that the nature of religious studies in high school is determined by the particular school the student attends (line 7). Focusing on the stance utterance, we can observe that the stance in this case is constructed somewhat differently than was evidenced in excerpt 1. Here, sp1 conveys disagreement by expressing the incompatibility between sp3's prior stance (referred to with the demonstrative *ze* 'this'), and the state of affairs in the world as perceived by sp1 (referred to by means of *kaχa*). Conveying disagreement in such a format seems to distance sp1 from sp3 by summarizing two different facts in line 6 and compressing them in the shortest way possible. The use of *ze lo kaχa* comes to not repeat the object that is the disagreement, creating more distance between the participants in a somewhat creative way.[11]

In the next excerpt, the utterance containing *kaχa* is used by the second speaker to convey a puzzled stance regarding the first speaker's behavior:

Excerpt 4 (OCD_2_sp2_060–065, sp1_028–031: friends are talking about a vacation)

1 sp2   *arbaa jamim* | (0.6) *ʃva   meot   ʃloʃim ʃekel lezug* ||
                 four   days | (0.6) seven hundreds thirty shekel to:couple ||

                 'Four days, (the cost is) (0.6) seven hundred and thirty shekels for a couple.'

2 sp1   *bli   kesef* ||
                 without money||

                 'Very cheap.'

---

9 A potential shortcoming in using this particular interaction is that sp1 was not a native Hebrew speaker, having Arabic as her first language (L1) and Hebrew as a second language (L2).

10 This exchange was omitted in the transcript.

11 For disalignment that creates distance between speakers in a creative way, see Dori-Hacohen 2017.

3   sp2   *naχon* /
             right   /
             'Right?'

4   sp1   *efo*   /
             Where /
             'Where?'

5   sp2   (0.4) *beholidej_in   haχadaʃ* ||
             (0.4) in:Holliday_in the:new ||
             '(0.4) At the new Holiday Inn.'

6   sp1   *daj* ||
             enough ||
             'Wow.'

7   sp2   (0.4) *niftaχ*   *holidej*   *in* *χadaʃ* || [*ken* ||
             (0.4) was:opened   Holliday_in   new || [yes ||
             '(0.4) A new Holiday Inn opened. [Yes.'

8   sp1   [*lama asit*   ***kaχa*** *velo*   *amart*   *li gam* /
             [why you:did   **thus**   and:not   you:told   me also /
             ['Why did you act **like that** and didn't tell me too?'

In (4), sp2 resumes the topic of going away for a weekend to a hotel by mentioning the extremely low price of that hotel. Sp1 reacts by wondering why sp2 did not tell him about her plans in a stance utterance structured as a paratactic clause complex (line 8). With this utterance, sp1 directs a puzzled stance towards sp2's behavior, roughly paraphrased as "going away for an exceptionally low-priced weekend". This stance object was not explicitly expressed prior to sp1's *kaχa* utterance in line 8, but rather, it seems to have been created through sp1's utterance by "condensing" the act of going away for a weekend with the fact that the holiday was a bargain. Note that the overall content conveyed by the paratactic clause contributes significantly to the interpretation of *kaχa*, since it constrains the range of compatible referents potentially derivable from the prior context. It is only by requesting the reason for not telling about some manner of conduct that the referent of *kaχa* receives its meaning. In other words, the exact nature of the referent becomes apparent only when processing the entire context of *kaχa*, in this case the context of the entire clause complex.

    In the following excerpt, we can see that speakers may target their own utterances by means of a retrospective *kaχa* utterance. This excerpt is taken from a conversation between two soldiers participating in a command briefing:

Excerpt 5 (P423_1_sp1_009–010: sp1 is a soldier talking with a fellow soldier during a command briefing)

1   sp1   *ad*   *χameʃ* *lo* *jakriu*   *et*   *haʃemot* ||
             until five   not   they:will:read   ACC   the:names ||
             'Until five they will not read the names.'

2   *ze tamid **kaχa***||
    this always **thus**||

    'It's always **like that**.'

In this excerpt, sp1 predicts that the names of the soldiers will not be read until five, implying that it will take a long time (line 1), and then strengthens the validity of his prediction by resorting to his past experience in the utterance *ze tamid kaχa* 'It's always like that.' (line 2). The manner demonstrative *kaχa* points to sp1's previous utterance, instructing the hearer to construct a referent out of it. The resulting referent is not the specific future (non)event conveyed in the previous utterance, but rather the habitual (non)event "they don't read the names until five", which is supported by the presence of the adverb *tamid* 'always' in the clause.

In a similar fashion, the speaker in the next excerpt attempts to strengthen the validity of her prior evaluation; however, here the stance utterance is structured as a negative yes/no question:

Excerpt 6 (OCD_3_sp3_001–006, sp2_005–008: sp2 is complaining about a dispute with her colleague)

1 sp3 *sigali | boj ani agid laχ ethaemet imkolhakavod ʃeani ohevet otaχ |*
    Sigali | let's I I:will:tell to:you the:truth with:all:due:respect that:I love you |

    'Sigali, let me tell you the truth, with all due respect, and I love you,'

2   *hasiχsuχ beneχ leben gili hitχil mize |*
    the:dispute between:you and Gili he:started from:this |

    ʃeʃtejχen jeʃ laχem pe gadol |
    that:both:of:you there:is to:you mouth big |

    'The dispute between you and Gili started from the fact that both of you have a big mouth,'

3   *toda | [baruχ haʃem ||*
    thank_you | [thank God ||

    'Thank you, [thank God.'

4 sp2 [*lo naχon || ze hitχil mize | ʃehitχalti lihjot level ʃtajim ||*
    [not right || this he:started from:this | that:I:started to:be level two ||

    ['That is not true. It started when I started being level two (at work).'

5   *omer| ze lo haja **kaχa** /*
    omer| this not he:was **thus** /

    'Omer, wasn't it **like that**?'

Prior to this excerpt, sp2 started to complain about a conflict with a co-worker, which, according to sp2, began after sp2 had reached that co-worker's level at work, resulting in a disrespectful attitude towards sp2. This complaint establishes the reason for this conflict as a stance object, which is subsequently oriented by sp3, who evaluates it differently. She proposes an alternative reason for the conflict (line 2), thus divergently disaligning with sp2. In response, sp2 disagrees with sp3 by repeating her own previous evaluation (line 4), and seeks support from another speaker whose name is Omer (sp1) with the stance utterance *omer | ze lo haja kaχa* 'Omer, wasn't it like that?'. This utterance is structured as a negative yes/no question with *kaχa*

pointing to sp2's perception of how the dispute began in line 4, resulting in a referent roughly paraphrased as "the way I have just described". In this case, the aligning stance is achieved by deploying the format of a negative polar question, which reveals an expectation on the part of the speaker regarding the truthfulness of the proposition in question (Givón 2001: 292; Sadock 2012: 113).

6. PROSPECTIVE *KAXA* – PREFACING EXTENDED TURNS

In this section, the function of prospective *kaχa* utterances is presented and discussed. The data for this study include 16 instances of such utterances, which were used by the speaker to preface his upcoming extended turn, thus functioning as a "floor-claiming" device. In this type of usage, *kaχa* creates a new referent that remains underspecified until it is "filled in" by representations derived from the subsequent textual segment. By creating an underspecified referent, the speaker seems to be focusing the addressee's attention on that referent, while creating suspense with regard to its anticipated content. Consider, for example, the following excerpt in which a prospective *kaχa* utterance functions as a "quotative index" (Güldemann 2008: 11), signaling to the recipient an upcoming reported discourse:

Excerpt 7 (P423_2_sp2_116–119: two friends discussing each other's preferences for women)

1   sp2   *amarti   leima   ʃeli   **kaχa**‖*
          I:told   to:mother my   **thus**‖

          'I told my mother **like this**.'

2   (0.8)*datija | lo meanjen oti | masortit   ken meanjen oti |*
          (0.8) religious | no interest me| traditional yes interest me|

          '(0.8) I am not interested in religious women, I am interested in traditional women'

In this excerpt, sp2 tells sp1 that he does not want to go out with religious women, but rather with women who have traditional Jewish values. He chooses to formulate his message as a direct quote of what he said to his mother, resulting in a more vivid and dramatic presentation of his preference (Rühlemann 2007: 127). The quote is introduced via the quotative index (line 1), in which *kaχa* functions as the modifier of a speech verb, filling the structural slot for the upcoming quote, but leaving it unspecified. It seems that *kaχa* acts as a projective device – it foreshadows what will come next, and it enables the recipients to process the anticipated material more easily by being prepared to address it in advance (Auer 2009; Keevallik 2011).

Literary evidence for the prefacing function of *kaχa* utterances in Israeli Hebrew can be found in the title of a novel by a well-known Israeli writer, Meir Shalev (2009) *Ha-Davar Haya Kaχa* 'It Was Like This'. This title refers to a phrase that the protagonist's grandmother used to employ as an opening formula for every story she would tell, and which his entire family continued using ever since.[12] Trying to explicate the function of this expression, the protagonist of the novel says the following:

ʕad hayom anaxnu mištamšim ba-ptixa ha-zot uva-mivta ha-ze kdey lomar – zot ha-ʔemet. Ma še-ʔasaper miyad hu bediyuk ma še-kara. (Shalev 2009: 16)

---

12 I thank one of the anonymous reviewers for bringing this literary work to my attention, and for suggesting a translation for the quote.

> Today we still use this opening formula and this accent to convey the message – this is true. What I am about to tell you now is exactly what happened.

According to the above quote, employing the opening formula *hadavar haya kaχa* 'It was like this' increases the validity and the reliability of the upcoming story. Such a projective function may also be employed by the speaker to preface extended turns that include explanations:

Excerpt 8: (D142_sp3_051–053, sp1_110–116: two family members are discussing travel options)

1   sp3 *jeʃ   iskaot || raiti || ʃva   meot   dolar ||*
there:is deals || I:saw || seven hundred dollars||

'There are (travel) deals. I saw. Seven hundred dollars.'

2   sp1 *leat leat || ze   **kaχa**||*
slow slow || this **thus** ||

'Slow down. It is **like this**.'

3   *ʃva   meot   dolar | ze   od   mea | veeser dolar   misim |*
seven hundred dollars| this more hundred| and:ten dollars taxes |

'Seven hundred dollars, it is another one hundred, and ten dollars taxes,'

4   *ze   kvar   ʃmone meot   veeser ||*
this already eight hundred and:ten ||

'it is already eight hundred and ten dollars.'

(sequence continuation: sp1_117–125, sp3_056–061)

Excerpt (8) is taken from a family conversation about the cost of various traveling options. Following a discussion of various traveling options, sp3 mentions she had seen several travel deals with an estimated cost of seven hundred dollars, implying that this was a good price (line 1). Sp1 disagrees with sp3's positive assessment of such a price, since, in his opinion, this price does not include other costs which, if taken together, render the overall price too high. He expresses his disagreement as an arithmetical calculation, starting with the price suggested by sp2, to which he adds the cost of taxes (lines 3–4). The disagreement is prefaced by two utterances that foreshadow the upcoming disaligning stance (see Pomerantz 1984: 75) – *leat leat* || 'Slow down.' expresses sp1's disalignment with sp3's conclusion that seven hundred dollars represents a good price, and *ze kaχa* || 'It is like this.' relates to an upcoming explanation as to why the evidence for sp3's conclusion is misrepresented (line 2). Note also that the prospective *kaχa* utterances in the last two excerpts differ in their syntactic structure – while in excerpt 7 *kaχa* occupied the syntactic position of the complement in a verbal clause, in excerpt 8 *kaχa* functions as a pro-predicate in a non-verbal clause.

In the following excerpt, *kaχa* is embedded within an even more simplified configuration as a stand-alone utterance:

Excerpt 9 (C612_4_sp2_108, sp1_131–141: two friends are discussing an irrigation start-up)

1   sp2 *ata moχer riʃajon /*
you sell   license /

'Do you sell the license?'

2   sp1   (0.5) *lo   lo || **kaχa**||
              (0.5) no no || **thus** ||

              '(0.5) No no. **Like this**.'

3   (0.6) *im ze   bakurs | ani moχer per jeχida* ||
              (0.6) if   this in:the:course | I   sell   per unit ||

              '(0.6) If it happens during the course, I sell per unit.'

4   *az ze   jeχol lanua   ben   ʃloʃim lemea   dolar* ||
              so this can   to:move between thirty   to:hundred dollars||

              'So it (=the price) can vary from thirty to a hundred dollars.'

5   *kʃehaχevre   anijim| veze | vejeʃ   ejze   χamiʃim   χevre* |
              when:the:guys poor | and:this | and:there_is around fifty   guys |

              'When the guys are poor and all, and there are approximately fifty guys,'

6   *anaχnu moχrim beʃloʃim* ||
              we   sell   in:thirty ||

              'We sell for thirty (dollars).'

7   (0.6) *kaχa   ulaj   anaχnu moχrim bemea ||*
              (0.6) **thus** maybe we   sell   in:hundred ||

              '(0.6) **Otherwise** we sell maybe for a hundred (dollars).'

Prior to the excerpt, the two speakers had been discussing an irrigation software that sp1 had developed and had been trying to sell around the world. At the beginning of the excerpt, sp2 asked sp1 whether he would sell the license for his software. Subsequently, sp1 provided an answer, but prefaced it with two utterances – *lo lo* || 'no no' and *kaχa* || 'like this'. The discourse marker *lo lo* || 'no no' seems to be resisting the assumption presupposed by the question that it could be answered in a bivalent manner instead – either confirming or disconfirming it (Kim 2015; Shor forthcoming); whereas the subsequent utterance *kaχa* || 'Like this.' anticipates a more complex state of affairs – sp1 does indeed sell the license, but the price varies according to the circumstances. For small groups of buyers, the price of each license may range from thirty dollars to one hundred dollars, depending on the financial ability of the buyers (lines 3–7). When *kaχa* is used as a stand-alone utterance, its discourse-deictic status is not unequivocal, since it may also be characterized as a discourse marker – it has a meta-lingual interpretation, is positioned initially with regard to the turn/discourse unit/sentence, is syntactically/prosodically independent, and has little semantic content (Jucker & Ziv 1998: 3; Müller 2005: 5–6; Maschler 2009: 17). As a discourse marker, it seems to function as a projective device, enabling the speaker to claim the right to an extended turn, as well as facilitating the interlocutor's processing of the upcoming segment (see Maschler 2009: 23).

7. OTHER USES

In the *kaχa* utterances examined in Sections 5 and 6, the referent of *kaχa* was derived, relatively uncontroversially, from prior or subsequent discourse. In some cases, however, it seems that *kaχa*'s referential capacity has "faded" to the point that it might be argued that *kaχa* is no

longer referential. In some contexts, *kaχa* has come to designate a general situation, roughly paraphrased as 'otherwise', 'in general' or 'in the absence of specific considerations'.

We can observe such an instance in line 7 of excerpt 9 in the utterance *kaχa ulaj anaχnu moχrim bemea* ‖ 'Otherwise we sell maybe for a hundred (dollars).' This utterance ends a detailed answer to a question addressed to sp1 by sp2 regarding whether he sells the license for his software. Prior to this utterance, sp1 explained that the price of the license is not fixed but ranges between two alternatives, according to the financial ability and the amount of the buyers – from thirty dollars, in the event that there are many low-income participants in the course (lines 5–6), to one hundred dollars otherwise (line 7). Whereas the first alternative that warrants the "thirty dollars" price is explicitly expressed with a "when"-clause in line 5, the second alternative that warrants the "one hundred dollars" price is denoted by the manner demonstrative *kaχa*, which in this case can be roughly paraphrased as "in circumstances different than those previously presented", or simply as "otherwise". In such a use, *kaχa* functions similarly to "negative condition" connectives, such as the Dutch *anders* (Smessaert & Van Belle 2010) or the French *autrement* (Isambert 2014), which imply a hypothetical event that differs in some way from a previously stated hypothetical event. This implied event serves as a condition for a subsequent state of affairs. In contrast to such connectives, which have been conventionalized to convey such meaning, in the case of *kaχa* this meaning seems to be an ad hoc inference, supported by *kaχa*'s capacity to refer to situations and states. The implied alternative in this case – the event that the participants in the course are relatively more affluent – seems to be created through an inference drawn during the interpretation of the utterance in which *kaχa* occurs, coupled with the description of the first option in lines 5–6.[13]

In the next excerpt, *kaχa* also denotes some general situation derived from prior contexts, as part of a relatively conventionalized expression *gam kaχa* 'in any case', 'anyway':

Excerpt 10 (C711_0_sp1_255–259: two friends discussing university curriculum)

1	sp1	*hajta*	*li*	*hitlabtut|*	*im*	*laasot tajʧi*	|	*o*	*kaze*	‖
		she:was	to:me	doubt	|	whether to:do Tai_chi	|	or	like_that	‖

'I had doubts whether I should choose Tai chi or that one.'

2		*aval*	*ma*	*ani*	*ʦriχa*	|	*gam* **kaχa**	*hamaareχet*	*ʃeli holeχet lihjot kol kaχ mlea|*
		but	what	I	need	|	also **thus**	the:curriculum	my go to:be so full |

'But what do I need that for? **In any case** my curriculum is going to be full,'

Prior to this excerpt, sp1 told sp2 that she considers participating in a sailing course as part of a sports course she is obliged to take in her university studies, since it requires minimal effort on her part. In the beginning of the excerpt, sp1 says that she had also been interested in taking a Tai chi course (line 1), but then she concludes that she probably does not need any additional courses, and justifies this conclusion by saying that her curriculum is going to be full even if she does not take the Tai chi course (line 2). The hypothetical event of "not taking the Tai chi course" is implied by *gam kaχa*, which may be interpreted in this context as 'in any case'

---

13 According to Silverstein's (1976; 1979) distinction between "relatively presupposing" and "relatively creative" indexicals, this instance of *kaχa* may be considered as situated somewhere between these two types, since it creates a referent that, although derived from prior discourse, is not presumed to be already salient for the addressee at the point it is used.

or 'anyway'. This occurrence of *kaχa* is even less referential than that in excerpt 9, since the expression *gam kaχa* seems to have a semi-conventionalized status in spoken Israeli Hebrew. It is possible to hypothesize that the partially conventionalized status of *gam kaχa* originates from discourse-deictic occurences of *kaχa* in which it referred to a hypothetical event created by negating a previously expressed event.

8. DISCUSSION

In the previous sections, we have seen that as a discourse-deictic manner demonstrative, *kaχa* may be employed by the speakers retrospectively or prospectively for different reasons. Retrospective *kaχa* utterances are typically used by the speaker to respond to the prior speaker's stance with regard to some state of affairs, or to some conduct described by the prior speaker, resulting in convergent or divergent alignment with that speaker. Speakers may also retrospectively target their own prior turns in order to emphasize the validity of their claims and evaluations. In such instances, *kaχa*'s referent is a metalinguistic referent that can be roughly paraphrased as "the way you/I have just evaluated". It should be noted that the referent of *kaχa* – as is the case with discourse-deictic referents – is not entirely presupposed, but it is constructed on the spot, with *kaχa* pointing to the relevant part of the context representation, guided by the predicative component of the indexical clause as a whole (see Cornish 2012: 19; Webber 1988; 1991). Drawing on Silverstein's (1976; 1979) distinction between "relatively presupposing" and "relatively creative" indexicals, many instances of the discourse-deictic *kaχa* can be found between these two types, since, in these cases, *kaχa* contextually points to a part of a recently constructed discourse representation, while at the same time building it into a new discourse entity which may subsequently be retrieved via an appropriate indexical expression (Cornish 2012: 19).

This was especially evident in excerpt 4, where the referent of *kaχa* was an event that was largely constructed through inferences drawn from preceding discourse, as well as through the processing of the entire utterance of which *kaχa* is a part. By the same token, the creative capacity of *kaχa* was also seen in its more conventionalized uses, demonstrated in excerpts 9 and 10, where *kaχa* came to denote an alternative state of affairs constructed by excluding or negating some previously described state of affairs. In such uses, it might be argued that *kaχa* is no longer fully referential.

In contrast to the mainly evaluative or attitudinal function of the retrospective *kaχa* utterances, prospective *kaχa* utterances are typically employed in order to explicitly announce the speaker's upcoming extended turn. This practice seems to manifest the fundamental process of recipient design – the process by which speakers accommodate the informational and interactive needs of their recipients, manifested by certain lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and semantic-pragmatic choices (Fox 2008: 255). From this perspective, explicitly prefacing an extended turn seems to prepare the recipient to deal with a more-than-expected amount of subsequent information, thus facilitating the processing thereof, while also functioning as a "floor-claiming" device, allowing the speaker to take the floor for a relatively longer amount of time and possibly heightening the listener's interest in the expected content (see also Smith 2004: 81; Bruti 2004: 56; Liddicoat 2007: 74–75; Deroey 2015: 67). The referent of the prospective *kaχa* is underspecified at the point of its occurrence, incrementally becoming specified as the subsequent discourse moves forward, providing an increasing amount of information that is then integrated into the created referent.

An examination of the syntactic realization of *kaχa* utterances shows that *kaχa* may partici-pate in diverse syntactic configurations differing in the level of their complexity. These are summarized in Table 2:

Table 2 Syntactic realization of *kaχa* utterances

	Verbal clause	Non-verbal clause	Stand-alone	Total
Retrospective *kaχa* utterances	31 (76%)	10 (24%)	-	41 (100%)
Prospective *kaχa* utterances	7 (50%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	14 (100%)
Total	36	15	4	55

As for the retrospective *kaχa* utterances, most of them were realized as verbal clauses in which *kaχa* was positioned either initially (as in excerpt 9) or finally (as in excerpts 4 and 6). In the non-verbal retrospective *kaχa* utterances, *kaχa* functions as a part of the predicate phrase (as in excerpts 3 and 5). The prospective *kaχa* utterances may also be structured either as verbal clauses, in which *kaχa* modifies metalinguistic verbs (as in excerpt 7), or as nonverbal clauses, in which *kaχa* functions as a pro-predicate (as in excerpt 8). The maximally reduced structure is the stand-alone *kaχa*, which exhibits syntactic and prosodic independence, and may thus be considered as a discourse marker (as in excerpt 9). This may suggest that through a process of grammaticalization, an original discourse-deictic reference may assume a "discourse marker" status, to the point that it no longer realizes a discourse-deictic indexical procedure.

9. SUMMARY

This study has sought to shed light on the discourse-deictic function of manner demonstra-tives, a neglected demonstrative subclass that has rarely been subjected to detailed analysis. By focusing on the Israeli Hebrew manner demonstrative *kaχa* 'thus', 'in this manner', this study has demonstrated that the functional properties of *kaχa* cannot be considered on their own, but should be examined in relation to the utterances of which *kaχa* is a part, in complemen-tarity with its intrinsic properties. Accordingly, the analysis of retrospective and prospective *kaχa* utterances showed that each of these types typically serves different pragmatic purposes. Retrospective *kaχa* utterances usually convey some kind of stance or attitude toward some state of affairs described in prior turns, resulting in convergent or divergent alignment with that speaker. Speakers may also retrospectively target their own prior turns in order to emphasize the validity of their claims and evaluations. Prospective *kaχa* utterances, by contrast, were found to preface the speaker's upcoming extended turns, functioning as a "floor-claiming" device that draws the recipient's attention to the upcoming turn, heightening the listener's interest in the expected content.

10. FUTURE RESEARCH

One intriguing aspect of manner demonstrative usage involves the underlying motivation for their frequent use as a part of quotative constructions. It has been established that, cross-linguis-tically, elements encoding manner and similarity often participate in quotative constructions. Güldemann (2008: 319–320) motivated this by assuming that the directed reported discourse is construed as a mimetic reenactment of a non-immediate state of affairs, which involves the speakers' attitudes and feelings expressed by the manner, or the way, in which an utter-

ance is delivered. Thus, introducing direct reported discourse with a manner demonstrative helps to focus on the non-propositional, paralinguistic aspects of the non-immediate speech or cognition event (see also Buchstaller 2013: 21–22). Since additional demonstrative forms in Israeli Hebrew, such as the demonstrative pronoun *ze* 'this-M' and the pro-adjective *kaze* 'like this', may also preface quotations, it would be beneficial to compare the functional distribution of these forms with that of *kaχa* 'thus'. Another aspect of manner demonstrative usage that deserves further research involves their capacity for performing discourse deictic reference to discourse segments that convey claims, explanations, and opinions.

I would like to suggest that the ontological dimension expressed by manner demonstratives may testify to a particular way of conceptualizing, or construing, the verbal action conveyed by the referred-to discourse segment. By means of a manner demonstrative, speakers can construe claims, explanations, and opinions not as objects, but rather as manners of performing the verbal action. The reason for such a construal may be rhetorical, or argumentative, namely highlighting the subjective nature of these verbal actions; since manner pertains to the actions of a particular object, it is by definition subjective and possibly contestable. These lines of inquiry will be pursued in future research.

REFERENCES

AUER, Peter 2009. Projection and Minimalistic Syntax in Interaction. *Discourse Processes* 46(2–3): 180–205.

AZAR, Moshe 1995. *Taẖbir lešon ha-mišna* [The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew]. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

BOLDEN, Galina B. & Jenny MANDELBAUM 2017. The Use of Conversational Co-remembering to Corroborate Contentious Claims. *Discourse Studies* 19(1): 3–29.

BOROCHOVSKY BAR-ABA, Esther 2010. *Ha-ʿivrit ha-meduberet: prakim be-meẖkarah, be-taẖbirah u-ve-darxey habaʿatah* [Issues in colloquial Hebrew]. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik.

BRUTI, Silvia 2004. Cataphoric Complexity in Spoken English. In: K. AJMER & A.B. STENSTRÖM (eds), *Discourse Patterns in Spoken and Written Corpora*: 39–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

BUCHSTALLER, Isabelle 2013. *Quotatives: New trends and sociolinguistic implications*. Oxford: Wiley.

CORNISH, Francis 2011. 'Strict' Anadeixis, Discourse Deixis and Text Structuring. *Language Sciences* 33(5): 753–767.

CORNISH, Francis 2012. Micro-syntax, Macro-syntax, Foregrounding and Backgrounding in Discourse: When indexicals target discursively subsidiary information. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 26: 6–34.

DEROEY, Katrien L.B. 2015. Marking Importance in Lectures: Interactive and textual orientation. *Applied Linguistics* 36(1): 51–72.

DIESSEL, Holger 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

DORI-HACOHEN, Gonen 2017. Creative Resonance and Misalignment Stance: Achieving distance in one Hebrew interaction. *Functions of Language* 24(1): 16–40.

DU BOIS, John W. 2007. The Stance Triangle. In: R. ENGLEBRETSON (ed.), *Stancetaking in Discourse*: 139–182. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

EWING, Michael 2014. Pragmatic Uses of Demonstratives in Cirebon Javanese Conversation. In: A. JUKES (ed.), *Deixis and Spatial Expressions in Languages of Indonesia* (NUSA 56): 47–63. <hdl.handle.net/10108/77645>

FOX, Barbara 2008. Dynamics of Discourse. In: G. ANTOS & K. KNAPP (eds), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics*, II: 255–284. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

GIVÓN, Talmy 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*, II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GLINERT, Lewis 1989. *The Grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: CUP.

GONEN, Einat, Zohar LIVNAT & Noam AMIR 2015. The Discourse Marker *axshav* ('now') in Spontaneous Spoken Hebrew: Discursive and prosodic features. *Journal of Pragmatics* 89: 69–84.

GOODWIN, Charles 2002. Time in Action. *Current Anthropology* 43(S4): S19–S35.

Gᴜ̈ʟᴅᴇᴍᴀɴɴ, Tom 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and diachronic survey*. (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology 34) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hᴀʟᴇᴠʏ, Rivka 2006. Tifkudah šel "ze" ha-bilti leksikalit be-ʕivrit bat yamenu [The Functions of the non-lexical *ze* in contemporary Hebrew]. *Leshonenu* 68: 283–307.

Hᴇɴᴋɪɴ, Roni 1999. Ma ben 'hašamayim kχulim kaʔele', 'hašamayim kχulim kaze' ve-'hašamayim kχulim keʔilu': ʕal ha-šimuš be-xinuye remez mašvim v-isodot aχerim le-histaygut [The Difference between 'the sky is blue *kaele*', 'the sky is blue *kaze*', and 'the sky is blue *keilu*': on the use of comparative demonstratives and other elements for hedging]. In: R. Bᴇɴ-Sʜᴀʜᴀʀ & G. Tᴏᴜʀʏ (eds), *Hebrew: A Living language* 2: 103–122. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.

Hɪᴍᴍᴇʟᴍᴀɴɴ, Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A Taxonomy of universal uses. In: B. Fᴏx (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*: 206–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hᴏᴘᴘᴇʀ, Paul J. 2014. This, That and the Other: Prospection, retraction and obviation in dialogical grammar. In: S. Gᴜ̈ɴᴛʜɴᴇʀ, W. Iᴍᴏ & J. Bᴜ̈ᴄᴋᴇʀ (eds), *Grammar and Dialogism: Sequential, syntactic, and prosodic patterns between emergence and sedimentation*: 271–300. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hᴏᴜᴛᴋᴏᴏᴘ, Hanneke & Harrie Mᴀᴢᴇʟᴀɴᴅ 1985. Turns and Discourse Units in Everyday Conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 9(5): 595–620.

Iꜱᴀᴍʙᴇʀᴛ, Paul 2014. Accommodating Theoretical Expectations with Conflicting Corpora. In: H. Tʏɴᴇ, V. Aɴᴅʀᴇ́, C. Bᴇɴᴢɪᴛᴏᴜɴ, A. Bᴏᴜʟᴛᴏɴ & Y. Gʀᴇᴜʙ (eds), *French Through Corpora: Ecological and data-driven perspectives in French language studies*: 12–25. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Jᴏᴜ̈ᴏɴ, Paul & Takamitsu Mᴜʀᴀᴏᴋᴀ 2003. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, I. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Jᴜᴄᴋᴇʀ, Andreas H. & Yael Zɪᴠ 1998. Discourse Markers: Introduction. In: A.H. Jᴜᴄᴋᴇʀ & Y. Zɪᴠ (eds), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and theory*: 1–12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kᴇᴇᴠᴀʟʟɪᴋ, Leelo 2005. The Deictic *nii* 'so, in this way' in Interaction. In: D. Mᴏɴᴛɪᴄᴇʟʟɪ, R. Pᴀᴊᴜꜱᴀʟᴜ & A. Tʀᴇɪᴋᴇʟᴅᴇʀ (eds), *From Utterance to Uttering and Vice Versa: Multidisciplinary views on deixis*: 109–126. Tartu: Tartu Ülikooli Kirjastus.

Kᴇᴇᴠᴀʟʟɪᴋ, Leelo 2010a. Pro-Adverbs of Manner as Markers of Activity Transition. *Studies in Language* 34(2): 350–381.

Kᴇᴇᴠᴀʟʟɪᴋ, Leelo 2010b. Marking Boundaries between Activities: The Particle *nii* in Estonian. *Research on Language and Social Interaction* 43(2): 157–182.

Kᴇᴇᴠᴀʟʟɪᴋ, Leelo 2011. Pro-Forms as Projective Devices in Interaction. *Discourse Processes* 48(6): 404–431.

Kɪᴍ, Stephanie Hyeri 2015. Resisting the Terms of Polar Questions through *ani* ('no')-Prefacing in Korean Conversation. *Discourse Processes* 52(4): 311–334.

Kᴏ̈ɴɪɢ, Ekkehard 2012. Le rôle des déictiques de manière dans le cadre d'une typologie de la deixis. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* CVII: 11–42.

Kᴏ̈ɴɪɢ, Ekkehard 2015. Manner Deixis as Source of Grammatical Markers in Indo-European Languages. In: C. Vɪᴛɪ (ed.), *Perspectives on Historical Syntax*: 35–60. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Kᴏ̈ɴɪɢ, Ekkehard & Carla Uᴍʙᴀᴄʜ (forthcoming). Demonstratives of Manner, of Quality and of Degree: A Neglected subclass. In: E. Bᴏᴇꜰ, M. Cᴏɴɪɢʟɪᴏ, E. Sᴄʜʟᴀᴄʜᴛᴇʀ & T. Vᴇᴇɴꜱᴛʀᴀ (eds), *Demonstratives: Syntax, semantics and typology*. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.

Lᴀᴜʀʏ, Ritva 1997. *Demonstratives in Interaction: The Emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lᴇᴠɪɴꜱᴏɴ, Stephen 2004. Deixis. In: L. Hᴏʀɴ (ed.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*: 97–121. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lɪᴅᴅɪᴄᴏᴀᴛ, Anthony J. 2007. *An Introduction to Conversation Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Lɪᴠɴᴀᴛ, Zohar, Noam Aᴍɪʀ & Einat Gᴏɴᴇɴ 2016. Mimšak siaχ ve-prozodya: "axšav" ke-mikre boχan [Discourse/prosody interface: *axshav* 'now' as a test case]. In: E. Gᴏɴᴇɴ (ed.): *Studies in Spoken Hebrew* (Teʾuda 27): 503–523. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.

Lɪᴠɴᴀᴛ, Zohar & Il-Il Yᴀᴛꜱɪᴠ 2006. Koherentiyut be-siaχ davur: ʕiyun be-tafkidav šel saman ha-siaχ "ʔaz" [Coherence in spoken discourse: a study in the functions of the discourse marker *az* ('then/so')]. In: R. Bᴇɴ-Sʜᴀʜᴀʀ & G. Tᴏᴜʀʏ (eds), *Hebrew: A Living language* 4: 175–189. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.

Mᴀꜱᴄʜʟᴇʀ, Yael 2001. Vekeʾilu haragláyim shʾxa nitkaʾot bifním kaze ('and like your feet get stuck inside like'): Hebrew Kaze ('Like'), Keʾilu ('Like'), and the Decline of Israeli Dugri ('Direct') Speech. *Discourse Studies* 3(3): 295–326.

Maschler, Yael 2009. *Metalanguage in Interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Müller, Simone 2005. *Discourse Markers in Native and Non-native English Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nogué-Serrano, Neus 2015. Catalan. In: K. Jungbluth & F. Da Mila (eds), *Manual of Deixis in Romance Languages*: 206–239. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Pomerantz, Anita 1984. Agreeing and Disagreeing with Assessments: Some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In: J.M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action: Studies in conversation analysis*: 57–101. Cambridge: CUP.

Rühlemann, Christoph 2007. *Conversation in Context: A Corpus-driven approach*. London: Continuum.

Sadock, Jerry 2012. Formal Features of Questions. In: J.P. DeRuiter (ed.), *Questions: Formal, functional and interactional perspectives*: 103–122. NY: CUP.

Schiffrin, Deborah 1980. Meta-Talk: Organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. *Sociological Inquiry* 50(3–4): 199–236.

Selting, Margret 2000. The Construction of Units in Conversational Talk. *Language in Society* 29(4): 477–517.

Shor, Leon (forthcoming). "Lo, ʾata tsodek be-meʾa ʾaxuz": Šimušim protseduraliyim šel milat ha-šlila "lo" ["No, you're one hundred percent right": procedural uses of the negator *lo* in spoken Israeli Hebrew]. *Balshanut Ivrit* (Hebrew Linguistics).

Smessaert, Hans & William Van Belle 2010. From Manner Expression to Attitudinal Discourse Marker: The Case of Dutch *anders*. In: A. Van Linden, J.-C. Verstraete & K. Davidse (eds), *Formal Evidence in Grammaticalization Research* (Typological Studies in Language 94): 137–190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smith, Michael 2004. Cataphoric Pronouns as Mental Space Designators. In: E. Contini-Morava, R.S. Kirsner & B. Rodriguez-Bachiller (eds), *Cognitive and Communicative Approaches to Linguistic Analysis*: 61–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Webber, Bonnie L 1988. Discourse Deixis: Reference to discourse segments. In: *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*: 113–122. Stroudsburg: Association for Computational Linguistics.

Webber, Bonnie L. 1991. Structure and Ostension in the Interpretation of Discourse Deixis. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 6(2): 107–135.

Ziv, Yael 1998. Hebrew *kaze* as Discourse Marker and Lexical Hedge: Conceptual and procedural properties. In: A.H. Jucker & Y. Ziv (eds), *Discourse Markers: Descriptions and theory*: 203–221. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ziv, Yael 2006. ʿosim kaze dibur yašir [Doing *like* direct speech]. In: R. Ben-Shachar & G. Toury (eds), *Hebrew: A Living language* 4: 141–156. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.