

Typological approaches to non-canonicity in demonstratives

Workshop convenors:

Don Killian (donald.killian@helsinki.fi)

Ekaterina Gruzdeva (ekaterina.gruzdeva@helsinki.fi)

Chingduang Yurayong (chingduang.yurayong@helsinki.fi)

Demonstratives are a semantic class of deictic expressions which serve to focus joint attention onto a referent in the surrounding situation or unfolding discourse (Diessel 2012). According to (Hanks 1992: 47), the basic communicative function of deictic forms is ‘to individuate or single out objects of reference or address in terms of their relation to the current interactive context in which the utterance occurs’. Himmelmann (1996: 210) suggests the following criterion for identification of demonstratives: ‘the element must be in a paradigmatic relation to elements which ... locate the entity referred to on a distance scale: as proximal, distal, etc.’

Demonstratives have traditionally been classified as belonging to certain morphosyntactic categories. Current research suggests that at least 7 different distinct categories of demonstratives can be identified: determiners, pronouns, adverbs, non-verbal predicators, verbs, adpositions, and articles, as well as additional semantic sub-categories such as manner adverbs and locative adverbs. The vast majority of the research has focused on canonical demonstratives, such as pronouns, determiners, and locative adverbs, whereas other categories have seen little research or awareness. Among recent publications on less-studied categories of demonstratives under different labels, one can mention Guérin (2015) on manner demonstrative verbs, Killian & Gruzdeva (in press) on the typology of demonstrative verbs, Killian (2022a) on deictic adpositions, Killian (2022b) on the typology of non-verbal demonstrative predicators, and Diessel & Breunese (2020) on demonstrative clause linkers.

Demonstratives frequently show morphosyntactic behavior which cuts across multiple word classes. Such behavior is not limited to the well-known pronoun-determiner overlap, and the following examples (1–2) in Lewotobi Lamaholot confirm that other demonstrative categories can also show mixed categorization, such as locative adverbs and adpositions. Due to this categorical ambiguity, Killian & Gruzdeva (in press) adopt the term *ontological* to refer to subcategories of demonstratives, particularly when it is not feasible or desirable to force a semantic categorization into a specific morphosyntactic category.

Lewotobi Lamaholot (Nagaya 2017: 50)

- (1) *go tei te*
1SG live DEM.PROX
‘I live here.’
- (2) *go tei te laŋo?*
1SG live DEM.PROX house
‘I live here (in) the house.’

Demonstratives are known to be used both in deictic and non-deictic functions. Deictic uses include exophoric (including the so-called *deixis am Phantasma*, following (Himmelmann 1996) and discourse deictic. Non-deictic use includes tracking (anaphoric and cataphoric reference), expressive, and recognitional (Levinson 2018). Due to their deictic nature,

demonstratives can also establish frames of reference across space, time, and discourse. Beyond these functions, various non-canonical functions of demonstratives have been discussed in connection to the role of demonstratives in conversation and discourse.

- Information-structural scope such as topicalisation: e.g. in Czech (Šimík 2009), Mon (Jenny 2009), Polish (Tabakowska 1989, Rutkowski 2006), Thai (Warotamasikkhadit 1997, Singnoi 2004), Finnic and Russian dialects (Yurayong 2020).

(3) Polish (Rutkowski 2006: 171)

Waterloo to wydaje się być zwycięstwo.
 Waterloo DEM seem.3SG REFL be.INF victory
 ‘Waterloo[, it] seems to be a victory.’

- Discourse organization such as fillers and place holders (see Hayashi & Yoon 2006, Podlesskaya 2010 for general typology): e.g. in Estonian (Keevallik 2010), and Finnish (Etelämäki 2006).

(4) Korean (Hayashi & Yoon 2006: 492)

ne ce-ke cwu-lkka? chicukheyikh?
 you DEM.DIST-CLF give-shall cheesecake
 ‘You, would you like to have that (thing)? Cheesecake?’

- Stance taking, evidentiality and evaluation: e.g. in Austronesian languages in general (Cleary-Kemp 2007: 336–337), specifically in Tagalog (Nagaya 2011), Burmese (Simpson 2008), Papuan languages (Kratochvíl 2011, Schapper & San Roque 2011), and Vietnamese (Lê 2002, Adachi 2016).

(5) Abui (Kratochvíl 2011: 773)

na nala nee=ti beek-a do
 1SG something eat=PHSL.C bad-DUR DEM.PROX
 ‘I could not eat up (swallow) anything.’
 [the speaker’s immediate experience of eating]

- Intensification and hedging: e.g. in German (Umbach & Ebert 2009), Russian (Grenoble 2008), and Thai (Iwasaki & Dechapratumwan 2022).

(6) Thai (Iwasaki & Dechapratumwan 2022: 539, with the authors’ modification in gloss)

yun kàt rǐu aray-yàŋ-ŋí-a
 mosquito bite or HDG[what-ADV-DEM.PROX-PTCL]
 ‘Mosquito bite, or something like that. [the speaker’s hedging of mosquito bite]’

- Quotation (see Buchstaller & van Alphen 2012 for general typology): e.g. in African languages (Güldemann 2008); Papuan languages (Reesink 1993); and Uralic languages (Teptiuk 2020).

(7) Komi-Permyak (Uotila 1985: 40, with gloss and translation by Teptiuk 2020: 290)

a sar’ vištalis sid’ž: “on-kö ad’džy
 and tzar tell.PST.3SG DEM.DIST NEG.2SG-PTCL.COND see.CNG
čuńkyčlō, me tenö vija.”
 ring.DAT 1SG 2SG.ACC kill.PRS.1SG

‘And the tzar said (lit. said thus): “If you do not find the ring, I will kill you.”’

The proposed workshop is aimed at discussing non-canonical demonstratives and demonstratives in non-canonical functions. We are especially interested in typologically oriented language-specific and cross-linguistic studies. We invite topics addressing the following questions:

- What non-canonical morphosyntactic categories of demonstratives are attested in the languages of the world?
- What kind of ontological categories of demonstratives are attested in the languages of the world, and what distinct properties do they show?
- How can non-canonical demonstratives be semantically typologized within each morphosyntactic category?
- What deictic oppositions are attested in non-canonical demonstratives, and how do these oppositions transform in non-exophoric functions?
- In which functions, including expressive and recognitional, can non-canonical demonstratives be used?
- Can any other non-canonical functions be identified aside from the aforementioned ones?
- Do we need to refine our definition of demonstrative in light of any new information coming from non-canonical demonstrative categories and functions?

Abbreviations

1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person
ACC	accusative
ADV	adverbializer
CLF	classifier
CNG	connegative
COND	conditional
DAT	dative
DEM	demonstrative
DIST	distal
DUR	durative
HDG	hedge marker
INF	infinitive
NEG	negative
PHSL.C	phasal completive
PROX	proximal
PRS	present
PST	past
PTCL	(discourse) particle
REFL	reflexive
SG	singular

References

- Adachi, Mayumi. 2016. *Betonamugo no shijishi to shijishi ni yuraisuru bunmatsushi, kandoushi* [Demonstratives, demonstrative-derived sentence-final particles, and interjections in Vietnamese] (doctoral dissertation). Tokyo: The University of Tokyo.
- Buchstaller, Isabelle & Ingrid van Alphen. 2012. Preface: Introductory remarks on new and old quotatives. In Isabelle Buchstaller & Ingrid van Alphen (eds.), *Quotatives: Cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary perspectives*, xii–xxx. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Cleary-Kemp, Jessica. 2007. Universal uses of demonstratives: Evidence from four Malayo-Polynesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 46(2). 325–347.
- Diessel, Holger. 2012. Deixis and demonstratives. In *An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*, vol. 3, 2407–2431. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Diessel, Holger & Merlijn Breunese. 2020. A typology of demonstrative clause linkers. In Åshild Næss, Anna Margetts & Yvonne Treis (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse* (Topics at the Grammar-Discourse Interface 6), 305–340. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Grenoble, Lenore. A. 1998. *Deixis and information packaging in Russian discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Guérin, Valérie. 2015. Demonstrative verbs: a typology of verbal manner deixis. *Linguistic Typology* 19(2). 141–199.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Etelämäki, Marja. 2006. *Toiminta ja tarkoite: Tutkimus suomen pronominiesta tämä* [Action and referent: A study of Finnish pronoun *tämä*] (doctoral dissertation). Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Hanks, William F. 1992. The indexical ground of deictic reference. In Alessandro Duranti & Charles Goodwin (eds.) *Rethinking context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayashi, Makoto & Yoon, Kyung-eun. 2006. A cross-linguistic exploration of demonstratives in interaction. With particular reference to the context of word-formulation trouble. *Studies in Language* 30(3). 485–540.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in anaphora*, vol. 33, 205–254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Iwasaki, Shoichi & Parada Dechapratumwan. 2022. Creating versatility in Thai demonstratives. *Studies in Language* 46(3). 517–558.
- Jenny, Mathias. 2009. Deixis and information structure in Mon: the Multifunctional particle *kəh*. *Journal of Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 2. 53–72.
- Keevallik, Leelo. 2010. The interactional profile of a placeholder: the Estonian demonstrative *see*. In Nino Amiridze, Boyd H. Davis & Margaret Maclagan (eds.), *Fillers, Pauses, and Placeholders*, 139–172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Killian, Don. 2022a. Deictic marking in adpositions. *Te Reo* 65(1). 1–41.
- Killian, Don. 2022b. Towards a typology of predicative demonstratives. *Linguistic Typology* 26(1). 1–41.
- Killian, Don and Gruzdeva, Ekaterina (in press). Towards a typology of demonstrative verbs. *Finnish Journal of Linguistics*.
- Kratochvíl, František. 2011. Discourse-structuring functions of Abui demonstratives. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*, 757–788. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Lê, Thị Hoài Dương. 2002. *Tiểu từ tình thái cuối câu tiếng Việt và việc dạy tiểu từ tình thái cuối câu tiếng Việt cho người nước ngoài* [Sentence-final modal particles in Vietnamese and teaching sentence-final modal particles in Vietnamese to foreigners] (master's thesis). Hanoi: Vietnam National University.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2018. Introduction: Demonstratives: Patterns in diversity. In Stephen C. Levinson, Sarah Cutfield, Michael J. Dunn, N. J. Enfield & Sérgio Meira (eds.), *Demonstratives in cross-linguistic perspective*, 1–42. Cambridge University Press.
- Nagaya, Naonori. 2011. Rise and fall of referentiality: articles in Philippine languages. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian Languages: Diachronic and typological perspectives*, 589–626. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Podlesskaya, Vera I. 2010. Parameters for typological variation of placeholders. In Nino Amiridze, Boyd H. Davis & Margaret MacLagan (eds.), *Fillers, Pauses, and Placeholders*, 11–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Reesink, Gerard Pieter. 1993. Inner speech in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24. 217–225.
- Rutkowski, Paweł. 2006. From demonstratives to copulas: A cross-linguistic perspective and the case of Polish. *Journal of Universal Language* 7(2). 147–175.
- Schapper, Antoinette & San Roque, Lila. 2011. Demonstratives and non-embedded nominalisations in three Papuan languages of the Timor-Alor-Pantar family. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 380–408.
- Šimík, Radek. 2009. The syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of the focus particle *to* in Czech. In Gerhild Zybatow, Denisa Lenertová, Uwe Junghanns & Petr Biskup (eds.), *Studies in Formal Slavic Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics and Information Structure: Proceedings of FDSL 7, Leipzig 2007*, 327–340. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Simpson, Andrew. 2008. The grammaticalization of clausal nominalizers in Burmese. In María José López-Couso & Elena Seoane (eds.), *Rethinking grammaticalization: New perspectives*, 265–288. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Singnoi, Unchalee. 2004. Discourse Functions of Thai Demonstratives: a Case On Pragmatically Controlled Irregular functions. In Somsong Burusphat (ed.), *Papers from the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, 645–657. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 1989. On pragmatic functions of the particle *to* in Polish. In Harald Weydt (Ed.), *Sprechen mit Partikeln*, 535–545. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Teptiuk, Denys. 2020. Manner deictics in quotative indexes of Finno-Ugric. In Åshild Næss, Anna Margetts & Yvonne Treis (eds.), *Demonstratives in discourse*, 273–304. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Umbach, Carla, & Ebert, Cornelia. 2009. German demonstrative ‘so’ – intensifying and hedging effects. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* (International Journal for Language Data Processing) 2009(1-2). 153–168.
- Uotila, Toivo E. 1985. *Syrjänische Texte I: Komi-Permjakisch*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Warotamasikkhadit, Udom. 1997. Fronting and backing topicalization in Thai. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 27. 303–306.
- Yurayong, Chingduang. 2020. *Postposed demonstratives in Finnic and North Russian dialects* (doctoral dissertation). Helsinki: University of Helsinki.