

Workshop 12

From and Towards Demonstratives: Grammaticalization Processes and Beyond

Verónica Orqueda (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

Berta González Saavedra (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Demonstratives are generally seen as deictic elements, which are primarily used to point to a referent, focusing the hearer's attention on an entity (Diessel 1999). However, their nature, their inner possible classifications, and their grammaticalization processes from and towards such a category have long been topics of debate. With respect to the sources of demonstratives, there is a well-known discussion regarding whether demonstratives can or cannot develop from lexical sources. Thus, Heine et al. (2020: 421) claim that "there are at least three main lexical sources that may lead to the emergence of demonstrative categories. But these sources do not seem to exhaust the range of pathways", contra Diessel (2006: 481), who believes that "demonstratives are so old that their roots are not etymologically analyzable".

As for the grammaticalization processes that start with demonstratives, it has been noted that demonstratives can develop into complementizers, conjunctions, copulas, definite articles, focus, third person pronouns, relatives and subordinators, among others. As Diessel (1999) shows, the targets may vary according to the syntactic classification of the source demonstratives. As well, demonstratives are not restricted to one single path of grammaticalization. Among examples of different targets that stem from the same source, there is the case of Latin *ille*, which develops both as a definite article (*el*) and as a third person personal pronoun (*él*) in Spanish (see e.g., Giusti 2001, Roca 2009, and van Gelderen 2011), probably depending on the different contexts.

Particularly, the connection between demonstratives and personal pronouns through grammaticalization processes is still a field of fruitful discussions, and one may wonder whether demonstratives may develop as 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person pronouns: there is plenty of evidence of 3rd person pronouns derived from demonstratives, (see e.g., Heine and Kuteva 2002), while there is no evidence of 1st person pronouns, and scarce evidence of 2nd person pronouns, as is the case of *anata* in Japanese (distal demonstrative > 2nd sg. person pronoun, see Ishiyama 2012 and Ishiyama 2019).

Regarding grammaticalization processes within the category of demonstratives, there is also an ongoing debate on whether exophoric uses (this is, in speech act situations) necessarily precede or not anaphoric or discursive uses. This debate has a direct implication to the question of unidirectionality of grammaticalization (see, e.g., Stavinschi 2012).

Lastly, recent cognitive investigations on the selection and use of demonstratives can shed light of possible explanations for the development of demonstratives. Thus, for instance, Peeters et al. (2021), among others, show that the selection of specific demonstratives may be determined by the communicational situation and the perception of the speaker-addressee relationship, and not only by the proximity or distance of the object. Such synchronic observations may lead one to wonder what cognitive factors are behind the grammaticalization of demonstratives towards new functions.

The purpose of this workshop is to invite scholars working on different aspects of the grammaticalization of demonstratives and from diverse theoretical frameworks, in order to jointly elaborate

a more complete map of possible developments of demonstratives and their related aspects that have taken place or are still taking place in languages of the world. As suggestions, some topics that will be welcomed are:

- New proposals for the origin of demonstratives
- New proposals of grammaticalization processes from demonstratives
- Processes with more than one result, e.g. Lat. *ille* > Sp. *él* and *el*.
- Cognitive processes involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives from cross-linguistic perspectives.
- New approaches from diverse linguistic areas (sociolinguistics, pragmatics, among others) that help us understand the processes involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives.

REFERENCES

- Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, H. (2006). “Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar”. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4). 463–489.
- van Gelderen, E. (2011). *The linguistic cycle: Language change and the language faculty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giusti, G. (2001). “The birth of a functional category: From Latin ILLE to the Romance article and personal pronouns”. In G. Cinque & G. Salvi (eds.), *Current studies in Italian syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 157–171. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Heine, B. and T. Kuteva. (2002). *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, CUP.
- Heine, B., T. Kuteva, H. Long, H. Narrog and F. Wu. (2020). “Where do demonstratives come from?” *STUF* 73(3). 403-434.
- Ishiyama, O. (2019). *Diachrony of personal pronouns in Japanese*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ishiyama, O. (2012). “The diachronic relationship between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns”. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 13(1). 50–71.
- Peeters, D., E. Krahmer, and A. Maes. (2021). “A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Demonstrative Reference”. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 28. 409–433.
- Roca, F. (2009). “The Left Periphery of Nominal Constructions and the Evolution of Definite Determiners in Romance”. In J. Rafel (ed.) *Diachronic Linguistics*, 497–553. Girona: Documenta Universitaria.
- Stavinschi, A. (2012). “On the development of the Romance demonstrative systems: Historical remarks and theoretical conclusions”. *Diachronica* 29(1). 72-97.

Contributions

Further Pathways Towards Demonstratives

Marianne Mithun (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Demonstratives are generally seen as deictic elements, which are primarily used to point to a referent. In a series of important works, Diessel (2006 and more) observes that though demonstratives are ubiquitous cross-linguistically, we rarely see evidence of the expected pathways of grammaticalization which underlie them. If demonstratives were indeed impervious to change, we would expect them to match across related languages, apart from regular sound changes. But such is often not the case. More recently, Heine et al (2020) have uncovered some pathways by which demonstratives have developed in certain languages from locative adverbs, positional verbs, and classifiers. They point out that while in many cases the developments involve processes of renewal, whereby original demonstratives are reinforced by additional elements, in some others demonstratives may not have been part of the source construction at all.

Demonstratives are especially pervasive in speech in languages of the Iroquoian family, indigenous to eastern North America. They are used as in other languages as pronouns, but they also occur in a wide array of other constructions, including pervasive conventionalized discourse structures. Yet they are not fully cognate across the languages.

Those in some of the languages show partial similarities which indicate development from shared communicative strategies. Basic proximal demonstrative pronouns for ‘this, this one’ include Mohawk *kí:ken*, Oneida *kaʔika*´, Onondaga *né:kə*, Cayuga *né:kyə*, Seneca *nə:kə*, and Tuscarora *kyè:ní:kə*. (The Mohawk digraph *en* is a nasalized vowel *ɛ*; spelling has otherwise been regularized to show correspondences.) Distal demonstratives include Mohawk *thí:ken*, Oneida *thika*´, Onondaga *thó:kə*, Cayuga *thó:kyə*, Seneca *hi:kə*, and Tuscarora *hè:ní:kə*.

All combine two of the sources described by Heine et al, locative adverbials and lexical verbs, but not via processes of renewal. Dialectal alternants in Mohawk provide a clue. In place of *kí:ken* ‘this’, some speakers use *ken*’ *í:ken*, and for *thí:ken* ‘that’, they use *tho í:ken*. Mohawk *kèn*: ‘*en* or *ken*’ is the proximal locative adverbial ‘here’, and *tho* is the distal locative adverbial ‘there’. The word *í:ken* is a verb consisting of the neuter pronominal prefix *ka-* and a verb stem *-i* which occurs only in certain fixed constructions. The sequence *a+i* fuses to the nasalized vowel. Verbs must be at least disyllabic, so the initial *i* is prothetic. The sources are thus ‘here it is’ and ‘there it is’. The languages have used different initial demonstratives in this construction.

Tuscarora has another proximal demonstrative of interest: *kyé:nə*: ‘this one’. It appears in such constructions as ‘Drink **this**’, ‘Suck on **this**’, ‘Hold **this**’, ‘Take **this** into the house’, ‘Cook **this one**’, etc., as well as ‘**This** is the tree’ and ‘**Here** is a treat for you’. Its source is a well-formed verb ‘I am holding it’: *k-yenə-*: 1SG.AGT-hold-STATIVE. This same demonstrative is the first element of the basic proximal demonstrative *kyè:ní:kə*: ‘this one’ (*kyé:nə*: *í:kə*:).

Comparison of demonstratives in Northern Iroquoian languages thus suggests certain pathways of development foreseen by Heine et al., in some cases from locative adverbial demonstratives

plus verbs, but not via renewal, and in others directly from verbs on their own. The developments still reflect well-known processes of grammaticalization: content extension, desemanticization, decategorialization, loss of lexical autonomy (fusion), and substance erosion.

REFERENCES

- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.4: 463-489.
- Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog, and Fang WU. 2020. Where do demonstratives come from? *STUF* 73.3: 403-434.

From spatial noun to medial demonstrative: the case of Khalkha Mongolian

Benjamin Brosig (University of Bern)

Guntsetseg Dolgor (Ludwig-Maximilians-University)

In this presentation, we discuss the development of two attributive/nominalized spatial nouns into addressee-centered demonstratives in Khalkha Mongolian as a so far unattested path of grammaticalization. Common Mongolic had an opposition of a demonstrative *ene, signaling closeness, to a demonstrative *tere that signaled distance. These forms consisted of the stems *e- and *te- and not fully transparent subsequent locative elements (cf. locative adverbs *ende/*tende, adjectival similatives *eyimü/*teyimü), but the stems themselves cannot be traced back any further. This basic demonstrative system has been retained in the Central Mongolic varieties Buryat, Khorchin or Oirat. However, the Khalkha branch has four demonstratives (as already suggest, but not elaborated on, by Janhunen 2012: 131-2, Guntsetseg 2016: 37-9, Brosig et al. 2018: 76):

Table 1: Demonstratives (for attributive or argument use) of Khalkha Mongolian

	speaker	addressee
close to	<i>en</i>	<i>naa-d(-ax)</i> (NOUN)= <i>č̣in</i>
far from	<i>ter</i>	<i>caa-d(-ax)</i> (NOUN)= <i>č̣in</i>

Structurally the stems *naa-* ‘near side of’ and *caa-* ‘remote side of’ belong to the class of “spatial nouns”, a specific word class in Mongolic that can be grouped as distantly related to the class of regular nominals (substantives, adjectives, personal pronouns, numerals) in that it shares some historical and synchronous morphology. Spatial nouns lack the nominative, but inflect for idiosyncractic locative and prolative suffixes. They also allow for ablatives (formed by attaching the regular ablative suffix to the locative) and form attributives or nominative argument forms through *-d*, which can then be turned into non-nominative or plural argument forms by adding *-x* and a case suffix (cf. Janhunen 2012: 121-5).

Table 2: The paradigm of Khalkha spatial nouns in juxtaposed with a sub-part of the paradigm of substantives

	Spatial paradigm		Corresponding noun forms	
Locative	<i>naa-n</i>	‘on the close side [of]’	<i>zam-[i]d</i>	way-DAT
Locative + Ablative	<i>naa-n-aas</i>	‘from the close side [of]’	<i>zam-aas</i>	way-ABL
Prolative	<i>naa-[ɣ]uur</i>	‘along the close side [of]’	<i>[zam-aar]</i>	way-INS (with possible prolative interpretation)
Allative	<i>naa-š</i>	‘towards the close side [of]’	<i>[zam-ruu]</i>	way-ALL
Nominative-Attributive	<i>naa-d</i> [N/Ø]	‘the N/one on the close side [of]’	<i>zam,</i> <i>zam-iij</i>	way (argument), way-GEN

Case forms	<i>naa-d-[a]x-</i> CASE	‘the N-CASE on the close side [of]’	<i>zam-iij-x</i>	way-GEN-NMLZ (‘the one belonging to the way)
------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------	---

Regular spatial nouns are mostly used as adverbials or postpositions, as in (1). The shift of the deictic origo to second person and with it the qualitative change to a second person-centered demonstrative has taken place in the presence of a postposed clitic such as the second person singular form =*čin* that indicates that the entity in question is ‘on the near (front) side of you’, which usually means within the perception of the addressee, as in (2), or ‘on the remote (back) side of you’, i.e. not only remote from the addressee, but also beyond her sight.

- (1) *tern-ees naa-n yuu=č med[-ex=güi.]*
 DEM.DIST-ABL this.side.of-LOC what=LIM.FOC know-FUT.PTCP=NEG
 ‘I don’t know anything beyond that [point in time] (i.e. that is closer to the present).’
- (2) *naa-d=čin kod=güi.*
 this.side.of-ATTR=2POSS code=NEG
 ‘That [which, seen from my perspective, is on the near side of you] doesn’t have a code.’

In corpus data, the new demonstratives are most well-established in argument function in free conversational data (*en*: 1032, *ter*: 793, *naad*: 226, *caad*: 26, discounting non-spatial uses), while they are basically absent in newspaper texts (e.g., for argument usage, *ene*: 4536, *naad*: 9).

Typologically, this change is distinct from developments of adverbs like ‘here’/‘there’ to demonstratives (Kuteva et al. 2019: 229-32, 430-1) since spatial nouns code relations between two entities that are not intrinsically linked to the interlocutors.

REFERENCES

- Brosig, Benjamin, Foongha Yap & Kathleen Ahrens. 2019. Assertion, assumption and presupposition: an account of the erstwhile nominalizer YUM in Khalkha Mongolian. *Studies in Language* 43(4): 896–940.
- Guntsetseg, Dolgor. 2016. *Differential Case Marking in Mongolian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Janhunen, Juha. 2012. *Mongolian*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kuteva, Tania, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

On the Development of Demonstratives into Personal Pronouns

Osamu Ishiyama (Soka University of America)

It is well known that crosslinguistically demonstratives are the major source of third person pronouns. Previous studies show that the close relationship between demonstratives and third person pronouns is due to their functional similarity and that many languages use demonstratives in place of third person pronouns (e.g. Bhat 2004; Diessel 1999; Siewierska 2004). However, questions regarding the tenuous link between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns have received little attention. For example, ‘How uncommon is it actually for demonstratives to develop into first/second person pronouns?’ and ‘What are some of the reasons for that?’ In this study, I first present the results of a crosslinguistic survey based on a representative sample of 100 languages. The present study shows that demonstratives gave rise to first/second person pronouns in a clear manner only in three languages. I then propose some reasons as to why demonstratives rarely develop into first/second person pronouns.

There are only three languages in the sample (Basque, Japanese, Malagasy) with first and/or second person pronouns that show a clear link with demonstratives. In some Eastern varieties of Basque, the second person singular *ori* is derived from the medial demonstrative *hori* (Trask 2003: 150), and in Japanese, one of the second person pronouns comes from the demonstrative adverb *anata* ‘that way (distant from both you and me)’ (Ishiyama 2012, 2019). Malagasy shows a more extensive connection between demonstratives and personal pronouns. Garvey (1964: 40-41) states that Malagasy demonstratives are composed of the demonstrative prefix *i-* and the locative stems (e.g. *iti* ‘this (very near)’, *iú* ‘that (near)’, *ítsi* ‘that (not far)’), and that this characteristic is shared by all Malagasy independent personal pronouns (with the exception of one of the first person singular forms) which consist of the same demonstrative prefix *i-* and the pronoun stems, as in *izául/iànául/ízi* ‘first/second/third person singular’, respectively. There are several languages in the sample that optionally use demonstratives for the speaker and addressee as contextual substitutes for first/second person pronouns. This contextual use occurs predominantly in a typologically similar languages, particularly in East and Southeast Asia.

I argue that the tenuous link between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns is due to their functional dissimilarities. The basic function of demonstratives is to (i) indicate the location of a referent in relation to the deictic center and (ii) coordinate the interlocutors’ joint attentional focus (Diessel 2003, 2006). (i) may lead to the use of demonstratives for the speaker/addressee, but within the scope of the original demonstrative function (i.e. spatial semantics), thus providing little need for demonstratives to become first/second person pronouns (cf. Ishiyama 2012, 2019). For (ii), the referent of first/second person pronouns is generally presupposed and readily accessible to all relevant parties. That is, the joint attentional focus is in most instances taken for granted for first/second person pronouns. The nature of deictic force involving demonstratives on the one hand and first/second person pronouns on the other is also quite distinct. First/second person pronouns assume less stability of referents than demonstratives in the speaker-addressee interaction, that is, the referent of first/second person pronouns is ‘more shifting’. For demonstratives to become first/second person pronouns, it is necessary to lose the two basic functions and acquire qualitatively different one: i.e. losing the function to achieve joint attention and gaining the ability to be used repeatedly for presupposed referents regardless of the spatial relationship that holds between a referent and the deictic center.

REFERENCES

- Bhat, D.N.S. 2004. *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cooke, Joseph Robinson. 1968. *Pronominal reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Diessel, Holger. 2003. The relationship between demonstratives and interrogatives. *Studies in Language* 27: 635-655.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4): 463-489.
- Garvey, Catherine J. 1964. *A Sketch of Malagasy grammar*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
- Ishiyama, Osamu. 2012. The diachronic relationship between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics* 13(1). 50–71.
- Ishiyama, Osamu. 2019. *Diachrony of personal pronouns in Japanese: A functional and cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trask, R.L. 2003. The noun phrase: Nouns, determiners and modifiers; pronouns and names. In Hualde, José Ignacio & Jon Ortiz de Urbina (eds.), *A Grammar of Basque*, 113-170. Berlin: Mouton.

LANGUAGES

Abkhaz (Northwest Caucasian, Northwest Caucasian; Georgia), Acoma (Keresan, Keresan; United States), Alambalak (Sepik Hill, Sepik; Papua New Guinea), Amele (Madang, Trans-New Guinea; Papua New Guinea), Apurinã (Purus, Arakawan; Brazil), Arabic (Egyptian) (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic; Egypt), Arapesh (Mountain) (Kombio-Arapesh, Torricelli; Papua New Guinea), Asmat (Asmat-Kamoro, Trans-New Guinea; Indonesia), Bagirmi (Bongo-Bagirmi, Central Sudanic; Chad), Barasano (Tucanoan, Tucanoan; Colombia), Basque (Basque, Basque; France/Spain), Bengali (Indic, Indo-European; Bangladesh, India), Berber (Middle Atlas) (Berber, Afro-Asiatic; Morocco), Bunuba (Bunuban, Bunuban; Australia), Burmese (Burmese-Lolo, Sino-Tibetan; Myanmar), Burushaski (Burushaski, Burushaski; Pakistan), Canela-Krahô (Ge-Kaingang, Macro-Ge; Brazil), Chamorro (Chamorro, Austronesian; Guam), Chinantec (Plantla) (Chinantecan, Oto-Manguean; Mexico), Chukchi (Northern Chukotko-Kamchatkan, Chukotko-Kamchatkan; Russia), Cree (Plains) (Algonquian, Algic; Canada), Daga (Dagan, Dagan; Papua New Guinea), Dani (Lower Grand Valley) (Dani, Trans-New Guinea; Indonesia), Drehu (Oceanic, Austronesian; New Caledonia), Dyirbal (Northern Pama-Nyungan, Pama-Nyungan; Australia), English (Germanic, Indo-European; United Kingdom), Fijian (Oceanic, Austronesian; Fiji), Finnish (Finnic, Uralic; Finland), French (Romance, Indo-European; France), Georgian (Kartvelian, Kartvelian; Georgia), German (Germanic, Indo-European; Germany), Gooniyandi (Bunuban, Bunuban; Australia), Grebo (Kru, Niger-Congo; Liberia), Greek (Greek, Indo-European; Greece), Greenlandic (West) (Eskimo, Eskimo-Aleut; Greenland), Guaraní (Tupi-Guarani, Tupian; Paraguay), Hausa (West Chadic, Afro-Asiatic; Niger, Nigeria), Hebrew (Modern) (Semitic, Afro-Asiatic; Israel), Hindi (Indic, Indo-European; India), Hixkaryana (Cariban, Cariban; Brazil), Hmong Njua (Hmong-Mien, Hmong-Mien; China), Imonda (Border, Border; Papua New Guinea), Indonesian (Malayo-Sumbawan, Austronesian; Indonesia), Ingush (Nakh, Nakh-Daghestanian; Russia), Jakaltek (Mayan, Mayan; Guatemala), Japanese (Japanese, Japanese; Japan), Kannada (Southern Dravidian, Dravidian; India), Kayah Li (Eastern) (Karen, Sino-Tibetan; Myanmar, Thailand), Kayardild (Tangkic, Tangkic; Australia), Kewa (Engan, Trans-New Guinea; Papua New Guinea), Khalkha (Mongolic, Altaic; Mongolia), Khoekhoe (Khoe-Kwadi, Khoe-Kwadi; Namibia), Kiowa (Kiowa-Tanoan, Kiowa-Tanoan; United States), Koasati (Muskogean, Muskogean; United States), Kobon (Madang, Trans-New Guinea; Papua New Guinea), Korean (Korean, Korean; Korea), Koyra Chiini (Songhay, Songhay; Mali), Kutenai (Kutenai, Kutenai; Canada, United States), Kyuquot (Southern Wakashan, Washakan; Canada), Lakhota (Core Siouan, Siouan; United States), Lango (Nilotic, Eastern Sudanic; Uganda), Lavukaleve (Lavukaleve, Solomons East Papuan; Solomon Islands), Lezgian (Lezgian, Nakh-Daghestanian; Azerbaijan, Russia), Luvale (Bantoid, Niger-Congo; Angola), Madurese (Malayo-Sumbawan, Austronesian; Indonesia), Malagasy (Barito, Austronesian; Madagascar), Mandarin (Chinese, Sino-Tibetan; China), Mangarrayi (Mangarrayi, Mangarrayi-Maran; Australia), Mapuche (Araucanian, Araucanian; Chile), Marathi (Indic, Indo-European; India), Maricopa (Yuman, Hokan; United States), Martuthunira (Western Pama-Nyungan, Pama-Nyungan; Australia), Maung (Iwaidjan, Iwaidjan; Australia), Maybrat (North-

Central Bird's Head, West Papuan; Indonesia), Meithei (Kuki-Chin, Sino-Tibetan; India), Mixtec (Chalcatongo) (Mixtecan, Oto-Manguean; Mexico), Ngiti (Lendu, Central Sudanic; DR of the Congo), Ngiyambaa (Southeastern Pama-Nyungan, Pama-Nyungan; Australia), Nkore-Kiga (Bantoid, Niger-Congo; Uganda), Nunggubuyu (Nunggubuyu, Guwinyguan; Australia), Oneida (Northern Iroquoian, Iroquoian; United States), Oromo (Harar) (Lowland East Cushitic, Afro-Asiatic; Ethiopia), Persian (Iranian, Indo-European; Iran), Pirahã (Mura, Mura; Brazil), Pitjantjatjara (West Pama-Nyungan, Pama-Nyungan; Australia), Quechua (Imbabura) (Quechuan, Quechuan; Ecuador), Rapanui (Oceanic, Austronesian; Chile), Russian (Slavic, Indo-European; Russia), Samoan (Oceanic, Austronesian; Samoa), Sango (Ubangi, Niger-Congo; Central African Republic), Sanuma (Yanomam, Yanomam; Brazil, Venezuela), Semelai (Aslian, Austro-Asiatic; Malaysia), Slave (Athapaskan, Na-Dene; Canada), Spanish (Romance, Indo-European; Spain), Supyire (Gur, Niger-Congo; Mali), Swahili (Bantoid, Niger-Congo; Tanzania), Tagalog (Greater Central Philippine, Austronesian; Philippines), Thai (Kam-Tai, Tai-Kadai; Thailand), Tibetan (Bodic, Sino-Tibetan; China), Tiwi (Tiwian, Tiwian; Australia), Tukang Besi (Celebic, Austronesian; Indonesia), Turkish (Turkic, Altaic; Turkey), Una (Mek, Trans-New Guinea; Indonesia), Vietnamese (Viet-Muong, Austro-Asiatic; Vietnam), Warao (Warao, Warao; Venezuela), Wari' (Chapacura-Wanham, Chapacura-Wanham; Brazil), Wichí (Matacoan, Matacoan; Bolivia, Argentina), Wichita (Caddoan, Caddoan; United States), Yagua (Peba-Yaguan, Peba-Yaguan; Peru), Yaqui (Cahita, Uto-Aztecan; Mexico), Yoruba (Defoid, Niger-Congo; Benin, Nigeria), Zulu (Bantoid, Niger-Congo; South Africa)

Types of contexts inducing the grammaticalization of demonstratives into definite articles – the case of a language without articles

Branimir Stanković (University of Niš)

We hypothesize that there are certain **types of contexts** that are mostly responsible for initiating the grammaticalization process(es) of demonstratives from spatial, deictic elements into discourse-relevant anaphorics thru context-induced reinterpretation (Heine, Claudi & Hünemeyer 1991), in which the use of these items is necessary for obtaining the intended definite interpretation, and not simply for reasons of disambiguating between the available indefinite and definite interpretation of bare NPs. This idea is based on the situation in Serbo-Croatian, a language lacking the categories of definite and indefinite articles, but in which the use of demonstratives is mandatory in the following types of contexts.

i. **cardinal numbers** and **partitivity**. Discourse-old cardinal number phrases (1) and partitive phrases (2) must be marked for definiteness, as the bare phrases unambiguously yield the indefinite interpretation. This is achieved by the use of demonstratives:

(1) Belić je napisao [dva rada o dijalektima južne
Belić AUX write-PAST.SG.MASC two papers on dialects-INST.PL Southern-GEN.SG
Srbije]_i. On u {[dva rada]_{*i,j}} / {[ta dva rada]_{i,*j}} objašnjava da...
Serbia-GEN.SG he in two papers that-PAUCAL.MASC two papers explains that
“Belić wrote two papers on the dialects of South Serbia. In {some two papers / those two papers} he explains that...”

(2) Belić piše o [delu reči]_i. {[Deo reči]_{*i,j} / [Taj deo reči]_{i,*j}} je...
Belić writes about part-LOC.SG word-GEN.PL part word-GEN.PL that part word-GEN.PL is
“Belić writes about a part of the words. {A part of the words / That part of the words is...}”

ii. **discourse-old indefinite specific pronominal referents**. The discourse status of previously introduced indefinite specific pronominal referents must be signaled with the use of demonstratives; otherwise, the indefinite pronouns remain unambiguously indefinite:

(3) Neko_i je napisao rad. {[Neko]_{*i,k} / [Taj neko]_{i,*k}} je Belić.
someone AUX write-PAST.SG.MASC paper someone that someone is Belić
“Someone wrote a paper. {Someone / That someone} is Belić.”

iii. **temporal constructions**. A series of temporal genitive constructions consist of a mandatory “determiner” and a noun denoting time period sequence (considering Meillet’s (1912) broad notion of grammaticalization, which includes the evolution of grammatical constructions):

(4) ove godine / tog jutra /
this-GEN.SG.FEM year-GEN.SG.FEM that-GEN.SG.NEUT morning-GEN.SG.NEUT
onog dana
that-GEN.SG.MASC day-GEN.SG.MASC
“this year / that morning / that day”

Although unidirectional in its nature (Greenberg 1978; Lyons 1977; Heine, Claudi & Hünemeyer 1991; Hawkins 1994; Diessel 1999), the proposed hypothesis does not negate the possibility of the reverse grammaticalization pattern, as shown by Frajzyngier (1996) for Chadic and Stavinschi (2012) for Romance languages. As a matter of fact, the presented Serbo-Croatian demonstratives are a result of a diachronic integration of the initial deictic items *ovъ*, *tъ* and *onъ* with the anaphoric pronoun *i/jъ* (*ovъ* / *tъ* / *onъ* + *jъ* > *ovъjъ* / *tъjъ* / *onъjъ* > *ovaj* / *taj* / *onaj*). Eventually, the anaphoric item *i/jъ* entirely disappeared from the

language, leaving its traces throughout the pronominal system and in the category of definite adjectival aspect.

REFERENCES

Diessel H. 1999. *Demonstratives*; **Frajzyngier** Z. 1996. "On Sources of Demonstratives and Anaphors"; **Greenberg** J.H. 1978. "How does a language acquire gender markers?"; **Hawkins**, J.A. 1994. *A performance theory of order and constituency*; **Heine**, B. U. **Claudi** & F. **Hünemeyer** 1991. *Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework*; **Lyons** J. 1977. *Semantics* 2; **Meillet**, A. 1912. "L'evolution des formes grammaticales"; **Stavinschi**, A. 2012. "On the development of the Romance demonstrative systems".

Demonstratives taking over discourse: the grammaticalisation of deictic clitics in Äiwoo

Åshild Næss (University of Oslo)

The Oceanic language Äiwoo (Solomon Islands) has deictic particles *le* (PROX)/*lä* (DIST) and enclitics =*Ce* (PROX)/=*Cä* (DIST) which are extremely frequent in discourse, and which frequently occur together, ‘bracketing’ a word or constituent:

- (1) a. **Lä** kälikäli nugo=**ngä** i-po-päko=to.
DIST sweet.potato POSS:FOOD.1MIN=DIST PFV-cook-good=now
‘My sweet potatoes are cooked.’
- b. **Lä** maniok=**kä lä** ki-to=**kä**.
DIST manioc=DIST DIST IPFV-be=DIST
‘That’s manioc there.’

The distribution and function of this construction is complex and not easily summarised. It can occur with almost any type of constituent, and with multiple constituents within the same clause, as in (1b). It has functions related to focus and information structure, but the bracketed constituent is not necessarily the focused constituent; it can equally well be the presupposed part of the clause. It is often found in constructions involving a notionally subordinate clause, but the bracketed constituent can be either the subordinate or the main clause. It can be used to indicate that a clause has a topic-comment structure, as opposed to forming part of the presupposition, as in the pair *nelo lä lägä=kä* (sea DIST dry=DIST) ‘the tide (topic) was low (comment)’ vs. *lä nelo lägä=kä* (DIST sea dry=DIST) ‘at low tide’ (background information for a further assertion). In short, the construction just seems to indicate that a particular sequence **forms an interpretationally relevant unit with respect to the surrounding discourse** – it provides a cue to the overall structure of the utterance rather than indicating a specific function (Næss 2021).

There are no historical records that would provide evidence of how this unusual situation has arisen. However, what we know about the grammaticalisation of demonstrative forms in other Oceanic languages may provide clues to the pathways that have led to the Äiwoo construction: among other things, Oceanic languages use demonstratives as phrase demarcation devices, as markers of topic, and to mark notionally subordinate clauses (Moyses-Faurie 1997, Næss and Hovdhaugen 2011, Brill 2010, François ms.). The process known as insubordination, where formally subordinate clauses take on independent uses, might help account for the range of environments in which the construction is used; Evans (2007) notes that typical functions of insubordinated clauses include focus constructions and discourse contrasts, and that «in a number of languages, insubordinated clauses have what at first sight seem to be a bewilderingly wide range of functions» (Evans 2007: 423). Mithun (2008) moreover notes that markers of syntactic dependency can be extended to discourse level, with the function of indicating a relationship to the larger context, which is precisely what the Äiwoo deictics seem to do. I propose that demonstrative forms are particularly suited to taking on such a function, as the core function of demonstratives is to «coordinate the interlocutors’ joint attentional focus» (Diessel 2006, cf. also Evans et al. 2018), i.e. to make sure that the hearer is attending to the same object or concept as the speaker. A construction the function of which is to guide the hearer towards correctly identifying the syntactic and information-structural makeup of an utterance would seem to be a natural extension of this attention-coordination function.

REFERENCES

- Bril, Isabelle. 2010. Informational and referential hierarchy: clause-linking strategies in Austronesian-Oceanic languages. In Brill (ed.), *Clause linking and clause hierarchy: syntax and pragmatics*, 269-311. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17:4, 463-489.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366-431. Oxford: OUP.
- Evans, Nicholas, Henrik Bergqvist, and Lila San Roque. 2018. The grammar of engagement I: framework and initial exemplification. *Language and Cognition* 10, 110-140.
- François, Alexandre, ms. From deictics to clause linkers: discourse deixis and clause backgrounding strategies in the languages of north Vanuatu.
- Mithun, Marianne. 2008. The extension of dependency beyond the sentence. *Language* 84:1, 69-119.
- Moyse-Faurie, Claire. 1997. *Grammaire du futunien*. Nouméa: CDP Nouvelle-Calédonie.
- Næss, Åshild. 2021. Deictics, syntax and information structure in Äiwoo. Paper presented at the 15th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics.
- Næss, Åshild, and Even Hovdhaugen. 2011. *A grammar of Vaeakau-Taumako*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Origin and development of the Albanian demonstratives

Sergio Neri (University of Basel)

Michiel de Vaan (University of Basel)

Albanian has a binary demonstrative pronoun system, with proximal *ky* m., *kjo* f. 'this' contrasting with distal *ai* m., *ajo* f. 'that'. The distal pronouns double as personal pronouns of the third person. In the Old Albanian period (16th to 18th century), the system was basically the same, with the addition of the then still productive neuter gender.

As opposed to the relative ease with which the synchronic morphology can be described, the grammaticalization path leading up to both pronouns is not yet completely understood. Both demonstratives arose from the composition of two deictic elements. The second of which (nominative masc. *-i/-y*, f. *-jo*) is the same for both pronouns and probably continues the PIE demonstrative **so*, **to-*, although the nominative singular forms have not been fully explained yet. The origin of the first elements *k-* resp. *a-* is disputed. In proximal *k-*, scholars have recognized PIE deictic **k-*, PIE interrogative **kw-*, or Romance *(ek)ku-*; distal *a-* has been argued to contain, for instance, PIE **so-u-* 'that one' or PIE **h₂eu-* 'yon'.

In our talk we will first sketch the morphology and the syntactic behaviour of the two demonstrative pronouns in Old Albanian, and then proceed to a re-evaluation of the etymological scenario's that may explain the rise and grammaticalization of *ky* and *ai*.

REFERENCES

- Demiraj, Shaban. 1993. *Historische Grammatik der albanischen Sprache*. Vienna.
- Matzinger, Joachim & Stefan Schumacher. 2018. The morphology of Albanian. In: *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, vol. 3, 1749–1771.
- Topalli, Kolec. 2011. *Gramatikë historike e gjuhës shqipe*. Tirana.

From demonstratives to articles in the Celtic languages

Eugenio Luján (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Esteban Ngomo Fernández (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

It is generally agreed on that the definite articles in medieval Celtic languages (Old Irish *in(t)*, Old Welsh *ir*, Old Breton *an*) must have originated from earlier demonstratives in **sindo-*, *-ā* (GOI §467). It is clear, in fact, that they are etymologically related to certain demonstratives in ancient Celtic languages, such as Gaulish *sinde* and (*s*)*indas* (Lambert 1994: 66). They would thus have followed a most frequent, well-known grammaticalization path DEMONSTRATIVE > DEFINITE ARTICLE (see, e.g., Heine – Kuteva 2004: 109-111).

Old Irish definite articles, however, display an interesting peculiarity – they can co-occur with indefinite referents (GOI §470). This has been variously explained (GOI §470, Ronan 2004) and Goldstein (2022) has recently proposed that they accompany referents that are the focal center of the discourse and also noun phrases that are a signal to the addressee to retrieve mental representation of the referent, which would be in line with Dryer’s (2014) reference hierarchy. In his analyses Goldstein has also applied Löbner’s (1985:298–299) distinction between pragmatically and semantically definite referents to identify the different types of definiteness that can trigger the use of the definite articles in Old Irish.

Our goal in this paper is to try to shed light on the grammaticalization processes that have led to the development of the definite articles of the Celtic languages. Although still quite limited in number, there are now more extant texts in continental Celtic languages, and they provide very interesting linguistic information. We have, therefore, collected and surveyed all the occurrences of demonstratives in the those languages: Celtiberian *so-* and *sto-* (Wodtko 2000: 338-334, Jordán 2019: 230-233, De Hoz in press), the various Gaulish forms (Lambert 1994: 66, Delamarre 2003), and maybe infixed Lepontic *-so-* (Lambert 1994: 66, *LexLep*, s.u. *tošokote*). We have analyzed all those instances in their context in relation to Dryer’s hierarchy and following Löbner’s frame and they appear to display an array of different uses. This allows for a comparison with the distribution of the definite article in Old Irish investigated by Goldstein (2022) and provides additional evidence for refining our understanding of the processes involved in the grammaticalization of Celtic definite articles.

REFERENCES

- De Hoz, Javier, in press: *Historia lingüística de la Península Ibérica en la Antigüedad*, Madrid, C.S.I.C.
- Delamarre, Xavier 2003: *Dictionnaire de la langue gauloise*, Paris, Errance.
- Dryer, Matthew 2014: “Competing methods for uncovering linguistic diversity. The case of definite and indefinite articles (Commentary on Davis, Gillon, and Matthewson)”, *Language* 90.4: 232–249.
- GOI = Thurneysen, Rudolph 1946: *A Grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Goldstein, David 2022: “The Old Irish article”, *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 23.
- Heine, Bernd – Tania Kuteva 2004: *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Jordán, Carlos 2019: *Lengua y epigrafía celtibéricas*, Zaragoza, Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza.
- Lambert, Pierre-Yves 1994: *La langue gauloise*, Paris, Errance.
- LexLep* = David Stifter et alii (eds.), *Lexicon Leponticum* (<https://lexlep.univie.ac.at/>).
- Ronan, Patricia (2004). “*Co n-accae in fer* and Functional Grammar”, *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 8, 133–147.

Wodtko, Dagmar 2000: *Wörterbuch der keltiberischen Inschriften* (vol. V.1 of *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*, ed. by Jürgen Untermann), Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Latin *ecce*: arguments in favor of its development from a PIE demonstrative

Verónica Orqueda (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

Roland Pooth (Independent researcher)

The Latin particle *ecce* has been extensively studied from different perspectives and, yet, it is not easy to reach a consensus as regards its etymology, due to the obscurity of the morphological formation, the scarcity of cognates in related languages, and the diverse uses found already in Archaic Latin (and its continuing stages). As alternative etymologies, it has been claimed that *ecce* derives from the combination of demonstrative roots (e.g. Dunkel 2014: 2011, de Vaan 2008: 185, and Fruyt 2011: 750). Also, it has also been claimed that it may derive from an imperative verb form (Julia 2020). Among the different proposals, the one that considers the demonstrative origin is probably the most widely accepted. However, attempts to connect this morphological formation with an explanation at other linguistic levels: syntax, discourse-pragmatic (e.g. why preceding accusatives? Or with which meaning exactly?) have not been convincing. The aim of this talk is to argue in favor of a derivation from PIE **h₁éd=k'e*, by offering a proposal for its original meaning and for its derivation towards Latin *ecce*, considering the data found in Archaic Latin.

To reach our goal, we classify the total number of cases with *ecce* in Plautus (as representative of Archaic Latin) according to the three possible syntactic contexts in which it appears: with no syntactic integrity to its context (type a), preceding a pronoun (type b1) or a noun phrase (type b2), and preceding a sentence (c). Results show that the most frequent use is 1st person pronoun, this is type (b1), where all referents are evidently animate. Following Diessel's (1999) analysis of demonstratives as elements that call joint attention, the possibility of considering type (b1) as most ancient let us claim that the etymology **h₁éd=k'e* can be explained as the combination of an exophoric demonstrative with ablative marking and the clitic of a here-deictic exophoric demonstrative. This univerbation may have had a meaning close to 'from that', which would explain the original combination with accusatives (*ecce me* 'from that towards me'). Such an original form-meaning construct would be an appropriate starting point for a later grammaticalization process towards an interjection or a discourse marker, as it is better interpreted when preceding sentences and in cases of no integrity with its syntactic context.

REFERENCES

- De Vaan, M. 2008. *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages*. Leiden: Brill.
- Diessel, H. 1999. *Demonstratives. Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dunkel, G. 2014. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominal-stämme*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Fruyt, M. 2011. Grammaticalization in Latin. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*. Volume 4: Complex sentences, grammaticalization, typology. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Julia, M.A. 2020 About Latin *Ecce* 'Behold! Lo! See! There!' and Some Ancient Languages Presentatives. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 17-23.