

A typology of clause-combining demonstratives

Merlijn Breunese and Holger Diessel

Analyzing cross-linguistic data from a stratified sample of 180 languages, this paper offers a typology of grammaticalized demonstratives in clause-combining functions. It distinguishes between two main types, based on the demonstratives' different original syntactic positions and the different cognitive processes they invoke. Additionally, this study explores the way in which the distance feature of a demonstrative is preserved in its clause-combining function. Finally, it considers how the demonstrative's connecting function interacts with its information structuring property.

The first main type of clause-combining demonstrative includes forms that originally occurred in pronominal or adverbial position and that have a pointing (or deictic) function. The demonstratives of this type refer endophorically to a preceding or following proposition (a process called "discourse deixis" by Himmelmann 1996). Two subgroups can be distinguished for this first main type. The first subgroup includes expressions such as English *therefore* (or German *deshalb*), which combine a demonstrative with a case marker or adposition to a complex clause linker (cf. Amele *eu nu* 'for that' = 'because'). The second subgroup consists of a manner deictic such as English *thus* (or German *so*), which many languages use as a sentence connective in certain semantic types of adverbial clauses (cf. East Futunan *fela'aki* 'be.like.that' = 'if.only', cf. König 2015) or in quotative constructions (cf. Epenaa Pedee *maga/maa* 'like that'; cf. Güldemann 2008).

The second main type does not involve pointing of any kind, but consists of a demonstrative that originally occurred as a determiner in a noun phrase (cf. Diessel 2018+). In clause-combining function, however, these demonstratives determine a clause (or verbal phrase), which results in a nominalized construction. The nominalization can function as a complement clause, a relative clause, or as an adverbial clause, and may include a case marker, an adposition or a definite article in addition to the demonstrative to indicate its function within the main clause (e.g. in Lakotha, Amele, Menya, Maricopa).

Additionally, the present paper considers the interaction between the clause-combining function of demonstratives and their use in space. First, it suggests that there is a tendency for medial terms, as opposed to proximal or distal terms, to develop a clause-combining function. Second, it shows that clause-combining demonstratives may map their deictic contrast onto e.g. the temporal or textual domain, marking temporally or textually close and distant events or entities (cf. Schapper and San Roque 2011). Finally, it explores the use of the relevant demonstratives as markers of information structure, arguing that they typically indicate a topical status of the referent or nominalized element (cf. De Vries 1999; François 2005).

De Vries, Lourens. 1995. Demonstratives, referent identification and topicality in Wambon and some other Papuan languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 24(5). 513–533.

Diessel, Holger. 2018+. Determiners and demonstratives. In Solveiga Armoskaite and Martina Wiltschko. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Determiners*. OUP

François, Alexandre. 2005. A typological overview of Mwotlap, an Oceanic language of Vanuatu. *Linguistic Typology* 9. 115–146.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008. *Quotative Indexes in African Languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*, 205–254. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

König, Ekkehard. 2015. Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.), *Perspectives on Historical Syntax*, 35–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schapper, Antoinette and Lila San Roque. 2011. Demonstratives and non-embedded nominalisations in three Papuan languages of the Timor-Alor-Pantar family. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 38–408.