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Demonstrative/indefinite pronouns are often bimorphemic; English *th-is, th-at*, and Japanese *so-ko* ‘there’ and *do-ko* ‘where’. But the patterns of the combination of the two morphemes are diverse and inconsistent even within a language. Against this background, a tripartite structure for demonstrative pronouns is proposed: Determiner-Deixis-Noun. With the assumption that the two overt morphemes are realizations of the two of the three segments in the template, a consistent analysis of the morpheme combination is obtained. As a consequence, despite their appearances, *this* and *that* do not have parallel structures, nor do *so-ko* and *do-ko*. The paper also speculates on the relation between demonstrative pronouns and adnominal demonstratives.

1. A puzzle: Diverse and inconsistent combinations inside demonstratives

Spacial expressions are often incorporated into demonstratives.

(1) a. French
   ici ‘here’         celui/celle-ci ‘this’
   là ‘there’        celui/celle-là ‘that’

b. Indonesian
   sini ‘here’       ini ‘this’
   situ ‘there’      itu ‘that’

(Dixon 2003: 74f)

Table 1  The *ko-so-a-do* paradigm in Japanese (Martin 1975: 1066, Kuno 1973: 27)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>medial</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>interrogative/indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>individual</td>
<td>ko-re</td>
<td>so-re</td>
<td>a-re</td>
<td>do-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>ko-ko</td>
<td>so-ko</td>
<td>a-soko</td>
<td>do-ko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction/alternative</td>
<td>ko-tira/ko-tti</td>
<td>so-tira/so-tti</td>
<td>a-tira/a-tti</td>
<td>do-tira/do-tti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adnominal</td>
<td>ko-no</td>
<td>so-no</td>
<td>a-no</td>
<td>do-no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>ko-nna</td>
<td>so-nna</td>
<td>a-nna</td>
<td>do-nna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>ko-o</td>
<td>so-o</td>
<td>a-a</td>
<td>do-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pattern A: X (proximity/indeterminacy)-Y (content)

Table 2  Tamil (Dixon 2003: 78/Asher 1985: 150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>distal</th>
<th>interrogative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>i-nta</td>
<td>a-nta</td>
<td>e-nta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>i-ngke</td>
<td>a-ngke</td>
<td>e-ngke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>i-ppa</td>
<td>a-ppa</td>
<td>e-ppa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>i-ttane</td>
<td>a-ttane</td>
<td>e-ttane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>i-ppati</td>
<td>a-ppati</td>
<td>e-ppati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Similar paradigms are found in many languages from South Asia (both Indo-Aryan and Dravidian) and Hausa (Dixon 2003: 78).

Table 3 Hausa (masculine; Newman 2000: 147)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demonstrative</th>
<th>interrogative/indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this (by me)</td>
<td>that (by you)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wannan</td>
<td>wannan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Classical Greek (Haselmath 1997: 30)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>relative pronoun</th>
<th>interrogative/indefinite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hoûtos</td>
<td>hós</td>
<td>tís/tis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toiósde</td>
<td>hoîos</td>
<td>poîos/poiós</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>ekeî</td>
<td>hoû</td>
<td>poû/pou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>tóte</td>
<td>hóte</td>
<td>póte/poté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>tosósde</td>
<td>hósos</td>
<td>pósos/posós</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner</td>
<td>hoútôs</td>
<td>hós</td>
<td>pôs/pôs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) English

th-is, th-at, th-ese, th-ose ↓

Pattern B: X (category)-Y (proximity)

The deictic feature encoded in a suffix is common, cf. French and Indonesian above.

Table 5 Ao (Indic) (Diesel 1999: 30/Gowda 1975: 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.m.</td>
<td>pa-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.f.</td>
<td>la-ya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.nonhuman</td>
<td>ipa-ya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditional grammar of English (or Germanic for that matter) did not postulate *th-* as an independent morpheme, nor did it pursue the similarity between *th-* words and *wh-* words (cf. Klinge 2008, see also Langacker 2001). But the paradigm in Table 1 is long known in Japanese traditional grammar as *ko-so-a-do* words, indicating that they are bimorphemic, and that demonstratives and indefinites are treated uniformly.


Table 6 Ponapean (Micronesia) (Rehg 1981: 143-154)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>medial</th>
<th>distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sg.individual/place</td>
<td>m-et</td>
<td>m-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.time</td>
<td>m-et</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.pointing</td>
<td>i-et</td>
<td>i-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.adnominal</td>
<td>-et</td>
<td>-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pattern C: X (content)-Y (proximity)
(3) th-ere, th-en ↓

Pattern D: X (category)-Y (content)
(4) wh-at, wh-o, wh-ere

Pattern E: X (indeterminacy) -Y (content)
(5) h-ere, th-ere ↓

Pattern E’: X (proximity/indeterminacy)-Y (content)
(6) th-is, th-at, th-en ↓

Pattern E’’: X (category/proximity/indeterminacy)-Y (content)

Pattern B: X (category)-Y (proximity)
(7) Complex demonstratives in Lamaholot (Nishiyama and Kelen 2006: 21f)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘this’</th>
<th>‘that, the’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pi</td>
<td>pe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi’in</td>
<td>pe’en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi’in</td>
<td>me’en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pimi’in</td>
<td>peme’en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pi’invn</td>
<td>pe’envn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi’invn</td>
<td>me’envn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pimi’invn</td>
<td>peme’envn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have been unsuccessful to collect data to detect syntactic, semantic and/or pragmatic differences between the several variants of Lamaholot demonstratives. But at least we can tell that the vowel i ~ e has to do with the proximity.

(8) Possible derivations of the variants

\[
\begin{array}{c}
pi \\
\downarrow \text{add nasal} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{pi’invn} \\
\leftarrow \text{pi’in} \rightarrow \text{mi’in} \rightarrow \text{mi’invn} \\
\downarrow \text{add -vn} \quad \text{nasalization} \quad \text{add -vn} \\
\downarrow \quad \text{partial reduplication and nasalization} \\
pimi’in \\
\downarrow \text{add -vn} \\
pimi’invn
\end{array}
\]

This derivation shows that demonstratives can be quite complex morphologically.
2. Tripartite structure


(10) a. Determiner: has to do with definiteness and referentiality
    b. Deixis: proximity and person
    c. Noun: not referential in and of itself, a predicate (e.g., boy (x))

(11) ko-ko ‘here’, so-ko ‘there’
    Det-Dex-N
    Ø-ko/so-place

How about indeterminates? They are variables (x) or sets (\(\lambda x\)) without referentiality. Thus, they are located in Det. (In Langacker’s 2001 terms, both \(th\)-words and \(wh\)-words involve “selection from range of alternatives”.)

(12) do-re ‘which’ do-ko ‘where’
    Det-Dex-N
    do-Ø-thing/place

Ko/so/a and do are in different slots.

Although ko/so/a are affixes in modern Japanese, they could be used as free words meaning ‘this thing’ and ‘that thing’ in premodern Japanese. The structure would be:

(13) Det-Dex-N
    Ø-ko/so/a-Ø (thing)

(14) th-is
    Det -   Dex -   N
    th - is ([+proximate]) - Ø (thing)

(15) th-at
    Det -   Dex -   N
    th - at ([−proximate]) - Ø (thing) ?? (cf. Di Sciullo 2005, ch. 6, and Leu 2008)

No

(16) wh-at       wh-en       wh-ere
    Det-Ø-thing  Det-Ø-time  Det-Ø-place
(17) th-at th-en th-ere
            Det-Ø-thing Det-Ø-time Det-Ø-place

In the distal *th*- series, there is no specification for proximity. That they are interpreted as distal is implicature due to the lack of the [+proximate] feature.¹

The unmarked nature of distal demonstratives and its affinity with definite article are attested diachronically (cf. Greenberg 1993: 304)² and synchronically (e.g. Indonesian *itu*, German *das* and its cognates on Danish and Old English, cf. Klinge 2008).

Despite their appearances, Japanese *ko-ko* ‘here’ and *do-ko* ‘where’ do not have parallel structures, nor do English *this* and *that*.³

In general, morphological arbitrariness (involving zero morphemes) and/or fusion of Det-Dex-N result in bimorphic structures, but my claim is that demonstratives basically have the tripartite structure.

3. Distinctiveness of definiteness and deixis

(18) a. an fear seo the man this
      (Irish)
b. aftos o andras this the man
      (Modern Greek)
(19) a. *ce le garcon (French)
b. *this the man
      (Panagiotidis 2000: 178)

The complimentary distribution of a definite article and a determiner in English and French may be analogous to the doubly-filled Comp filter (*the book which that he bought*) (cf. Giusti 1997: 109).

Nonetheless, the cross-linguistic tendencies for demonstratives to be bimorphemic (rather than trimorphemic) may reflect the redundancy between definiteness and deixis, leading to their fusion. (Yet, if the above analysis is correct, English *this* manifests distinctive slots for definiteness and deixis.)

---

¹ The exact identification of *th*- is controversial (i.e., a definiteness marker for Déchaine and Wiltschko 2002, a 3rd person marker compatible with indefiniteness for Bernstein 2008, and a ostensive (i.e., pointing out) marker for Klinge 2008). I tentatively identify *th*- as the Determiner part.
² But Heine and Kuteva (2002: 109-111) also report cases where a proximate demonstrative developed into a definite article.
³ Di Sciullo (2005, ch. 6) offers a bimorphemic analysis of *this* and *that*, claiming that they are parallel (see also Leu 2008 and Kayne and Pollock 2010), with further implication that *ko-ko* and *do-ko* are also parallel. See Nishiyama (2009) for problems with Di Sciullo’s analysis.
4. The relation between demonstrative pronouns and adnominal demonstratives

The analogy of the complimentary distribution of a definite article and a determiner to the doubly-filled Comp filter has side effects.

In current theoretical implementation, the Doubly-filled Comp Filter is captured as the Specifier-Head relation, and by analogy, the above analogical analysis locates adnominal demonstratives in DP Spec (see also Panagiotidis 2000 and Brugè 2002). Thus, one might postulate the following hypothesis:

(20) Demonstratives are phrases (XPs, syntactic objects); Demonstrative pronouns are adnominal demonstratives in disguise.

Adnominal demonstratives may lack the Noun part; Japanese ko-no consists of the deictic part and the linker no. If the linker is the genitive marker analogous to English ‘s (Taro-no hon ‘Taro’s book’), demonstrative pronoun is not different from adnominal demonstratives in having an empty (understood) noun:

(21) a. I need this Ø. (cf. Radford 1993, Kayne and Pollock 2010)
    b. I like John’s Ø.

However, demonstrative pronouns, as systematic as those in Japanese in Table 1, are more likely to be heads (Xs, morphological objects). Thus, one might postulate the following alternative hypothesis:

(22) Demonstratives are heads (Xs, morphological objects); Adnominal demonstratives are demonstrative pronouns in disguise.

Adnominal demonstratives contain the Noun part, yielding a kind of appositive structure (this man = this thing, man). This is analogous to certain sets of pronouns as discussed by Postal (1969) (e.g., we linguists).

But a demonstrative appearing in the middle of a noun phrase cannot be a pronoun but only a modifier:

(23) Bauer acetru frumos Romanian (Brugè 2002: 16)
    boy-the this nice

Maybe demonstratives are not monolithic and allow for either of the analyses. Radford (1993) argues that nominal expressions like these students, good students, and many students are doubly headed.
References