Finite complementizers as demonstratives in the clausal domain

CogLing Days 2022, Tilburg

Camil Staps
Leiden University & Radboud University
info@camilstaps.nl
mstdn.social/@CamilStaps

Johan Rooryck
cOAlition S & Leiden University
johan.rooryck@gmail.com
mstdn.social/@JohanRooryck

Get the full draft on LingBuzz: https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/006751

1. Roadmap

- The complementizer that retains the spatial meaning of the original distal demonstrative
- This is because it **points** to a presupposition in the **Common Ground**
- A distal element is used because it involves the **Addressee**, who is far from the Speaker
- We should take the "Common Ground" seriously as a cognitively represented space

2. Introduction: direct & indirect speech

Direct speech is 'proximal'; indirect speech is 'distal':

- (1) a. Sue said (this/*that): "It is raining."
 - b. Sue said (*this/that) it is raining.

(Rooryck 2019: 257)

This 'distance' is interpreted in two ways:

- **Actual distance**: the distance between the referent (the original utterance) and the deictic expression (the speech report) as multidimensional conceptual objects in a state space (Churchland 1986)
 - Dimensions: propositional content, lexical form, accent, accompanying gestures, ...
 - Direct speech is proximal because it requires copying of lexical form and allows copying of accent, accompanying gestures, ... (Clark & Gerrig 1990)
 - Indirect speech is distal because only propositional content needs to / can match
- Addressee involvement: the distance between the referent (the original utterance) and the Speaker
 - Direct speech is proximal because the Speaker has direct evidence for the utterance, which is not shared with the Addressee
 - Indirect speech is distal because both Speaker and Addressee have indirect evidence; the utterance is in the Common Ground, 'close' to the Addressee and 'far' from the Speaker
 - The Common Ground is not proximal for the Speaker, but the proximal/distal distinction is used to distinguish between the information content private to the Speaker (proximal) and that shared with the Addressee (distal)

3. Presupposition effects

Claim: overt distal complementizers \Rightarrow Addressee involvement \Rightarrow Common Ground.

3.1. Exclamatives

Many languages use finite complementizers for exclamatives (more examples in Zevakhina 2013: 167):

(2) That bio industry is still allowed!

Explanation: the propositional content of the exclamative is presupposed in the Common Ground (Zanuttini & Portner 2003), e.g. cannot be used to convince the Addressee:

(3) (*That) bio industry is still allowed, I'm telling you!

Hence: that explicitly involves the Addressee, who has access to the Common Ground.

3.2. So-called 'optional' that

(4) Did you know (that) you had a flat?

(Bolinger 1972: 59)

Bolinger (1972: 59):

- "A passes a slow-moving car driven by B, and calls out to him: Did you know you had a flat?
- "Alternatively, A passes B, notices the flat and says nothing, but B observes A's curiosity and calls What are you staring at? A' replies, Did you know that you had a flat?"

In other words, without *that* the sentence can be uttered out of the blue. *That* suggests some context between Speaker and Addressee. Again, distal *that* involves the Addressee through the Common Ground.

3.3. The adverb-COMP construction in Romance

Romanian:

(5) Sigur (că) va veni sure COMP will.3SG come 'Of course s/he's coming.'

(Romanian; Cruschina & Remberger 2017: 89)

Interpretive difference between the presence/absence of the complementizer:

- Că can only be used if the Addressee could have inferred the propositional content themselves
- The overt complementizer is thus conditioned by the existence of Common Ground
- Că comes from Latin quod, a non-proximal interrogative; this is another case of a non-proximal element used to involve the Addressee via the Common Ground.
- Similar examples exist in Ibero-Romance (Kocher 2022)

3.4. Generalisation

Exclamatives, Romance adverb-COMP constructions, and English 'optional' complementizers all use an **overt distal complementizer** to refer to the **Common Ground** which involves the **Addressee**. The complementizer is therefore **still demonstrative**, as it points to a presupposition.

¹ Bolinger has B instead of A here, but we take this to be a mistake.

4. Parallels with demonstratives

Definitions (Diessel 1999):

- Exophoric demonstratives: refer to entities in the speech situation: *that book there* (with a pointing gesture)
- Anaphoric demonstratives: refer to linguistic elements in the surrounding discourse: *I borrowed* [1984], but I have not read [that book], yet

4.1. Exophoric demonstratives

The standard view that *this/that* indicate physical proximity/distance is too simple. Demonstratives are chosen based on different factors (Peeters et al. 2021):

- Physical: distance, visibility, uphill/downhill, ...
- Psychological: joint attention, cognitive accessibility, ...

Actual distance is a physical factor and psychological factors are the recycling of Addressee involvement:

- Actual distance: the distance between the referent (the entity in the world) and the deictic expression (the demonstrative)
 - The demonstrative is accompanied by a pointing gesture
 - Both referent and demonstrative therefore have a place in the real world
 - Hence, the actual distance can be computed in terms of 'regular' distance
- Addressee involvement: the distance between the referent (the entity in the world) and the Speaker
 - Again, the distance from the Speaker is used to describe proximity to the Addressee
 - E.g., when the referent is in joint attention it is in the Common Ground, close to Addressee
 - Common Ground can also be used for empathy: *How's that throat?* (Lakoff 1974)

4.2. Anaphoric demonstratives

The intuitive idea that *this/that* are used depending on the textual distance between anaphor and antecedent cannot be confirmed experimentally (Çokal et al. 2014). The choice of demonstrative can be predicted more accurately based on text genre (Peeters et al. 2021; Maes et al. 2022):

Prefer proximal demonstratives

←

Scientific literature

Written news stories

Interactional spoken discourse

These genres differ with respect to the degree the Addressee is involved with the discourse:

- Interactional spoken discourse: Addressee provides continuous feedback; Speaker is relatively certain of the extent of the Common Ground
- Written news stories: are written on a relatively simple level; the writer assumes that the Addressee can follow along; writer can thus still assume a relatively large Common Ground
- Scientific literature: written to communicate new information that may require considerable cognitive effort on the part of the Addressee; the content is 'close' to the writer but not to the Addressee

In this way text genre is a proxy for Addressee involvement, which explains the preferences for proximal/distal elements.

5. Conclusion

Complementizers like *that* and *que* are **demonstrative** in the sense that they refer to a presupposition in the **Common Ground**.

| | Information content (CP) | Entities (DP) |
|-----------|---|---|
| Exophoric | Direct / indirect speech (§2) | Exophoric demonstratives (§4.1) |
| | Actual distance in a multidimensional conceptual world, interpreted as descriptive similarity | Actual distance in the concrete physical world |
| | Addressee involvement: interpreted as evidentiality; proximity is private witness evidentiality | Addressee involvement: interpreted as psychological factors (psychological distance, joint attention, empathy,) |
| Anaphoric | Presupposition (§3) | Anaphoric demonstratives (§4.2) |
| | Addressee involvement: <i>that</i> used over Ø to signal content in the Common Ground | Addressee involvement: <i>that</i> used over <i>this</i> to interact and empathise with the Addressee |

- The reference to **utterances** and **propositions** can be seen as the CP parallel to the reference to **entities in the speech situation** and **linguistic elements** on the DP level
 - Speech reports are exophoric references to information content
 - Presupposition is anaphoric reference to information content
- Addressee involvement can explain differences between *this* and *that* in all reference types, and also the alternation between *that* and zero in clausal complements
 - This cannot introduce clausal complements because it would introduce not-at-issue content
- **Actual distance** is relevant for exophoric reference only, as it requires the deictic expression and the referent to be of the same type
 - For exophoric demonstratives: pointing gesture and entity both have a physical location
 - For speech reports: original utterance and report both have a linguistic representation
- The spatial core of **demonstratives** like *that* is stable: as **complementizers** they still **point**, namely to content in the **Common Ground**
- The Common Ground is a cognitively represented space
- This allows for a **polysemy** account of *that* based on actual distance and Addressee involvement (rather than a grammaticalization account)

6. Addendum: relativizers and the fluidity of the DP/CP distinction

Relativizers fit in the lower right quadrant, but require a distal element for the same reason as *that*-clauses on the left: a proximal element would imply that the head, which has already been mentioned, is private to the Speaker. The alternation between *that* and zero is thus based on whether there is something to refer to:

(6) a. There was nothing unusual Ø caught your eye when you came in?

(Inspector Morse, season 7, episode 1)

b. Was there anything that/? Ø caught your eye while browsing through the racks?

References

- Churchland, Paul M. 1986. 'Some reductive strategies in cognitive neurobiology'. *Mind* 95/379:279–309. Reprinted in Paul M. Churchland, 1992, *A neurocomputational perspective. The nature of mind and the structure of science*, 77–110. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Clark, Herbert H., and Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. 'Quotations as Demonstrations'. *Language* 66:764–805.
- Çokal, Derya, Patrick Sturt, and Fernanda Ferreira. 2014. 'Deixis: *This* and *that* in written narrative discourse'. *Discourse Processes* 51:201–229.
- Cruschina, Silvio, and Eva-Maria Remberger. 2017. 'Before the Complementizer: Adverb Types and Root Clause Modification'. In *Adjective Adverb Interfaces in Romance*, edited by Martin Hummel and Salvador Valera, 81–109. Linguistics Today 242. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives. Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Typological Studies in Language 42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kocher, Anna. 2022. Complementizers on edge. On the boundaries between syntax and pragmatics in *Ibero-Romance*. Open Romance Linguistics 1. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Lakoff, Robin. 1974. 'Remarks on this and that'. In Proceedings of the Tenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society, edited by Michael W. La Galy, Robert A. Fox, and Anthony Bruck, 321–344. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Maes, Alfons, Emiel Krahmer, and David Peeters. 2022. 'Explaining variance in writer's use of demonstratives: A corpus study demonstrating the importance of discourse genre'. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 7/1:1–36.
- Peeters, David, Emiel Krahmer, and Alfons Maes. 2021. 'A conceptual framework for the study of demonstrative reference'. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 28:409–433.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2019. "Recycling" evidentiality: a research program'. In *Mapping linguistic data. Essays in honour of Liliane Haegeman*, edited by Metin Bağrıaçık, Anne Breitbarth and Karen De Clercq, 242–261. Ghent.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella, and Paul Portner. 2003. 'Exclamative Clauses: At the Syntax-Semantics Interface'. *Language* 79:39–81.
- Zevakhina, Natalia. 2013. 'Syntactic Strategies of Exclamatives'. *Eesti ja soome-ugri keeleteaduse ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 4:157–178.