

Finite complementizers as demonstratives in the clausal domain

Camil Staps (@CamilStaps@mstdn.social)
Johan Rooryck (@JohanRooryck@mstdn.social)

CogLing Days 2022

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. Direct & indirect speech

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

(Rooryck 2019: 257)

This/that mark **actual distance**:

- Direct speech reports are ‘close’ to the original utterance because they (a) require identical lexical form and (b) can copy accents, accompanying gestures (Clark & Gerrig 1990)
- Indirect speech reports are ‘far’; they only need to match propositional content
- Actual distance is the distance between entities in a **conceptual state space** (Churchland 1986)

2. Direct & indirect speech

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

(Rooryck 2019: 257)

That marks **Addressee involvement** and Common Ground:

- Speakers of direct speech reports are ‘close’ to the original utterance because they have direct evidence for it
- With indirect speech, both Speaker and Addressee have indirect evidence
- Distal *that* thus becomes a marker of Common Ground, because CG involves the Addressee, who is ‘far’ from the Speaker

3. Presupposition effects

- **Addressee involvement** generalizes to other uses of *that*
- In contexts where *that* is optional, a choice for *that* over a zero complementizer indicates that there is Common Ground shared with the Addressee

3.1. Exclamatives

(2) *That bio industry is still allowed!*

Exclamatives are factive (Zanuttini & Portner 2003):

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

Hence, *that* is used to mark the presupposition in the Common Ground

3.2. So-called ‘optional’ *that*

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

(Bolinger 1972: 59)

- Without *that*, (4) is more likely to be uttered out of the blue
- *That* is more likely when (4) is used as a response to a question
- We see this question as shared Common Ground

3.3. Adverb-COMP constructions in Romance

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

(Cruschina & Remberger 2017: 89)

- *Că* can only be used in the Addressee could have inferred the propositional content themselves
- Hence, *că* is conditioned by the existence of a common inferential base
- *Că* comes from Latin *quod*, a non-proximal interrogative
- Similar examples exist in Ibero-Romance (Kocher 2022)

3.4. Generalisation

- In all these cases **distal elements** mark **Common Ground**:
 - Exclamatives
 - ‘Optional’ *that* in English object clauses
 - Adverb-COMP constructions in Romance
- This is because the Common Ground **involves the Addressee**, who is **distal from the Speaker**

4.1. Parallels with exophoric demonstratives

- Physical distance is only one factor; psychological factors also play a role (Peeters et al. 2021)
- Exophoric demonstratives are analogous to speech reports:

Exophoric demonstratives

Actual distance: distance in 3D space
(physical factors)

Addressee involvement: distance of the entity
in the Speaker's mind (psychological factors)

Speech reports

Actual distance: conceptual distance in state
space (propositional content, lexical form,
accents, gestures, ...)

Addressee involvement: direct/indirect
evidentiality

4.2. Parallels with anaphoric demonstratives

- The choice of *this/that* depends on text genre (Maes et al. 2022)
 - Interactional spoken discourse prefers *that*
 - Scientific literature prefers *this*
- Suggestion:
 - The Addressee is more involved in jointly building the discourse in interactional conversation
 - As a result, the Common Ground is much larger than in scientific literature
 - Text genre is thus a proxy for Addressee involvement

5. Conclusion

Information content (CP)

Direct / indirect speech

Actual distance in a conceptual state space

Addressee involvement is evidentiality

Presupposition

Addressee involvement: *that* used over \emptyset to signal content in the Common Ground

Entities (DP)

Exophoric demonstratives

Actual distance in concrete physical world

Addressee involvement is psychological factors

Anaphoric demonstratives

Text genre as a proxy for **Addressee involvement** to explain preferences for certain demonstratives

5. Conclusion

- 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)

Get the full draft on lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/006751 (link on front of handout)

6. Relativizers: fluidity of the DP/CP distinction

There was nothing unusual Ø caught your eye when you came in?

(Inspector Morse, season 7, episode 1)

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

Information content (CP)

Presupposition

Addressee involvement: *that* used over Ø to signal content in the Common Ground

Entities (DP)

Anaphoric demonstratives

Text genre as a proxy for **Addressee involvement** to explain preferences for certain demonstratives