On the demonstrative nature of finite complementizers

—

Camil Staps (@SemiCamil)
Johan Rooryck (@JohanRooryck)

SLE 2022 Bucharest

1. Roadmap

- *this* : *that* :: direct speech : indirect speech
- Proximal/distal is used to mark direct/indirect evidentiality
- Indirect evidentiality (distal *that*) involves the Addressee, 'far' from the Speaker
- Addressee involvement plays a role in many uses of *that*
- This suggests a polysemous account of the demonstrative / complementizer *that*
- Can generalize this to other uses of *that*, including relativizer

2. Direct & indirect speech

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

<div align="right">(Rooryck 2019: 257)</div>

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) a.   *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!*

- *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

3.3. Adverb-COMP constructions in Romance

(6) *Evidentemente (que) Julia está muy enfadada!* (Etxepare 1997: 98 via Hernanz 2007: 165–166)

- *Que* is conditioned by the existence of a previous, lexically identical utterance: *Julia está muy enfadada*
- This previous utterance establishes a Question Under Discussion to which (6) refers
- *Que* therefore also requires shared context between Speaker and Addressee

3.3. Adverb-COMP constructions in Romance

(7) a.   *Chillo*$_i$ *s'è*   *astutato*   [*'o*   *riscaldamento*]$_i$
            that.M self=is turned_off the.M.SG heating.M
     b.   *Chello*$_i$ *s'è*   *astutato*   [*'o*   *riscaldamento*]$_j$
            that.N self=is turned_off the.M.SG heating.M   (Ledgeway 2011: 286)

- (7a) can be uttered out of the blue, but with *chello*, there must be a context to which (7b) can respond
- Again the distal element refers to shared context with the Addressee

3.3. Adverb-COMP constructions in Romance

- Spanish *que* / Romanian *că* come from Latin *quod*, a non-proximal interrogative
- Neapolitan *chillo/chello* comes from Latin *eccum ille*, a distal deictic
- So these are also examples of distal elements referring to Common Ground

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	Speech reports
Actual distance: distance in 3D space (physical factors)	**Actual distance**: conceptual distance in state space (propositional content, lexical form, accents, gestures, …)
Addressee involvement: distance of the entity in the Speaker's mind (psychological factors)	**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)	**Entities (DP)**

<u>Direct / indirect speech</u>

Actual distance in a conceptual state space
Addressee involvement is evidentiality

<u>Presupposition</u>

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

<u>Exophoric demonstratives</u>

Actual distance in concrete physical world
Addressee involvement is psychological factors

<u>Anaphoric demonstratives</u>

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

5. Conclusion

- **Complementizers** like *that* and *que* are **demonstrative**: they **refer** to content in the **Common Ground**
- We argue for a **polysemy** account of *that* based on **actual distance** and **Addressee involvement**