



HRZZ

Hrvatska zaklada
za znanost

Book of Abstracts

DEIXIS IN LANGUAGE

**DEICTES 2019
SYMPOSIUM**

28-29 June, 2019,
The University of Rijeka, Croatia
<http://deictes.ffri.hr/results/events.html>



This symposium has been fully supported by the Croatian Science Foundation (HRZZ) under the project number IP-2018-01-2243 „Semantic domains of deictic words: Investigating the fast semantic processes in language (DeicTeS)“

Book of Abstracts:

Edited by:

Marija M. Brala-Vukanović, The University of Rijeka, Croatia

Proofreading:

Anita Memišević

Layout and print: TISKARA SUŠAK

Symposium Programme Chair: Marija Brala-Vukanović, The University of Rijeka, Croatia

Chair of Local Organising Committee: Mihaela Matešić, The University of Rijeka, Croatia

Symposium Committee:

Anita Memišević (president),

Marija Brala Vukanović,

Ana Meštrović,

Danijela Trenkić,

Henriette Hendriks,

Mihaela Matešić,

Ljiljana Šarić,

Matina Baričević (secretary)

Symposium keynote speakers:

Professor Holger Diessel, Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena, Germany

Professor Peter Gardenfors, Lund University, Sweden

Professor Ljiljana Šarić, University of Oslo, Norway

Professor Svetlana Nedelcheva, Konstantin Preslavsky University of Shumen, Bulgaria

Table of content

INVITED PAPERS

1. **Holger Diessel** - Demonstratives: From gesture to grammar
2. **Peter Gärdenfors** - Deixis from Gesture via Demonstratives to Articles. (A Study in Deixis for a Theory of Mind)
3. **Ljiljana Šarić, Svetlana Nedelcheva** - Deictic verbs of motion: A corpus-based study of (South) Slavic

ROUND TABLE

4. **Marija Brala-Vukanović, Mihaela Matešić** – Demonstratives as Deictic Terms and Beyond

SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

5. **Paola Bocale** - Deixis and irrealis in Slavic
6. **Nichuta Bunkham, Karl Seifen, Alice Vittrant** - Encoding Dynamic Deixis: Examples from Southeast Asia
7. **Valentina Colasanti, Martina Wiltschko** - Spatial and discourse deixis and the speech act structure of nominals
8. **Cornelia Ebert, Robin Hörnig, Susanne Fuchs, Aleksandra Ćwiek, Manfred Krifka** - Experimental evidence on the non-at-issueness of co-speech gestures and demonstratives as dimension shifters
9. **Martina Irsara** - English locative here and there as perceived by speakers of other languages
10. **Martin Janečka** - Deictics, pictographs, emblems: how aphasic people compensate verbal deficit with gestures
11. **Agnieszka Jędrusik** - Dynamic Nature of Deixis in Political Discourse: an Analysis of the Political Debates between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump
12. **Ekkehard Koenig** - Beyond exophoric and endophoric uses: Additional discourse functions of demonstratives
13. **Xuping Li, Yiming Sheng** - The D type and the Dem type of definite classifiers in Wu
14. **Anita Memišević** - What happens when a couple meets ménage a trois, and vice versa?
15. **Paweł Rutkowski** - Is space a grammatical feature? The case of Polish Sign Language
16. **Jinke SONG** - The encoding of Dynamic Deixis in Standard Chinese – an investigation of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors
17. **Biljana Stojanovska** - The Definite Article in the Macedonian Language
18. **Enikő Tóth** - Hungarian demonstratives in contrastive contexts
19. **Carla Umbach, Britta Stolterfoht** - Demonstratives of Manner, Quality and Degree – constraints on features of comparison
20. **Clément Voirin, Anetta Kopecka** - Encoding deictic motion: language specific tendencies in translation

STUDENT POSTERS

21. **Pamela Grozdanić** – Person-Centered (Deictic) Expressions and Autism
22. **Ines Takač** - The gestural origin of language. A photo book

ABSTRACTS

Demonstratives: From gesture to grammar

Holger Diessel

Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena

Department of English

Ernst-Abbe-Platz 8

07743 Jena

holger.diessel@uni-jena.de

Abstract. *In their basic use, demonstratives serve to focus the interlocutors' attention on objects and events in the surrounding speech situations, but they are also often used with reference to linguistic elements in the unfolding discourse. When demonstratives are routinely used to organize the information flow in a particular discourse context, they often lose their deictic force and develop into grammatical markers. The best-known examples of grammaticalized demonstratives are definite articles and third person pronouns. In addition, demonstratives provide a very frequent source for grammatical clause linkers such as English so, that, thus, so that and therefore. Drawing on data from a balanced sample of 100 languages, this paper presents a cross-linguistic survey of (grammaticalized) demonstratives that are routinely used to combine clauses or propositions. The study shows that demonstrative clause linkers occur in a large variety of constructions including all major types of subordinate clauses and paratactic sentences. Concentrating on the most frequent types, the paper considers (grammaticalized) demonstratives functioning as (i) relative pronouns, (ii) linking and nominalizing articles, (iii) quotative markers, (iv) complementizers, (v) conjunctive adverbs, (vi) adverbial subordinate conjunctions, (vii) correlatives and (viii) topic markers. It is the purpose of the paper to provide a comprehensive overview of demonstrative clause linkers from a cross-linguistic perspective and to consider the cognitive mechanisms that are involved in the grammaticalization of demonstratives.*

Keywords. Demonstratives, deictic pointing, grammaticalization, clause combining

Deixis from Gesture via Demonstratives to Articles. (A Study in Deixis for a Theory of Mind)

Peter Gärdenfors

Department of Philosophy and Cognitive Science, Lund University

Box 192

S-221 00 Lund

Sweden

`peter.gardenfors@lucs.lu.se`

Abstract. *The central tenet of this paper is that the semantics of deictic expressions can be based on a theory of mind that enables the communicative partners to adopt the perspective of another person. This view is taken to anchor a further hypothesis, that demonstratives stem from the pointing gesture (a precursor of language) while, at the same time, demonstratives represent the possible source of lexically coded joint attention elements that drive the emergence and development of language (e.g. articles).*

Intertwining the theoretical positions with data from the rich system of Croatian demonstratives (Gärdenfors and Brala 2018) – where we find elements coding the domains of location and object, but also path, time, manner, size and other properties, and even discourse properties – I propose a mapping between the different semantic categories of meanings expressed by different demonstratives in the Croatian language on the one hand, and the system of different word types, i.e. grammatical categories in language (thus providing further arguments for some grammaticalization theories), on the other.

*As regards articles, they have historically evolved out of demonstratives. We argue that semantically determiners function as demonstratives ‘pointing’ metaphorically to an epistemic domain created by the knowledge of the interlocutors. This domain emerges from two basic distinctions: (1) Whether the speaker *S* can uniquely identify the referent or not (specificity); and (2) whether the speaker believes that the hearer *H* can uniquely identify the referent in the *S-H* shared universe of discourse (common ground) or not (definiteness). We take definiteness and specificity to be intrinsically linked to the identifiability of the referent in the universe of discourse by the discourse participants. Combining these two dichotomies generates a 2-by-2 grid that represents a minimal structure of the epistemic domain. In English, and many other languages with articles, the definite article ‘the’ only refers to the case (specific, definite), while the indefinite ‘a(n)’ refers to the three other cases. Other languages have other combinations of articles and may rely on further distinctions of the knowledge of the interlocutors. In final analysis the various options offered by various articles systems are reconnected to the initial views proposed on the theory of mind that enables the communicative partners to adopt the perspective of another person.*

Keywords. articles, demonstratives, theory of mind, cognitive semantics

References

- Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gärdenfors, P. (2014). *Geometry of Meaning: Semantic Based on Conceptual Spaces*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gärdenfors, P. and Brala, M. (2018). Semantic domains of demonstratives and articles: A view of deictic referentiality explored on the paradigm of Croatian demonstratives, *Lingua* 201, 102-118.
- Trenkic, D. (2004). Definiteness in Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian and some implications for the general structure of the nominal phrase, *Lingua* 114, 1401-1427.

Deictic verbs of motion: A corpus-based study of (South) Slavic

Ljiljana Šarić¹, Svetlana Nedelcheva²

¹University of Oslo, ILOS

P.O. Box 1003, Blindern

`ljiljana.saric@ilos.uio.no`

²Shumen University, Faculty of Humanities

115 Universitetska str., 9700 Shumen

`s.nedelcheva@shu.bg`

Abstract. We analyze deictic verbs—verbs whose interpretation relies on the spatial and temporal location of the speech act participants (e.g., *come* and *go*, Fillmore 1997); i.e., “deictic verbs of motion” (von Waldenfels 2016)—in the Slavic languages. In research on Slavic, certain prefixes on motion verbs have been discussed as “deictic prefixes” (e.g., Łozińska 2018). The particular emphasis of this analysis is on a few prefixed motion verbs in Croatian, Serbian, and Bulgarian, some of whose uses can be considered deictic.

Whereas the interpretation of non-deictic verbs (e.g., English *enter*) is independent of the location of the speech act participants, deictic verbs either imply the presence of the speaker at the goal of movement (often conveyed by a spatial adverb meaning ‘here’), or they imply the absence of the speaker at the goal of movement (often conveyed by a spatial adverb meaning ‘there’). In languages such as Spanish and Portuguese (see, e.g., Lewandowski 2014) there are verbs that convey strict deictic information concerning the spatial position of the speaker (“motion toward the speaker” vs. “motion away from the speaker”; for instance, the Spanish verbs *venir* ‘come’, *traer* ‘bring’ vs. *ir* ‘go’, *llevar* ‘take’). In some languages, the deictic center of COME can shift to other goals of movement (e.g., the addressee) or even to a goal of movement beyond the speech act participants. In some others, deictic uses are central to some verbs, but these verbs also exhibit non-deictic uses that are also fundamental in their meaning networks. It has been noted that the use of COME and GO is related to other, non-deictic factors in most Slavic languages, such as the perspective speakers choose to adopt (arrival-oriented or source-oriented). An interesting question is Slavic commonalities and differences in this regard. We contribute to this discussion by examining Bulgarian, Croatian, and Serbian. We conduct a corpus-based analysis and provide a contrastive view of the verbs found in a small collection of literary texts translated from Croatian and Serbian into Bulgarian, and from Bulgarian into Croatian. We consider all the examples with the following verbs meaning COME and GO: Bulgarian *dojda* (pf.) – *idvam* (impf.); *otida* (pf.) – *otivam* (impf.); Croatian and Serbian *doći* (pf.) – *dolaziti* (impf.); *otići* (pf.) – *odlaziti* (impf.). We provide a short quantitative overview and conduct a qualitative study of deixis-related meanings, paying necessary attention to other meanings and the constructional interplay of various deictic elements that co-occur with deictic verbs.

Because the material is literary texts and not everyday interaction, we consider the genre and context, and apply the notion of viewpoint, which also covers the mental viewpoint adopted by the narrator, in addition to the “deictic” viewpoint of one of the speech participants.

Keywords. Deictic verbs of motion, corpus-based study, Croatian, Serbian, Bulgarian

References

- Fillmore, Charles J. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Lewandowski, Wojciech. 2014. “Deictic Verbs: Typology, Thinking for Speaking and SLA.” *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 27: 43–65.
- Łozińska, Joanna. 2018. *Path and Manner Saliency in Polish in Contrast with Russian: A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- von Waldenfels, Ruprecht. 2016. “Easy Come, Easy Go: Balkan Slavic Motion Verbs from a Parallel Corpus Perspective.” A paper presented at the International conference on Corpus-based approaches to the Balkan languages and dialects, 5–7 December 2016, Saint Petersburg. Retrieved from: <https://iling.spb.ru/confs/balkan2016/slides/waldenfels.pdf>

Demonstratives as Deictic terms and beyond

¹Marija Brala-Vukanović, ²Mihaela Matešić

University of Rijeka

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

¹Department of English Language and Literature

²Department of Croatian Language and Literature

Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51 000 Rijeka, CROATIA

mbrala@ffri.hr

mmatesic@ffri.hr

Abstract. *Demonstratives are not just inherently linked to the notion of contextuality. They also represent a direct link (if not even a direct mapping?) between perception, conceptualization, language structure and linguistic expression (communicative intentions). Departing from the potentially telling position that demonstratives seem to have on the LANGUAGE - MIND continuum, in this paper we propose a linguistic continuum that might help us gain a further insight into the role and function that determiners might have in the sense of our understanding and describing the evolution and structure of language. The language in case, Croatian, proposes a very good example of the possible organization of the system of demonstratives that, looked at from the point of view of linguistic categories, seems to present a very interesting (rich but not at all 'messy') picture. We observe this picture both from the linguistic and the cognitive point of view. Most specifically, the challenge is that standard categories of deixis (person, place, time, possibly discourse) could (and possibly should) be seen as secondary manifestations of the representation of reality by means of deictic terms. With this in mind, we ask: what is **then** the primary source (domain?) of these manifestations? We might productively rephrase the latter by asking two related questions: a) what is the primary communicative rationale behind the emergence of such real-world manifestations?, and b) how is this rationale mirrored in i.e. by the cognitive / conceptual reality?*

Keywords. Demonstratives, deixis, Croatian, grammaticalization

References

- Diessel, H. (1999). *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gärdenfors, P. and Brala, M. (2018). Semantic domains of demonstratives and articles: A view of deictic referentiality explored on the paradigm of Croatian demonstratives, *Lingua* 201, 102-118.

Deixis and irrealis in Slavic

Paola Bocale

Università degli Studi dell'Insubria

Dipartimento di Scienze Umane e dell'Innovazione per il Territorio

Via S. Abbondio 12 - 22100 COMO, Italy

paola.bocale@uninsubria.it

Abstract. *The frequency with which the distal deictic TAM 'there' is encountered in several modern spoken Slavic languages suggests its potential development as a pragmatic marker. Based on investigation of Bulgarian, Russian, and Polish corpus data, this work reveals that TAM appears in a wide range of linguistic environments, including: modal and negative sentences (BULG kakǎv TAM prestǎpnik, naprotiv 'what TAM criminal, on the opposite'); non-declarative speech acts (POL Co TAM slychać? 'what's up TAM?'); indefinite expressions (POL ja slyszalam w jakimś TAM programie 'I heard in some TAM program'); approximative quantifications (RUS v poslednie TAM 20 let 'In the last TAM 20 years'); listing and disjunctive coordinations (POL powiedzmy tlist raktajm czy TAM czacza 'let's say twist ragtime or TAM chacha').*

What all of these contexts share is that they seem to convey irrealis meanings, as described, among others, by Comrie (1985), Givón (1995), and Plungian (2005). But why does a distal deictic like TAM appear in contexts expressing irrealis? Crosslinguistically, the use of distal deictics to express irrealis values suggests that the development of TAM into an irrealis marker must be guided by some general pragmatic principles, such as the conventionalization of conversational implicatures. The distal spatial meaning of the deictic TAM makes possible the rise of pragmatic inferential meanings in certain environments. The inference of distalness that TAM generates is semanticized as a new coded meaning of the speaker's epistemic uncertainty, which, according to Givón (1995, 121), is the "semantic common denominator to all sub-modes of irrealis." The result of this metonymically-driven process is an epistemic TAM that contributes to signalling the speaker's stance towards a proposition. TAM comes to express not only deictic distance (spatial or temporal) with respect to a proposition, but also «epistemic distance», i.e. «the speakers are released from the responsibility for the truth of the utterance» (Plungian 2010, 47).

In most environments, TAM contributes but is not solely responsible for conveying irrealis modality. However, in some negative assertions and in quantification expressions where the quantity is not determined with certainty the occurrence of TAM is decisive to communicate irrealis. Overall, the fact that in some environments TAM is not contrastive, carries all the marking of negation, and co-occurs with indefinites, vague or cardinal determiners indicates the bleaching of its original demonstrative meaning towards a weaker and more pragmatic meaning. Moreover, the loss, in the same contexts, of referentiality, one of the key features of deictic reference, testifies to the ongoing development of its pragmatic functions.

Keywords. Distal deictics, irrealis, epistemic uncertainty, indefiniteness, vagueness

References

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge: CUP.

Givón, Talmy. 1995. *Functionalism and Grammar*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Plungian, Vladimir. 2005. "Irrealis and Modality in Russian and in Typological Perspective." In *Modality in Slavonic languages: New perspectives*, edited by Björn Hansen and Petr Karlík, 135-147. München: Otto Sagner.

Plungian, Vladimir. 2010. "Types of Verbal Evidentiality Marking: an Overview." In *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*, edited by Gabriele Diewald and Elena Smirnova, 15-58. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

Encoding Dynamic Deixis: Examples from Southeast Asia

Nichuta Bunkham^{1,2}, Karl Seifen³, Alice Vittrant^{1,3}

¹ CNRS, DDL (UMR 5596)

14 avenue Berthelot, 69363 Lyon, France

² Université Lumière Lyon 2

18 quai Claude Bernard, 69365 Lyon, France

³ Aix-Marseille Université, Faculté ALLSH

29 avenue Robert Schuman, 13621 Aix-en-Provence, France

nichuta.bunkham@univ-lyon2.fr

karl.seifen@etu.univ-amu.fr

alice.vittrant@univ-amu.fr

Abstract. Our talk will discuss the encoding of dynamic deixis in Southeast Asian languages, mainly Thai and Burmese. Dynamic deixis refers to the direction of motion in relation to the deictic center (usually the speaker). More precisely it should be understood as the variation in time of the distance to a viewpoint (Fortis & Fagard 2010). This implies a direction along an axis defined by its relation to the deictic center (or viewpoint).

Dynamic deixis may be a constituting element of a motion event. It may be expressed by morphemes encoding centripetal or centrifugal motion (motion respectively towards and away from the deictic center), labelled directional morphemes in some linguistic traditions. Morphemes expressing dynamic deixis often convey other functional meanings (such as tense, aspect, modality, or associated motion). Morphemes encoding dynamic deixis are well represented in Southeast Asian languages. Examples (1) and (2) show grammatical morphemes that encode either dynamic deixis (a) or aspect (b) in Burmese and Thai respectively.

- (1a) kaŋN²ma¹le³ pyŋN³-KhiN² the³=Ka¹ne² pyaŋN² thwɛʔ la²=Te²
woman corn-area interior=ABL back go.out come/CTP=REAL
The young woman came out back from the [interior off] corn field (towards me).
- (1b) ʔɛiN²thaŋN² ca¹=To² wa¹ la²=Te²
marry happen=SUB.TIME fat come/INCHOAT=REAL
She became fat when she got married.
- (2a) kãʔtʰíʔ d̥x:n kʰâw paj naj sǎ:la:
Kati walk enter go/CTP in hut
Kati enters [on foot] the hut (away from me).
- (2b) kʰâw hǎ:j tua paj
3 disappear REFL go/PERFECT
He's disappeared.

Our study aims to examine the morphemes encoding dynamic deixis in two SEA languages. The elicitation material (Trajectory video stimuli) originally designed to analyze the expression of path in dynamic events, shows the great use of deictic grammatical morphemes in several languages when describing motion events (Vittrant 2015), including Burmese. Consequently, we aim to investigate the functions and limits of these morphemes in this language but also in Thai, a neighboring language, although not affiliated, that shows the same tendency.

The examined data consists of elicited data (including Burmese Trajectory corpus) and compared corpora (Thai). Burmese data were mainly collected by showing participant video clips of moving figures, and pictures story (Frog Story). The Thai data are parallel corpora retrieved from literature works, either translated to Thai (Harry Potter) or from Thai (The Happiness of Kati, Far from Home).

This first attempt to investigate dynamic deixis in Thai and Burmese confirm the polyfunctionality of grammatical morphemes in SEA languages: dynamic deixis morphemes in both languages are encoded by lexical verbs that have been grammaticalized with several meanings. Our study also reveals the significance of dynamic deixis even in non-motional event: the morphemes encoding dynamic deixis, appear in fictive motion event, bearing or stressing non-motional values of dynamic deixis.

Keywords. Dynamic Deixis, Thai, Burmese

References

Fortis, Jean-Michel, and Benjamin Fagard. 2010. "Space in Language." Presented at the Leipzig Summer School on Linguistic Typology, University of Leipzig, August 14.

Vittrant, Alice. 2015. "Expressing Motion - The Contribution of Southeast Asian Languages with Reference to East Asian Languages." In *Languages of Mainland Southeast Asia*, edited by N.J. Enfield and Bernard Comrie, 586–632. Mouton de Gruyter.

Spatial and discourse deixis and the speech act structure of nominals

Valentina Colasanti, Martina Wiltschko

University of British Columbia

Department of Linguistics

valentina.colasanti@ubc.ca

martina.wiltschko@ubc.ca

Abstract. *The goal of this talk is to explore two types of deixis: spatial and discourse. While spatial deixis encodes the interlocutors' attention on a spatially located referent, discourse deixis deals with interaction and relationships of interlocutors within the discourse. Spatial and discourse uses of demonstratives have not been treated as related phenomena in the previous literature (Lakoff 1974; Diessel 1999:93; Himmelmann 1996, i.a.). However, for example, in both spatial and discourse uses demonstratives display the same morphological form, the same morphosyntactic distribution (i.e. pre-nominal), and they can both refer to semantic individuals. The main aim of this talk is to explore the formal relation between spatial and discourse deixis considering the dual use of demonstratives. We demonstrate that a nominal speech act structure is crucial for capturing both spatial and discourse deixis. A simple DP cannot accommodate, for example, the presence of the speaker and the addressee's shared knowledge in the common ground and the speaker's knowledge only, or the actual presence of the speaker and addressee's roles, which both ought to be present in the discourse in both spatial and discourse use of demonstratives. Our talk is the first attempt to provide a unified analysis of spatial and discourse deixis in terms of the syntax-pragmatics interface.*

Keywords. demonstratives, deixis, speech acts

References

- Burton, S., Matthewson, L. 2015. 'Targeted constructions storyboards in semantic fieldwork.' In L. Matthewson & MR Bochnak (eds.), *Methodologies in semantic fieldwork*, 135-156. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Diessel, H. 1999. *Demonstratives. Form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1982. "Towards a Descriptive Framework for Spatial Deixis." In Jarvella and Klein (eds.), *Speech, Place, and Action*, 31-59. Chichester: John Wiley,
- Himmelmann, N. 1996. 'Demonstratives in Narrative Discourse: A taxonomy of universal uses.' In *Studies in Anaphora*, B.A. Fox (ed.), 205-254. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, R. 1974. 'Remarks on this and that.' *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10:345-356.
- Ritter, E., Wiltschko, M. 2018. 'Distinguishing speech act roles from grammatical person features.' *Proceeding of Canadian Association of Linguistics Meeting 2018*.
- Speas, E., Tenny, C. 2003. 'Configurational properties of point of view roles.' In Di Sciullo, A.M. (ed.), *Asymmetry in the Grammar*, pp. 315-344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Experimental evidence on the non-at-issueness of co-speech gestures and demonstratives as dimension shifters

Cornelia Ebert¹, Robin Hörnig², Susanne Fuchs³, Aleksandra Ćwiek³, Manfred Krifka³

¹Goethe-Universität Frankfurt ²Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

³Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft Berlin

²Institut für Linguistik ²SFB 833

¹Norbert-Wollheim-Platz 1, 60323 Frankfurt am Main ²Nauklerstraße 35, 72074 Tübingen

³Schützenstraße 18, 10117 Berlin

ebert@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

Abstract. We present experimental evidence for Ebert & Ebert's (E&E's) (2014) analysis of demonstratives and accompanying iconic gestures. E&E argue that, by default, gesture meaning enters into composition as non-at-issue material (Potts 2005), and that demonstratives function as 'dimension shifters' from the non-at-issue to the at-issue dimension.

Two studies tested the impact of speech-accompanying gestures on how well a description matches the scene it describes. Following Potts (2005), we predict that non-at-issue material influences matching judgments less strongly than at-issue material (cf. Syrett & Koev 2015). In both studies, participants saw a picture and a video of a person describing the picture (e.g. 'In this picture, you see a wall with a (round) window.') with or without a speech-accompanying gesture and judged how well the description matched the picture.

Experiment 1 tested E&E's claim that co-speech gestures are non-at-issue with the two factors MODE (ADJECTIVE vs. GESTURE) and MATCH (MATCH vs. MISMATCH). As for MODE, the critical property of the object in the picture (here: roundness) was conveyed via speech (ADJECTIVE 'round') or by way of an iconic co-speech GESTURE ([a window]+ROUND-GESTURE). The property agreed (MATCH) or disagreed (MISMATCH) with the picture. The ANOVA revealed that MODE and MATCH interacted significantly: Whereas both matching conditions were attested a similarly good match, the mismatching adjective was judged a more severe mismatch than the mismatching gesture in line with the predicted less strong effect of false non-at-issue material (GESTURE) compared to false at-issue material (ADJECTIVE).

Experiment 2 tested whether the German demonstrative 'so' (such) acts as dimension shifter. A third level was added to the MODE factor: a co-speech gesture with a concurrently uttered stressed 'SO' (such). The main prediction was that the demonstrative 'so' (such), as a dimension-shifter, strengthens the effect of the mismatching gesture such that SO+GESTURE interacts with MATCH when compared to GESTURE due to a stronger mismatch effect. MODE and MATCH interacted significantly. Two contrasts were specified for the 3-level factor MODE to the effect that SO+GESTURE was compared to GESTURE and to ADJECTIVE. Both comparisons confirmed a significant interaction: the gesture effect shifted by the demonstrative 'so' (such) was stronger than the one of the gesture alone (non-at-issue), yet it was less strong than that of the adjective (at-issue). This confirms the predicted shift although the shifted gesture exerted a less strong effect than at-issue speech material. That the effect with 'so' is less strong is somewhat surprising under the assumption that 'so' is a dimension shifter and under the standard view that the at-issue/non-at-issue distinction is a binary one. In Ebert (2017), however, we propose to conceptualize at-issueness as a gradient category. We will discuss our results in light of this view of gradient at-issueness.

Keywords. Demonstratives, gestures, at-issueness

References

Ebert, Christian & Cornelia Ebert (2014): Gestures, demonstratives, and the attributive/referential distinction, *Semantics and Philosophy in Europe* 7, ZAS, Berlin, June 2014. <http://www.cow-electric.com/neli/talks/CECE-SPE2014.pdf>

Ebert, Cornelia: Handling information from different dimensions (with special attention on gesture vs. speech), Institut für Linguistik, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, October 2017. <http://www.cow-electric.com/neli/talks/CE-Frankfurt-2017.pdf>

Syrett, K. & T. Koev (2015): Experimental Evidence for the Truth Conditional Contribution and Shifting Information Status of Appositives. *Journal of Semantics* 32, 3: 525–577,

Potts, Ch. (2005): *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford University Press.

English locative *here* and *there* as perceived by speakers of other languages

Martina Irsara

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano

Faculty of Education

Regensburger Allee 16 – Viale Ratisbona 16, I-39042 Brixen-Bressanone (BZ)

`martina.irsara@unibz.it`

Abstract. *A subject can conceive and portray one particular situation in various ways. Speakers can take different perspectives and choose alternative expressions to talk about their mentally constructed views of the situation. Perspective subsumes the vantage point or location from which the situation is conceptualised, a factor whose import is apparent from deictics such as here and there (Langacker, 2017). The spatial adverbs here and there express a positive and negative relation to the deictic centre. However, their use does not presuppose absolute measures of distance, so that it involves a degree of interpretation.*

Spatial adverbs can elicit more associations in some than in other languages. Ladin spatial adverbs display little-known deictic distinctions and seem to demand a further exercise of conceptualisation as compared to English (Irsara, 2015). The translation of English here and there into Ladin requires semantic and pragmatic interpretation, intuition, and introspection. Despite extensive research on deixis in different languages, cognitive-pragmatic analyses of deictic phenomena in Ladin as compared to English are lacking.

This paper uses a combination of approaches. It analyses the English deictic adverbial system from a comparative and cognitive-pragmatic point of view, being concerned with meaning-in-context and cognitive aspects (Schmid, 2012). The paper takes a micro-perspective to consider how English deictic here and there are interpreted by Ladin speakers and makes an original descriptive contribution by discussing a number of examples in detail.

The research started with a qualitative analysis of the pragmatic uses of deictic adverbs in a narrative prose text. Passages containing proximal and distal adverbs were subsequently extracted from conversational interactions in the text and translated by speakers of Ladin. The translators needed to take account of the viewpoint of a conceptualiser in the English source text and to consider the deictic forms available in the Ladin target language. The research revealed how different translators portrayed a number of situations in different ways.

Conceptualisation seems to play a pivotal role in the deictic use of language. This analysis further revealed the complexity of the decision-making process in the translation of deictic utterances. While speakers might be unaware of deictic patterns in their first languages, an act of translation often requires conscious and analytical processing. A reflective translation process might therefore reveal previously unnoticed deictic nuances in the first as well as in additionally learnt languages.

Keywords. Deixis, spatial adverbs, English, Ladin, learner language, translation, language awareness

References

- Irsara, M. (2015). Ladin. In K. Jungbluth & F. Da Milano (Eds.), *Manual of deixis in Romance languages* (pp. 140-166). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Langacker, R. W. (2017). *Ten lectures on the elaboration of cognitive grammar*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Schmid, H.-J. (2012). Generalizing the apparently ungeneralizable: Basic ingredients of a cognitive-pragmatic approach to the construal of meaning-in-context. In H.-J. Schmid (Ed.), *Cognitive pragmatics* (pp. 3-22). Berlin / Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Deictics, pictographs, emblems: how aphasic people compensate verbal deficit with gestures

Martin Janečka

Faculty of Arts, University of South Bohemia

Department of Bohemistics

Branišovská 31a, 370 05, České Budějovice, Czech Republic

mjanecka@ff.jcu.cz

Abstract. *In my research I create an audiovisual corpus of aphasic patients and verification persons with the help of ELAN software. 5 patients with diagnosed aphasia and 10 verification persons (or persons with no evident speech deficiency) participate in this project.*

From methodological point of view, I point out a necessity to include description of nonverbal elements into grammar description and, at the same time, to describe damaged data on aphasic patients as well. I also introduce some possible perspectives of exploring categories and extent of speech damage by aphasic patients and different ways, how they substitute verbal deficiency with the help of gestures. I also dedicate an interest to the fact, that gestures can grammaticalize in positions of e.g. nominal groups.

As a basic typology of gestures I take over the classification by Hogrefe (2009): in the group of so called pictographs (semantic gestures) belong iconographs (to draw an object in the air) and kinetographs (to represent a way or a speed of a movement). Other independent group of gestures are so-called emblems, which means gestures conditioned by culture and concrete language.

I dedicate special attention to deictic gestures and I further differentiate concrete deictic gestures, which can be used to point out a concrete object in space, or abstract deixis in the situation, when we point out empty space in front of our body while we describe an imaginary situation.

I verify two fundamental hypotheses established by Jakob et al. (2011):

Hypothesis no. 1) Patients with aphasia produce more gestures than so called verification persons during interpretation of texts. I will extract some data by the experiments, and those data will show if A) group of patients shows higher rate of words matched to a gesture than the verification group and if B) aphasic patients use more complex gestures than the verification group.

Hypothesis no. 2) The more speech restricted an aphasic patient is, the more gestures he/she produces during the interpretation of a text. Data will show, whether the patients producing long or complex phrases use less gestures than the patients producing short and less complex phrases; therefore, I will explore the relationship between the rate of words matched to a gesture and the complexity of phrase. The next issue is whether aphasic patients with lower lexical diversity use more gestures than patients with higher lexical diversity, which means that the relationship between the rate of words matched to a gesture and the length of a phrase will be explored.

My data show that both hypotheses and their subhypotheses proven on German speakers by Jakob (2011) were also successfully verified on Czech speakers.

Keywords. deictic gestures, aphasia, multimodality, pictographs, emblems, iconographs, kinetographs, lexical diversity

References

- CICONE, M. The relation between gesture and language in aphasic communication. *Brain and Language*, 1979, 8, pp. 324–349.
- FRICKE, H.: *Grammatik multimodal: Wie Wörter und Gesten zusammenwirken*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012.
- HOGREFE, K. *Aphasie, Apraxie und Gestik: Zur Produktion von Handgesten bei Patienten mit linkhemisphärischer Hirnschädigung*. Dissertation, Universität Potsdam, 2009.
- JAKOB, H. et al. Zusammenhang von Spontansprachproduktion und Gesten bei Patienten mit Aphasie. *Aphasie und verwandte Gebiete*, 3, 2011, pp. 20–38.

Dynamic Nature of Deixis in Political Discourse: an Analysis of the Political Debates between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump.

Agnieszka Jędrusik

University of Silesia

Institute of English

ul. Bankowa 12, 40-007 Katowice

agni.jedrusik@gmail.com

Abstract. *The purpose of this work is to put forward a hypothesis that personal deixis is characterised by dynamic nature. By dynamic nature we shall understand the tendency to accommodate the choice of the deictic device to the other speakers' usage of them. Although a number of researchers have contributed their work to studying deixis, one of the distinguished linguists studying the subject, Stephen Levinson recognizes that it is a neglected area of study although deixis is crucial to our understanding of the language and language learning and according to Giles may change the nature of social relationships of the interlocutors. In this study, the author uses the political debates between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton to present influences on the use of personal pronouns drawing on the Communication Accommodation Theory. The results suggest that although it is a seemingly content dependent part of sentence, a pronoun is prone to influences of the context. It proves to be an important matter for every day life encounters and manipulation as well as mass media presentation. The connections between the results of the study and the latter are then presented in a humble attempt to establish a template for further study.*

Keywords. Personal deixis, Communication Accommodation Theory, political discourse, convergence, divergence

References

- Giles, H., N. Coupland and J. Coupland. 1991. Accommodation theory: communication, context, and consequences. In H. Giles (ed.) Contexts of accommodation: developments in applied sociolinguistics. 1- 68, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Levinson, Stephen C. 2006. Deixis. In Laurence R. Horn, Gregory L. Ward (eds.) The Handbook of Pragmatics. 97–120. Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing

Beyond exophoric and endophoric uses: Additional discourse functions of demonstratives

Ekkehard Koenig

FU Berlin & University of Freiburg
Philosophie und Geisteswissenschaften
Am Muehlebusch 10B, 79249 Merzhausen
koenig@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Abstract. *It is generally acknowledged that in addition to their exophoric (deictic, gestural) use, demonstratives typically also have endophoric, i.e. anaphoric and cataphoric, uses, which can be regarded as a first step in their further grammaticalization. Based on typological surveys (Diessel, 1999; Dixon, 2003) and a variety of previous studies (Koenig, 2015; Koenig, 2017; Koenig & Nishina, 2015), the present paper aims to identify and analyze additional discourse functions of demonstratives, so far neglected in cross-linguistic studies, primarily on the basis of data from European languages. Three major types of discourse uses will be distinguished, which cannot simply be subsumed under the exophoric or endophoric use types: (a) coordination of contrasting terms (b) idiomatic combinations and (c) reference via different points of orientation.*

(a) In **coordinate conjunctions of contrasting members** of a demonstrative paradigm, the relevant expressions lose their deictic components, while keeping their content component. The relevant sentences simply express that a situation applies to a whole spectrum of different reference points or values, thus expressing both quantification and vagueness:

- (1)a. Engl. *here and there, now and then, this and that, hither and thither, so so*;
- (2)a. You still find such attitudes here and there.
- b. The children were running hither and thither.

(b) **Idiomatic combinations of demonstratives** (*now then, so there, here goes, that's that, here we go again, there he was, there and then, here is to you, this and that, so what, etc.*) could at first sight be analyzed as expressing specific illocutions. Such an analysis would not do justice to deictic origin, however. A trace of their endophoric use is still visible in their functions of introducing (cataphoric) or closing an interaction (anaphoric) and thus of structuring a discourse. Since closing one argument or one joint project can always be the beginning of a new one, these uses may combine retrospective and prospective functions:

- (3)a. Now then (prospective: attention getter or topic change)
- b. So there (retrospective: closing an argument by maintaining a decision or view)
- c. Here goes. (prospective: introduction to doing something risky)
- d. And that's that. (retrospective: closing an argument.)

(c) The characteristic feature of our third type of non-canonical uses of demonstratives is a **transfer of the point of orientation** ("origo") from the coordinates of the utterance or a point in the development of a text to some point provided by norms, expectations, situations, etc. in the external context. The English demonstrative of degree *so* provides particularly good illustration of this shift:

- (4)a. Her hair always has to be just so.
- d. You can only eat so much.

It will be shown that traces of exophoric, anaphoric and cataphoric 'meanings' are still visible in these uses.

Keywords. demonstratives, discourse functions, grammaticalization, coordination, idiomatic combinations

References

- Diessel, Holger (1999). *Demonstratives. Form, Functions and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger (2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.4: 463-489.
- Koenig, Ekkehard (2015). Manner deixis as a source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.) *Perspectives on Historical Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Koenig, Ekkehard (2017). The deictic identification of similarity. In Treis, Yvonne & Martine Vanhoeve (eds.) *Similitive and Equative Constructions*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

The D type and the Dem type of definite classifiers in Wu

Xuping Li, Yiming Sheng²

Zhejiang University 1, Fudan University²

Email: xupingli@zju.edu.cn

Abstract. Classifier languages like Mandarin are articleless languages, and demonstratives are often employed to encode definiteness. Nevertheless, it's reported that classifiers can also be employed to express definiteness in southern Chinese languages like Cantonese (Cheng & Sybesma 1999) and Wu Chinese (Li & Bisang 2012). This study makes a case study of definite classifiers in Shaoxing Wu. We argue that it is empirically inadequate to assume that definite articles are uniformly projected as a determiner head. We, following Sheng et al (2016), suggest that it is necessary to make a distinction between the definite article type and the demonstrative type of definite classifiers, i.e. the D type versus the Dem type. We propose that the two types of definite classifiers are realized by different syntactic mechanisms, either being base-generated as part of DemP or via Cl^0 -to- D^0 raising.

In Shaoxing Wu, “Classifier+Noun” can have a definite interpretation, where the classifier is either marked with a mid-level tone 33 or a high-level tone 55, as shown in (1). Sheng et al (2016) showed that these two differently tonal-marked Cl-N phrases are distinguished from each other w.r.t. the contexts in which they are allowed (cf. Himmelmann 1996, Diessel 1999).

- (1) a. tsaŋ^{33} tsɔ^{5-33} zɔŋ^{131-55} $\text{p}^{h\text{a}55-55}$ ɦuẽ^{231-55} tse^{-31} , \#haŋ^{55-55} tsaŋ^{-55} $\text{fe}^{?5-33}$ $\text{p}^{h\text{a}55-55}$
 CL table broken broken PFV that CL Neg broken
 ‘CL_{THE} table is broken, #that one is not.’
 b. tsaŋ^{-55} $\text{tsɔ}^{?5-33}$ zɔŋ^{131-53} $\text{p}^{h\text{a}55-55}$ ɦuẽ^{231-5} tse^{-31} , haŋ^{55-55} tsaŋ^{-55} $\text{fe}^{?5-33}$ $\text{p}^{h\text{a}55-55}$
 CL table broken broken PFV that CL Neg broken
 ‘CL_{THIS} table is broken, and that one is not.’

	Situational use [±Contrastive]	Anaphoric use		Bridging use	Recognitional use	Larger situational use
		NP as antecedent	Clause as antecedent			
Cl^{33} -N	[-Contrastive]	+	—	+	+	+
Cl^{55} -N	[+Contrastive]	—	+	—	—	—

Table-1: Usages of the D type and the Dem type of classifiers

Sheng et al (2016) suggest that classifiers with the tone value 33 are the D type of definite classifiers, and those with 55 are the Dem type. However, Shaoxing Wu also has demonstratives, and they can co-occur with the Dem type of classifiers. Some of the questions arising are: How definiteness is encoded in demonstrative phrases in Shaoxing Wu? Is it expressed by demonstratives or definite classifiers?

Observation (1): demonstratives cannot directly modify nouns, unless they are mediated by Cl^{55} , but not by Cl^{33} .

- (2) a. *Dem-N b. Dem- Cl^{55} -N c. *Dem- Cl^{33} -N

Observation (2): Classifier doubling is possible in singular DemPs, where Cl^{55} is required obligatorily by the demonstrative. The use of Cl^{33} before the noun has to satisfy S-selection requirement between them.

- (3) a. Dem- Cl^{55} - Cl^{33} -N b. *Dem- Cl^{33} - Cl^{55} -N

Observation (3): plural numeral phrases cannot be directly preceded by Dem but by Dem- Cl^{55} .

- (4) a. *Dem-Num-Cl-N b. Dem- Cl^{55} -Num-Cl-N

Observation (4): demonstratives can be omitted in the cases of classifier doubling.

- (5) a. Cl^{55} - Cl^{33} -N b. Cl^{55} -Num-Cl-N

Relying on these observations, we claim that (i) the apparent demonstratives in Shaoxing Wu are locatives, analogous to **here** and **there** in English. In order to refer to individuals, classifiers are needed obligatorily, which follow demonstratives to form expressions like Dem-Cl; (ii) the two types of definite classifiers undertake different roles in expressing definiteness, whose syntactic differences can be recast as the distinction between DemP and DefP in generative syntax. Cl^{55} , along with locative demonstratives, form a complex demonstrative expression, whereas Cl^{33} is a canonical classifier performs the canonical “individuation” function. Its definiteness marking function is realized via Cl^0 -to- D^0 raising (Li an Bisang 2012).

The co-existence of demonstratives and two types of definite classifiers are in support of a two-layer DP analysis in the sense of Bruge (1996) and Giusti (1997, 2002). The significance of this study lies in (i) classifier languages may be in lack of definite articles, but they may still feature a well-articulated DP structure; (ii) the two types of definite classifiers are realized by different syntactic mechanisms.

Keywords. Definite classifier, demonstrative, DP

What happens when a couple meets ménage a trois, and vice versa?

Anita Memišević

University of Rijeka

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Sveučilišna avenija 4

51000 Rijeka

Croatia

amemisevic@ffri.hr

Abstract. *Demonstratives possess some qualities which set them apart from other function words with which they are usually grouped. Diesel (2006: 464) claims that “demonstratives constitute a unique class of linguistic expressions serving one of the most fundamental functions in language: In their basic use, they serve to coordinate the interlocutors’ joint focus of attention”. Demonstratives have a special status among words – they are present in every language, they are among the oldest words and they are among the first words that children learn. However, the fact that demonstratives are present in all languages does not mean that the system of demonstratives is organized identically in all languages. Languages tend to ‘view’ the world around us differently and require us to pay attention to different aspects of reality (cf. Slobin’s Thinking-for-speaking hypothesis), which in turn means that the systems of demonstratives present in various languages differ in several many aspects, including the number of the members that a particular system of demonstratives has.*

When two languages the demonstrative systems of which differ in the number of their members meet, some difficulties are bound to arise. One such pair of languages includes Croatian which has a three-way paradigm consisting of a proximal (ovaj), medial (taj) and distal (onaj) elements, and English which has a two-way paradigm consisting of a proximal (this) and distal (that) element. Teaching practice with Croatian students of English has shown that Croatian students frequently have problems with English demonstratives. Sometimes students make mistakes even in the case of the proximal and distal demonstratives, but it is the medial one which presents a true challenge. This should come as no surprise, since the medial element has no counterpart in English. Instead, depending on the context it is either translated as ‘this’ or as ‘that’. In addition to this, there is another aspect to this story that further confounds it – the fact that the medial element is gradually pushing out both the proximal and the distal elements and is increasingly being used in both the proximal and distal senses (Brala-Vukanović & Matešić, 2015). The goal of this paper is to try to determine, on the basis of student translations from Croatian into English and from English into Croatian, which factors might contribute to the error rate when it comes to the medial element – e.g. is the error rate greater when the medial element appears on its own, or when it is accompanied by a noun?; is the error rate greater when the medial element is used to refer to a visible entity or an invisible one?; does the way in which the medial element is used (recognitional use, unstressed this, discourse deictic demonstratives) affect the error-rate? ; etc.

Keywords. Croatian, English, demonstratives

References

- Brala-Vukanović, Marija, Matešić, Mihaela. 2015. Croatian ‘pointing words’: Where body, cognition, language, context and culture meet. In: Belaj, B. (ed.), *Dimenzije značenja*. Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet u Zagrebu/ Zagrebačka slavistička škola. 31-61.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. ‘Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar’. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17, 463–489.
- Slobin, Dan. 1996. ‘From “thought and language” to “thinking for speaking”’. In: J. Gumperz & S. Levinson (eds.), *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 70-96.

Is space a grammatical feature? The case of Polish Sign Language

Paweł Rutkowski

University of Warsaw

Section for Sign Linguistics, Faculty of Polish Studies

Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28, 00-927 Warsaw, Poland

p.rutkowski@uw.edu.pl

Abstract. Polish Sign Language (*polski język migowy*, hereinafter *PJM*) is an understudied natural sign language used by the Deaf community in Poland. This paper discusses the role of space in the pronominal system of that language. I address this issue by examining the grammatical properties of *PJM* deictic signs. My research is based on video material selected from an extensive corpus of *PJM* (cf. Rutkowski et al., 2017), which includes numerous examples of how pointing signs are used in various contexts. One of the most important questions to be addressed in the present paper is as follows: should the pointing sign be treated as a grammaticalized linguistic element, akin to spoken-language pronouns, or should it rather be considered mere gesturing?

There are several signs that could be interpreted as personal pronouns in *PJM*: “I” (an index handshape directed towards the speaker), “you” (an index handshape directed towards the person spoken to), “he/she/it” (an index handshape directed towards one of a potentially infinite number of points in the signing space, previously associated with the referent in question). However, the fact that all these signs are based on the same handshape makes me assume that they are contextual forms of the same demonstrative. By proposing this analysis, I attempt to take a position in one of the most important debates in contemporary sign linguistics. According to many researchers, sign languages have personal pronouns inflected for person and number. Meier (1990) argues that sign languages have a two-person pronominal system – first and non-first: first person has a default location (center of the chest), whereas for second/third person there is no single default location. Liddell (2003), on the other hand, assumes that the use of space for pointing is purely gestural (gradient) rather than linguistic, which in turn means that all pronouns are simply deictic points (pronouns “point to” their referents in the same way as hearing people point to locations while gesturing). I follow Liddell (2003) in assuming that there are no reasons to distinguish first and non-first person; I show that even “first-person” pronouns may be subject to displacement, e.g. when telling a story about oneself; however, this does not mean that pointing is nonlinguistic. The pointing sign is a pronominal element but, unlike its counterparts in spoken languages, it is not associated with person features. The only formal feature associated with the pointing sign is that of referentiality (therefore, it resembles definite articles in spoken languages). An important consequence of this approach is that, according to my analysis, there is no separate class of personal pronouns in *PJM*. I follow Diessel’s (2006) observation that, crosslinguistically, personal pronouns are derived from demonstratives, meaning that the latter are more basic and belong to the universal set of core vocabulary. The indexical sign in *PJM* enters into a two-directional matching relation with the context (the signing space), thus being provided with a semantic value. Therefore, the signing space becomes a kind of grammatical feature, unparalleled in spoken languages.

Keywords. Polish Sign Language, pointing, pronoun, space

References

- Diessel, H. (2006), “Demonstratives,” in: K. Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 430-435.
- Liddell, S. K. (2003), *Grammar, gesture, and meaning in American Sign Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meier, R. P. (1990), “Person deixis in ASL,” in: S. D. Fischer and P. Siple (eds.), *Theoretical issues in sign language Research*, vol. 1: Linguistics, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 175-190.
- Rutkowski, P., A. Kuder, J. Filipczak, P. Mostowski, J. Łacheta, S. Łozińska (2017), “The design and compilation of the Polish Sign Language (*PJM*) Corpus,” in: P. Rutkowski (ed.), *Different Faces of Sign Language Research*, Warsaw: University of Warsaw, Faculty of Polish Studies, 125-151.

The encoding of Dynamic Deixis in Standard Chinese – an investigation of linguistic and extra-linguistic factors

Jinke SONG

University Lumière Lyon 2 & Laboratory Dynamique du Langage
DDL – MSH-LSE, 14 avenue Berthelot 69363 LYON CEDEX 07 FRANCE
jinke.song@univ-lyon2.fr

Abstract *The deictic motion morphemes such as come and go in English play an important role in the linguistic encoding of Dynamic Deixis in languages that are ‘deictically-oriented’ (e.g. Fillmore 1975; Fortis & Fagard 2010; Ricca 1993, Vittrant et al. 2017). Previous studies on Standard Chinese have examined the usage and distribution of deictic verbs lái/qù and deictic particles lái/qu in different types of constructions (Chao 1968, Lù 1985, 1989/1993, Lamarre 2008). However, there are relatively few studies that investigate the factors that trigger the use of Dynamic Deixis in the expression of motion event in this language. By exploring the proportion of the encoding of Dynamic Deixis, the present paper aims to examine (1) the contexts that prompt the use of Dynamic Deixis and those in which it is left unexpressed; and (2) the linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that condition the overt expression of Dynamic Deixis.*

To conduct this study, the paper is based on the corpus composed of translational (both spontaneous and caused) motion (1) elicited with two visual stimuli, namely “Trajectoire” (2004) (714 clauses) which show people moving in different direction with respect to different reference points (e.g., walk out of the woods) and “Put & Take” (2006) (800 clauses) that show people putting things in places and removing them from places (e.g., put a candle into the candle stand), and (2) extracted from two TV series, respectively, “Married for ten years” (2002) (1025 clauses), and “Loquacious Zhang Damin’s Happy Life” (1998) (967 clauses).

First, the analysis reveals that in the TV series-based data, the encoding of Dynamic Deixis is more pervasive than expressions without Dynamic Deixis. By contrast, the result uncovers the opposite trend in the stimuli-based data where non-Dynamic Deixis expressions are much more frequent. Second, the analysis shows an asymmetrical distribution of different morphosyntactic devices which encode the Dynamic Deixis orientation (centripetal vs. centrifugal). A hypothesis that I put forward according to the preliminary findings is that there is a correlation between the use of the deictic motion morphemes and several factors which trigger their use. There are (1) linguistic factors such as discourse types (description vs. dialogue), speech acts (imperative sentence vs. non-imperative sentences), word order of Dynamic Deixis with respect to the other elements (preceding vs. following the Figure), the relationship of Dynamic Deixis to the other deictic expressions, such as personal deixis, and (2) extra-linguistic factors such as the event types (spontaneous vs. caused), the distance travelled between camera and the Figure (i.e. the moving entity), the animacy of the Figure, the nature of the Ground (i.e. the reference point) (with or without boundary-crossing). In this presentation I will discuss the interplay of these various factors in order to provide a better understanding of the use and the encoding of Dynamic Deixis in Standard Chinese.

Keywords. Dynamic Deixis, Standard Chinese, descriptive data, dialogical data

References

- Fillmore, Charles J. 1975. Santa Cruz lectures on deixis. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Fortis, Jean-Michel & Fagard, Benjamin. 2010. Space and language, Leipzig summer school in typology. September 16-27, 2010.
- Lamarre Christine. 2008. The Linguistic Categorization of Deictic Direction in Chinese: With Reference to Japanese. In *Space in Languages of China: Crosslinguistic, synchronic and diachronic perspectives*, Dan Xu (ed.), 69-97. Cham/Heidelberg: Springer.
- Vittrant, Alice, Lamarre, Christine, Voisin, Sylvie, Bon, Noëllie, Fagard, Benjamin, Grinevald, Colette, Moysé-Faurie Claire, Risler, Anna, Song, Jin-Ke, Tan, Adline & Voirin, Clément. 2017. Deictic directionals revisited in the light of advances in typology, Paper presented at Neglected Aspects of Motion-Event Description. ENS, Paris. May 19- 20, 2017.

The Definite Article in the Macedonian Language

Biljana Stojanovska

Department of Croatian language and Literature
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences – Rijeka
biljana.stojanovska@uniri.com

Abstract. *The paper presents an overview of the definite article in Macedonian. The definite article in Macedonian - as in other languages - has evolved from the demonstrative. In the talk we overview and analyse the system of Macedonian demonstratives as well as that of the definite article, as the two are closely related not just etymologically, but in usage patterns as well. More specifically, an analysis of the interaction between the system of definite articles and demonstratives in Macedonian is proposed; Macedonian makes a three-way opposition in the definite article, corresponding to the three-partite (proximal medial distal) opposition of demonstratives. An outline of the most prominent papers and authors who have researched this linguistic phenomenon in Macedonian - as a part of Slavic language family where definite article is not the norm (except for Bulgarian) – is followed by a systematic description of the distribution of the tripartite definite article in Macedonian.*

Apart from the theoretical basis, the paper includes an analysis which should lead to answer concerning frequency of each element in the tripartite system of the definite article. The analysis is aimed at showing which deictic word – definite article or demonstrative – will be used in a different communicative situation or context. The focus is put on language data with the general definite article (-t). The corpus contains examples from spontaneous speech (phone conversations, interviews, etc.) which are analysed in detail. Beside spoken usage corpus, we also look at language data from journalistic, literary and scientific texts. The double definite noun phrases as a feature of spoken language are also presented, looking at their usage patterns and the distribution of the demonstrative and the definite article. An important question connected with these double definite phrases is: in which situations is it not possible to use double definite noun phrases and why.

The paper is envisaged as a good basis for other researches as well as a good starting point for comparisons between Macedonian as a language with definite article and other languages (with or without definite article as an indicator of the category of definiteness).

Keywords. Macedonian, definiteness, definite article, demonstratives

References

- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. Definiteness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Минова-Ѓуркова, Лилјана. 2011: Синтакса на современиот македонски јазик. Штип: 2-ри август С.
- Тополињска, Зузана. 1974: Граматика на именската фраза во македонскиот литературен јазик – род, број, посоченост. Скопје: Македонска академија на науките и уметностите.

Hungarian demonstratives in contrastive contexts

Enikő Tóth

University of Debrecen

Institute of English and American Studies

4032 Debrecen Egyetem tér 1.

toth.eniko@arts.unideb.hu

Abstract. Hungarian descriptive grammars traditionally distinguish two demonstratives: proximal *ez* “this” and distal *az* “that”. However, there are two other, less frequently used demonstratives, proximal *emez* and distal *amaz*, which are either assumed to make a finer distinction within near and far, or to have a reinforcing role (Laczkó 2012). The aim of this paper is to explore a novel, previously neglected contrastive use of *emez/amaz*, relying on corpus based findings and experimental data. Crosslinguistically, exophoric contrastive uses of demonstratives have been studied for example by Meiro and Terrill 2005. The aim of this study is to examine how distance influences the use of the aforementioned four demonstratives in contrastive contexts, where two objects, which are equidistant from the speaker, are being referred to by two different demonstratives. Preliminary corpus queries in the Hungarian National Corpus indicate that - in line with crosslinguistic data - the demonstratives can occur in a combination of patterns in contrastive contexts: *ez-emez*, *ez-amaz*, *az-emez* and *az-amaz* (cf. Wilkins 1999, Maes and de Rooij 2007). In a pilot online questionnaire, a rating task with a 5 point Likert scale was used to see whether a given pattern is more acceptable in different scenarios regarding distance. 26 participants saw a photo depicting the position of two speakers with respect to two objects, both located either close or far from the speaker (position of objects was counterbalanced with respect to the across/away axis (cf. Wilkins 1999). Their task was to rate contrastive utterances containing two demonstratives, such as: *Az a sál jobban áll neked, mint emez*. “That scarf suits you better than this one.” Two factors were examined in a 2x4 design: DISTANCE: peripersonal vs. extrapersonal (Kemmerer 1999), and TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: *ez-emez*, *ez-amaz*, *az-emez* and *az-amaz*. A repeated measures ANOVA was carried out in order to analyse the results. There was a main effect of TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION: $F(1, 23) = 9.26$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = 0.55$, but there was no effect of distance: $F(1, 25) = 0.23$, ns. There was also a significant interaction between the two variables: $F(1, 23) = 3.15$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.29$. Overall, *ez-amaz* structures were preferred in both near and far scenarios, while *az-emez* constructions received higher ratings in the peripersonal condition. This means that in contrastive contexts the more appropriate structure is not selected only due to relative distance from the speaker; there must be another factor interacting with distance in contrastive contexts.

Keywords. Hungarian demonstratives, contrastive context

References

- Kemmerer, David. 1999. “‘Near’ and ‘far’ in Language and Perception.” *Cognition* 73: 35–63.
- Maes, Alfons, and Christ de Rooij. 2007. “(How) Do demonstratives code distance?” In António Branco, Tony McEnery, Ruslan Mitkov and Fátima Silva (eds.) *Proceedings of DAARC 2007*, 83–89. Lagos Portugal: Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Porto.
- P Meira, Sergio and Angela Terril. 2005. Contrasting contrastive demonstratives in Tiriyo’ and Lavukaleve. *Linguistics* 43–6, 1131–1152.
- Wilkins, D. 1999. Eliciting contrastive use of demonstratives for objects within close personal space (all objects well within arm’s reach). In D. Wilkins (ed.), *Manual for the 1999 Field Season*, 25–28. Nijmegen: Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

Demonstratives of Manner, Quality and Degree – constraints on features of comparison

Carla Umbach, Britta Stolterfoht

ZAS Berlin / University of Cologne, University of Tübingen

umbach@leibniz-zas.de, britta.stolterfoht@uni-tuebingen.de

Abstract. German "so" ('such'/'like this') is, in the first place, a demonstrative expression that can be used deictically and anaphorically. It combines with nominal, verbal and adjectival expressions and serves as a modifier of quality, manner, or degree. In (1), "so" combines with the noun "Auto" ('car') characterizing Anna's car as being similar in certain respects to the one the speaker points at.

- (1) (speaker points at a car):
Anna hat auch so ein Auto. 'Anna has a car like this, too.'

Demonstratives expressing manner, quality or degree occur across languages (König & Umbach 2018, for Croatian see Gärdenfors & Brala-Vukanovic 2018). They pose the problem of how to reconcile their demonstrative characteristics with their modifying capacity. Umbach & Gust (2014) suggest that they express similarity to, not identity with, the target of the demonstration gesture. Similarity is spelled out in multi-dimensional attribute spaces.

The notion of similarity would be trivial without specifying the relevant features of comparison. There seem to be constraints on features in combination with particular predicates. In the example in (2) the demonstrative "so" is supposed to pick up a property mentioned earlier. Being Japanese is easily picked up, leading to the interpretation that Berta has a Japanese car. In contrast, being new does not qualify as a feature of comparison – the second sentence cannot be understood such that Berta has a new car. Similarly, in (3) preparing a chicken in the wok qualifies as features of comparison whereas preparing it in the garden does not.

- (2) Anna hat ein japanisches Auto / ein neues Auto. Berta hat auch so ein Auto
(nämlich ein japanisches Auto / *nämlich ein neues Auto).
'Anna has a Japanese car / a new car. Berta has such a car, too (namely a Japanese car / a new car).'
- (3) Anna hat das Huhn im Wok zubereitet / im Garten zubereitet. Berta hat die Ente auch so zubereitet
(nämlich im Wok / *nämlich im Garten).
'Anna prepared the chicken in the wok / in the garden. Berta prepared the duck like this, too (namely in the wok / in the garden).'

In this talk, a recent experimental study will be presented investigating restrictions on features of comparison. Acceptability ratings were collected for nominal and verbal stimuli analogous to the examples in (2)/(3). The results refer to restrictions on kind formation, in particular to the notion of principled connections between kinds and properties (Prasada & Dillingham 2006), and to the distinction between external and internal manner modification (Maienenborn & Schäfer 2011).

Bringing these insights together it seems reasonable to assume that features that can be picked up by German "so" correspond to properties relevant in establishing kinds – be it kinds of individuals or kinds of events. Questions to be discussed are whether analogous restrictions are found for demonstratives expressing manner, quality and degree in other languages and how they relate to Lewis' idea of natural properties and Gärdenfors' idea of convex regions.

Keywords. Demonstratives, manner, quality, degree, similarity, features of comparison

References

- Gärdenfors, P. (2000) Conceptual Spaces. The Geometry of Thought. MIT Press.
- Gärdenfors, P. & M. Brala-Vukanovic (2018) Semantic domains of demonstratives and articles: A view of deictic referentiality explored on the paradigm of Croatian demonstratives. *Lingua* 201, 102–118.
- König, Ekkehard & Carla Umbach (2018) Demonstratives of Manner, of Quality and of Degree: A Neglected Subclass. In E. Boef, M. Coniglio, E. Schlachter & T. Veenstra (eds.). *Demonstratives: syntax, semantics and typology*. Berlin, de Gruyter Mouton, 285-327.

Lewis, D.K. (1986) *On the Plurality of Worlds*. Oxford, Blackwell.

Maienborn, C. & M. Schäfer (2011) Adverbials and Adverbs. In Maienborn, von Stechow, Portner (2012) (eds.). *Semantics. An international handbook of natural language meaning*, vol. 2, 1390–1420. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Prasada, S. & E. Dillingham (2006) Principled and statistical connections in common sense conception. *Cognition* 99, 73-112.

Umbach, C. & H. Gust (2014) Similarity Demonstratives. *Lingua* 149, 74-93

Encoding deictic motion: language specific tendencies in translation

Clément Voirin, Anetta Kopecka

Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage

14 avenue Berthelot, 69363, Lyon Cedex 07, France

Clement.Voirin@univ-lyon2.fr Anetta.Kopecka@univ-lyon2.fr

Abstract. *It is well known that semantic concepts of FIGURE, GROUND, PATH and MANNER shape the conceptualization of motion events and that speakers of typologically different languages vary in the types of information (e.g. MANNER, PATH) they convey in the linguistic structure (Talmy, 2000; Slobin, 1996a; 2004; 2005a). It has also been shown that depending on language specific characteristics of the source and target language MANNER and PATH are more likely to be added or lost in translation (Sugiyama, 2000; Ibarretxe-Antuñano, 2003; Slobin, 2005b). Studies have also shown that when describing motion, speakers of typologically different languages can adopt either a centrifugal perspective ‘away from the deictic center’ (henceforth CTF) or a centripetal perspective ‘to(wards) the deictic center’ (henceforth CTP) (see Fillmore (1971; 1975), Gathercole (1977), Wilkins & Hill (1995), Fortis & Fagard (2010) inter alia), and that languages can be fully (e.g. Spanish, Hungarian), predominantly (e.g. French, English) or non-deictic (e.g. Polish, Russian) (Ricca, 1993). The present study addresses the encoding of deictic motion in three languages, French, English, and Polish, and investigates the following questions: What are language specific tendencies of these languages as regards the expression of deictic motion? To what extent the deictic perspective (i.e. CTF or CTP) expressed in the source language is maintained, changed or lost when translated into a target language? To examine these questions, the study is based on a corpus of parallel texts which includes one original novel in French, English and Polish and their translations. Spontaneous motion events consisting of a Figure moving from a Source and/or to(wards) a Goal (e.g. They crept out of their holes; She slowly came in) were extracted from the original novels. The analysis focuses on motion expressed by verbs ‘aller’ and ‘venir’ in French and ‘go’ and ‘come’ in English that convey the CTF and CTP perspective respectively (see Bouchard (1993) and Chevalier (1976) for French, and Fillmore (1971; 1975) for English), and in Polish, on the use of the *po*+V and *przy*+V constructions for the CTF and CTP perspective respectively (see Kopecka (2004) on Polish, Grenoble (1998) and Israeli (2002) about similar constructions in Russian). We then examine how the original deictic clauses of each language are translated into the two other languages.*

Our preliminary results show that motion events are predominantly expressed with a non-deictic perspective in the three languages. However, when a deictic perspective is expressed, there are subtle variations between the three languages in original novels as well as in translations. In original novels, we observe that languages vary with respect to both the frequency of expression of deictic motion and the preference for either the CTP or CTF perspective. In translations, we also observe cross-linguistic variation as regard the frequency and the preference for maintenance, change or loss of the deictic perspective.

In this presentation, we thoroughly investigate these cases of variation in order to deepen our understanding of language-specific preferences in the choice of the deictic perspective and the contexts in which it is maintained, changed or lost in translation.

Keywords. Typology, motion events, deictic motion, deictic perspective, translation studies, parallel texts

References

- Fillmore, C. (1975), *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Fortis, J.-M. & Fagard, B. (2010), *Space in language*, Leipzig Summer School in Linguistic Typology, Part V – Deixis.
- Ricca, D. (1993), *I Verbi Deittici di Movimento in Europa: Una Ricerca Interlinguistica*, Firenze, La Nuova Italia Editrice.
- Slobin, D. I. (2004), The Many Ways to Search for a Frog: Linguistic Typology and the Expression of Motion Events, in Strömquist S. & Verhoeven L. (eds.), *Relating events in narratives: typological and contextual perspectives* (vol. 2), Mahwah, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 219-257.

Person-Centred (Deictic) Expressions and Autism

Pamela Grozdanić

University of Rijeka

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51 000 Rijeka, CROATIA

pgrozdanic@ffri.hr

Abstract. *Hobson, Garcí'a-Pe'rez and Lee (2009) have proposed that proficient use of both verbal and non-verbal deictic expressions relies on children's capacity to identify with other people and that children and adolescents with autism are limited in their propensity to identify with others, and in recognizing and/or adopting the psychological perspectives of other people. Furthermore, they have predicted (ibid.) that when tested for deictic production and understanding subjects with autism would produce fewer and/or atypical deictic words and gestures, and show limited or atypical understanding of deictic words and gestures produced by others. The authors studied the meanings of the spatial deictic words — 'this'/'that', 'here'/'there' and 'come'/'go'—that are related to the vantage-points of the speaker who utters the terms and the listener who interprets them (i.e. person-centred deictic term). When compared with the typical development of deictic expressions, the process of adopting these expressions by the individuals with autism presents special difficulties. Methodologically, the study included 20 children and adolescents with autism and 20 children and adolescents without autism or other specific diagnoses but with mental retardation. They were group-matched with other participants who were closely similar in chronological age and verbal mental ability. In order to support the thesis that was presented in the research, I interviewed a mother of an eleven-year-old child diagnosed with autism. The mother said that her child had difficulties in understanding the difference between "this" and "that" because of the limited understanding of gestures. When it comes to the child's second language acquisition outcome (English), the child seems to have considerably fewer difficulties, especially with deictic expressions. The mother suggested that the reasons for that are connected to the fact that English has fewer grammatical cases and is more "expressive" than Croatian language. Apart from that, the mother, a student of linguistics herself, proposes that the difference might be due to the fact that different part of the brain is involved in second language acquisition as opposed to first language acquisition.*

Departing from the experimental evidence that children with autism are atypical in their comprehension and use of both verbal and non-verbal aspects of deixis, in this paper we ask whether it might be plausible that such abnormalities stem from the children's limited propensity to identify with other people. When it comes to the research projects in the future, I would suggest conducting a research that deals with the second language acquisition by children diagnosed with autism in order to hopefully define factors that will explain why the second language acquisition by children with autism is easier and faster.

Keywords. Deictic expressions, children with autism, person-centred deictic expressions

References

- Hobson, R. Peter, Garcí'a-Pe'rez, Rosa M., Lee, A. (2009). Person-Centred (Deictic) Expressions and Autism. *Springer Science+Business Media*
- Sakai, K. (2009). Language Acquisition and Brain Development. *Science*, 310 (5749), 815-819.

The gestural origin of language. A photo book

Ines Takač

University of Rijeka

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

Department of English Language and Literature

Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51 000 Rijeka, CROATIA

itakac@ffri.hr

Abstract. *Demonstratives belong to the class of context-sensitive expressions, indexicals, and are utilized together with deictic pointing gestures. Michael C. Corballis (1999) argues that gestural communication may be the foundation of oral languages. To underpin his hypothesis, he draws upon how hands accompany speech. The study carried out by Iverson and Goldin-Meadow (2005) likewise indicates a correlation between the initial instances of babbling emerging at seven months of age and the upsurge in repetitious manual activity. Among the first ten words of children whose native language is English are deictic words “that” and “there”. To use deictic expressions implies the ability to adopt another person’s perspective and hence the theory of mind. Around the first year of life, the child’s brain has developed enough for it to engage in triadic interaction, thus achieving joint attention – the child accompanies demonstratives with pointing gestures and a steady, intent look alternation between the adult and the object of interest. We distinguish between two types of infants’ pointing gestures: proto-imperatives and proto-declaratives. Early imperative gestures are self-centered acts. The purpose of early declarative gestures is interaction with the adult. Proto-declaratives branch into declarative informative and declarative expressive gestures. In the early stages of deictic pointing, infants impart redundant referential information by producing complementary gestures. Within a couple of months, they learn how to convey supplemental referential information, which heralds the onset of the two-word stage. Parent-child interactions largely influence their children’s vocabulary extent.*

I would like to complement the main theoretical propositions about the gestural origin of language I have reviewed with photographic evidence of pointing gestures in children in my immediate surroundings.

Keywords. gestural communication, demonstratives, deictic expressions, joint attention, deictic pointing, proto-imperative pointing, proto-declarative pointing

References

- Corballis, M. (1999) “The Gestural Origins of Language: Human language may have evolved from manual gestures, which survive today as a “behavioral fossil” coupled to speech“, *American Scientist*, 87(2), 138-145. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27857812>
- Iverson, J. M. and Susan Goldin-Meadow (2005) “Gesture Paves the Way for Language Development”, *Psychological Science*, 16(5), 367-371
- Özçalışkan, S. and Nevena Dimitrova (2013) “How gesture input provides a helping hand to language development”, *Seminars in Speech and Language*, 34(4), 227-236
- Rohlfing, K. J., Grimmering, A. & Lüke, C. (2017) “An interactive view on the development of deictic pointing in infancy”, *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, Article ID 1319. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01319>

