

A comprehensive account of the historical and present-day English functions of demonstrative determiners in the English noun phrase

This paper positions itself in the line of several recent studies such as Ariel 1990; De Mulder 2000; Diessel 1999, 2006; Epstein 2002; Himmelmann 1996; Kleiber 1990; Gundel et al. 1993, 2001) which have shown that demonstrative determiners convey several meanings that cannot be reduced to the traditional situational deictic interpretation in terms of proximity. Drawing on their insights, this paper propose a new comprehensive semantic account that (1) inventorizes all non-situational meanings of **English demonstrative determiners in both historical and present-day corpus data** and (2) explains how they are related to each other and to the traditional proximity meaning.

Langacker (2002) has suggested that demonstratives are different from determiners such as the definite and indefinite article in that they convey **a complex deictic value**. Demonstratives with a proximity semantics, for example, express joint mental contact of speaker and hearer with the referent **and** make a further specification regarding proximity. This analysis brings out the functional similarities between demonstratives and determiner + secondary determiner units such as *the same, another* (Author 2006). These complex determiners are used when a determiner alone does not provide sufficient information to conceptualize and/or identify the referent of the NP. In the same vein, I propose that English demonstrative determiners supplement simple definite- or indefiniteness in four types of ways. (1) **Emphatic demonstratives** merely emphasize identification as in *The moment Peter met her, he knew that this woman was his real mother*. (2) **Deictic demonstratives** provide additional information to help identify the referent. This function subsumes many semantic subtypes, including the traditional situational meaning as well as a wide range of non-situational meanings such as distance of the referent in discourse, familiarity/givenness, co-referentiality with special types of antecedents such as longer stretches of text. (3) **Conceptualizing demonstratives** indicate that the conceptualization of the referent requires a special process such as generalization from concrete instances, e.g. *I don't like those cookies* in the sense of "such cookies, that type of cookies". (4) **Discourse-pragmatic demonstratives** convey that the referent is salient in the discourse, typically marking the referent as topic. The so-called indefinite use of *this* introducing a new topic into the discourse belongs to this type.

Subsequently, I will argue that these types and subtypes can be arranged into **one radial semantic structure**, the centre of which is the situational deictic meaning. From this centre, distinct paths involving step-by-step semantic extensions branch out. These semantic extensions include amongst others the metaphorical extension from actual situational proximity to proximity in the text (Langacker 2002) and mental proximity or salience (Strauss 2002), the bleaching of the situational pointing act to any type of directing act leading to joint mental contact (Diessel 2006). As a final step, demonstratives loose their relational semantics and become 'token-reflexives' (Kleiber 1990, De Mulder 2000), that is rather than expressing that the referent can be identified by means of a phoric relation with a salient antecedent, demonstratives mark the referent of the NP itself for salience and turn it into a discourse topic.

References

- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Author. 2006.
- De Mulder, Walter. 2000. Démonstratifs et accessibilité. *Verbum* XXII(1) (Thematic issue *Référence Discursive et Accessibilité Cognitive*, ed. by Francis Cornish): 103-125.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17(4): 463-489.
- Epstein, Richard. 2002. The definite article, accessibility, and the Construction of discourse referents. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12(4): 333-378.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg and Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69: 274-307.
- Gundel, Jeanette K., Nancy Hedberg and Ron Zacharski. 2001. Cognitive status and definite descriptions in English: why accomodation is unnecessary. *English Language and Linguistics* 5: 273-295.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1996. Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In Barbara A. Fox, ed. *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 205-254.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1990. Sur l'anaphore démonstrative. In Michel Charolles, Sophie Fisher and Jacques Jayez, eds. *Le Discours: Représentations et Interprétations*. Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy. 243-263.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2002. Remarks on the English grounding systems. In Frank Brisard, ed. *Grounding: The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 29-38.
- Strauss, Susan. 2002. *This, that, and it* in spoken American English: a demonstrative system of gradient focus. *Language Sciences* 24: 131-152.