Demonstrative Pronouns and Competition
Ivy Sichel
UC Santa Cruz
(joint work with Martina Wiltschko, UBC)

Personal pronouns appear to compete with a variety of other elements and to lose: to anaphors, at least on some accounts (Hellan 1988, Burzio 1991, 1998, Williams 1997, Hornstein 2000, Safir 2004), to *pro* (Montalbetti 1984, Larson and Lujan 1989) to simple anaphors such as *sig*, and to gaps in Wh-chains. What do these competitions have in common, if anything, and what does their potential commonality suggest about preferences among pronominal alternatives? How are these preferences structured and what can be concluded about the nature of pronouns in general from the fact that their distribution and interpretation are often determined, at least in part, in relation to an alternative? The talk will approach these questions by examining a new alternation, between personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns (a demonstrative which can exhaust the entire DP, henceforth d-pronoun). In this alternation, unlike the ones above, the personal pronoun is the preferred choice, and we explore the consequences of our findings for a broader understanding of pronominal meaning and pronominal scales of preference.

In some languages, such as Hebrew and German, a d-pronoun may refer to a human. When it does, the use of the d-pronoun may be associated with a pejorative effect, implying a negative evaluation of the denoted individual (henceforth *N(egative)-effect*), as in (1b) / (1d) and (2). The N-effect is triggered, however, only under certain conditions. For example, when the d-pronoun is modified (3), no N-effect arises. We address two empirical questions: (I) What is the distribution of the N-effect? (II) How is it linguistically encoded? Regarding (I), we show that the N-effect is triggered only when a personal pronoun could also have been used. This suggests that everything else being equal, a personal pronoun is preferred over a d-pronoun (Patel-Grosz and Grosz 2017); it also suggests that the N-effect is not intrinsically, or lexically, encoded (Sichel and Wiltschko 2018). Regarding (2), we argue that it must derive from the non-use of a personal pronoun, and in this sense is related to the markedness systems and systems which derive conversational implicatures. We argue that the use of a d-pronoun when a personal pronoun could also have been used gives rise to an implicature that the d-pronoun is associated with [-person], and discuss several options for integrating this type of indexical alternative-sensitive meaning into the mechanisms for the calculation of conversational implicatures.

EXAMPLES

(1) no N-effect

    a. hi_1 xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha   c. Sie glaubt **sie** ist gross.
        she_1 think.3fs that she_1 tall she_1 think. she_1 is.3sg tall
        'She$_1$ thinks that she$_1$'s tall.'   'She$_1$ thinks that she$_1$'s tall.'

    b. N-effect

       zot_1 xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha   d. Die glaubt die ist gross
       $Z.f.s_1$ think-3fs that-she_1 tall   d-f.sg believe.3sg d-f.sg is.3sg tall
       '[This one]$_1$ thinks that she$_1$'s tall.'   '[This one]$_1$ thinks that she$_1$'s tall.'

(2) a. zot / ha-hi gvoha.   b. Sie/die ist gross.
     Z.f.sg / the-H.f.sg tall.f.sg   f.sg/d-f.sg is.3sg tall
     'This one / that one is tall.'   This one / that one is tall.'
      Said of a person: there is an N-effect; said of a lamp, there is no N-effect.

(3)   a. [$_{DP}$ zot_1 [$_{PP}$ im ha-nemaSim]] xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha   (no N-effect)
        [$_{DP}$ $Z.f.s_1$ [$_{PP}$ with the-freckles] thinks that-she_1 tall
        'The one with the freckles thinks that she's tall.'

      b. [$_{DP}$ zot_1 [$_{CP}$ Se-yac'a im dani]] xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha   (no N-effect)
        [$_{DP}$ $Z.f.s_1$ [$_{CP}$ that-went.out with dani]] thinks that-she_1 tall
        'The one that went out with Dani thinks that she's tall.'

      c. Die mit den Sommersprossen glaubt   die ist   gross

d-f.sg with the freckles   believe.3sg   d-f.sg   is.3sg   tall

'The one with the freckles thinks that she's tall.'

d. Die, die mit der Dani befreundet ist glaubt   die   ist   gross

d-f.sg d-f.sg with the Dani friended is   believe.3sg   d-f.sg   is.3sg   tall

'The one who is friends with Dani thinks she's tall.'

Selected References

Acton, E. & C. Potts. 2014. That straight talk: Sarah Palin and the sociolinguistics of demonstratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 18: 3-31

Bosch, P. & C. Umbach 2007. Reference determination for demonstrative pronouns. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 48: 39-51.

Cardinaletti A. & M. Starke. 1999. "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns". In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, and Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:409–442.

Doran, R & G. Ward 2015. Proximal Demonstratives in Predicate NPs. Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 41 (http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6w63n6mf)

Imai, S. 2003. *Spatial Deixis*. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo

Lakoff, R. 1974. Remarks on this and that. In *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 345-356. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Patel-Grosz, P. and P. G. Grosz. 2017. Revisiting pronominal typology. Linguistic Inquiry 48:259-297.

Potts, C. & F. Schwarz. 2010. Affective 'this'. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 3(5). 1–30.

Sichel, I. and M. Wiltschko. 2018. Demonstrative pronouns and the linguistic encoding of appraisal. In Wm. G. Bennet, L. Hracs, and D. Ryan (eds.) Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference in Linguistics p. 365-373. Cascadilla press.