I am here and this is new. You are there and that is old.
The role of speaker and addressee in the interpretation of demonstratives

It is well-known that demonstrative systems come in (at least) two guises. There are systems with a 2-way distinction, like the one found in English (1), where the anchor is the *location* of the utterance (i.e., HERE/THERE). In addition, there are systems, like the one exhibited by European Spanish (2), with a 3-way distinction where the utterance *participants* (i.e., SPEAKER, ADDRESSEE, OTHER) serve as the anchor.

(1) a. **This** book right here. (2) a. **Este** es Miguel. (close to SPEAKER)
     b. **That** book over there.   b. **Ese** es Juan.   (close to ADDRESSEE)
                                        c. **Aquel** es Jorge. (far from SPEAKER/ADDRESSEE)

Crucially, in languages with 2-way demonstrative systems like English, it has been observed (Diessel 1999) that the proximal demonstrative *this* can also introduce novel discourse referents (DR, henceforth) as in (3a), whereas the distal demonstrative *that* can also refer to familiar DRs as in (3b).

(3) a. I used to know **this/*that** actor. And I never told you about him.
     b. Remember **that/*this** actor we met a few weeks ago.

The empirical goal of this talk is to show that the use of spatial demonstratives in locating a DR in the common ground is not a peculiarity of English but it represents a robust pattern across typologically-unrelated languages. That is, while the reuse of proximal demonstratives for novel DRs is exhibited by all the 22 languages we investigated, we have found no language presenting the opposite pattern (i.e., reuse of proximal demonstrative for familiar DRs and distal demonstrative for novel DRs). We refer to this pattern (summarized in Table 1) as the 'spatial-grounding correlation' (SGC, henceforth).

Spatial location	PROXIMAL	DISTAL
Grounding location	novel	familiar

Table 1. The spatial-grounding correlation (version 1).

We further show that the SGC holds no matter whether the language has a location-based or a participant-based spatial demonstrative system. In our sample of 9 participant-based systems, all but one language reuses the speaker-oriented spatial demonstrative for novel DRs and the distal (3rd person-based) demonstrative for familiar DRs.

In this talk, we explain the SGC adopting Ritter & Wiltschko's (2019) nominal interactional structure. In particular, we show how the role of the speaker and the addressee influences the interpretation of DR in the common ground. In the remainder of this abstract, we discuss the rationale behind our analysis and the relevant supporting evidence. Lastly, we briefly illustrate some theoretical consequences of our analysis.

Explaining the SGC. Intuitively, the SGC is surprising: one might expect that a proximal demonstrative is used to refer to a familiar DR (i.e., a DR that is in the common ground is somewhat close). However, we argue that the SGC can be understood if closeness is interpreted relative to the speaker, even in location-based systems (Terenghi 2019). The proximal demonstrative is used if the referent is close to the speaker (i.e., in speaker's ground). Via Gricean principles (and/or a version of Heim's (1991) maximize presupposition) this is interpreted as the DR being close *only* to the speaker and not the addressee. This is what a novel DR is: the speaker introduces a referent which is novel for the addressee. In contrast, the distal demonstrative is used if the referent is close to the addressee (i.e., in the addressee's ground). This is what a familiar DR is: the speaker can only refer to an addressee-familiar DR if it is also in the speaker's ground. Thus, we propose that the SGC suggests that proximal demonstratives are intrinsically speaker-oriented, while distal demonstratives are intrinsically other-oriented. This is summarized in Table 2.

Spatial location	SPEAKER	OTHER
Grounding location	novel	familiar

Table 2. The spatial-grounding correlation (version 2).

Analysing the SGC. The explanation of the SGC leaves us with the question as to how the re-interpretation of spatial demonstratives as grounding DRs comes about and what it might tell us about the representation of SPEAKER and ADDRESSEE. In this talk, we propose that the SGC is syntactically conditioned. We assume that spatial demonstratives are inserted in SpecDP and are associated with deictic features that determine their spatial deictic interpretation. Specifically, following Terenghi

(2019) we assume that proximal demonstratives are associated with a feature SPEAKER (Terenghi's [+AUTHOR]) while distal demonstratives are associated with a feature OTHER (Terenghi's [-AUTHOR]). This is schematized in (4):

(4) a. $[_{DP}$ DEM$_{SPEAKER}$ D $[_{NP}$ $]]$ → proximal spatial demonstrative
    b. $[_{DP}$ DEM$_{OTHER}$ D $[_{NP}$ $]]$ → distal spatial demonstrative

As for the non-spatial interpretation of demonstratives we propose that it derives by 'recycling' the spatial demonstrative in a structural position above the DP, dedicated to regulating conversational interaction, namely Ritter & Wiltschko's (2019) nominal interactional structure. This layer of structure is the nominal equivalent of Wiltschko's (2021) interactional structure and consists of a speaker and an addressee-oriented grounding layer. The speaker-oriented grounding layer introduces the speaker's ground (i.e., what the speaker knows at the current state of the interaction, including propositions and DR's) while the addressee-oriented grounding layer introduces the addressee's ground. We propose that proximal demonstratives are 'recycled' in SpecGround$_{Spkr}$P, as in (5a) while distal demonstratives are recycled in SpecGround$_{Adr}$P, as in (5b).

(5) a. $[_{GroundAdrP}$ $[_{GroundSpkrP}$ DEM$_{SPKR}$ $[_{DP}$ ~~DEM$_{SPKR}$~~ $]]]$ → novel DR
    b. $[_{GroundAdrP}$ DEM$_{OTHER}$ $[_{GroundSpkrP}$ $[_{DP}$ ~~DEM$_{OTHER}$~~ $]]]$ → familiar DR

We assume that 'recycling' is a form of movement where the moved element is (re)interpreted in the derived position: the DR is interpreted as being located in the speaker's ground or in the addressee's ground. The target of recycling is restricted by the feature associated with the demonstrative such that the feature [SPEAKER] on DEM can only be (re-)interpreted in Ground$_{SPKR}$ and not in Ground$_{ADR}$ while the feature [OTHER] on DEM can only be (re-)interpreted in Ground$_{ADR}$ and not in Ground$_{SPKR}$.

A potential alternative. We further compare our syntactic analysis with a hypothetical alternative according to which the features [SPEAKER] and [OTHER] are simply reinterpreted as referring to the common ground rather than the utterance location. This could be viewed as a kind of metaphorical extension of the deictic interpretation. We argue, however, that our syntactically conditioned analysis is empirically and theoretically superior. We present two empirical arguments. First, we show that in languages where demonstratives are composed via a determiner and a dedicated locative particle, recycling is not available (i.e., the locative particles cannot be used to refer to novel vs. familiar DRs), as in (6) from non-standard German.

(6)   Ich kenne den Schauspieler **da/dort**.
        I   know   the   actor   here/there
        'I know this/that actor.' (spatial deictic interpretation only)

If the reuse of demonstratives were simply a matter of metaphoric extension this would be unexpected. On our analysis it follows assuming that locative particles cannot be reinterpreted in the interactional structure.

A second empirical argument concerns the fact that spatial demonstratives can be re-interpreted affectively (Lakoff 1974) such that proximal demonstratives can be interpreted as emotionally close (i.e., positive) while distal demonstratives can be interpreted as emotionally distant (i.e., negative). However, we show that cross-linguistically this pattern is not systematic (categorical), unlike what we see for the SGC, which is categorical. We argue that this difference follows straightforwardly from the fact that there is a syntactic grounding layer which is responsible for the reinterpretation of spatial demonstratives as grounding demonstratives whereas universally, there is no corresponding syntactic emotive layer that would be responsible for a hypothetical 'spatial-emotive correlation'.

Theoretical consequences and conclusions. From a theoretical point of view, we argue that an analysis that utilizes a layer of structure dedicated to regulating the conversational interaction is more parsimonious as an analysis that is solely based on features. Moreover, in as much as the analysis is on the right track it provides us with an argument for encoding the speaker and addressee as ground holders rather than as speech act roles. Finally, another theoretical consequence of our analysis is that we need to distinguish two notions of deixis: spatial deixis (associated with location in the real world) and grounding deixis (associated with location in our mental world).

Selected references

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

Ritter, E., Wiltschko, M. 2019. Nominal speech act structure: Evidence from the structural deficiency of impersonal pronouns. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics*, 64:4, 709—729.

Terenghi, S. 2019. Demonstrative-reinforcers constructions and the syntactic role of deictic features. *Linguistics in the Netherlands* 36:1, 192—207.

Wiltschko, M. 2021. *The Grammar of Interactional Language,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.