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1. Introduction
It is generally acknowledged that in addition to their exophoric (deictic, gestural) use, demonstratives typically also have endophoric uses, which can be regarded as a first step in their further grammaticalization. Following the thematic specifications of the workshop and building on a variety of previous studies (Koenig, 2015; Koenig, 2017; Koenig & Nishina, 2015, Koenig & Umbach, 2018), the present paper aims to identify and analyze additional discourse functions of demonstratives so far neglected in cross-linguistic studies, mainly on the basis of data from European languages (English, German), as representatives of languages with few deictic differentiations, but partly also on the basis of data from Japanese and Armenian, as representatives of languages with a rich system of relevant differentiations. The rich differentiations and the transparent make-up of the demonstrative system in Armenian are portrayed in Figure 2 below. Moreover, a subset of largely neglected and ‘a-typical’ demonstratives denoting the ontological dimensions of MANNER, QUALITY and DEGREE (MQD-demonstratives: Fr. ainsi, tel/pareil, comme ça) will receive specific attention.

2. Exophoric and endophoric uses
There is more or less general agreement that the deictic (gestural, exophoric) use of demonstratives is the basic one and arguments from language acquisition, from language evolution and from plausible assumption about the direction of language change have provided strong support for the view that the endophoric (anaphoric and cataphoric) uses are derived from the basic exophoric ones.
As far as our focal area is concerned, the following overview can be given for the different exophoric and endophoric uses on the basis of (a) historical evidence and (b) of semantic reconstruction (Koenig, 2015; 2017; Koenig & Nishina, 2015):

- **Semantic basis: ‘SIMILARITY’** (of manner, quality, degree)
- **Propositional (object, pred. complement, VP)** > affirmation
- **Anaphoric** > conditional/causal/inferential/manner/concessive adverbs
- **Relative marker** (such...as)
- **Exophoric**
  - **Comparative** (as...as) > consecutive > booster (so good; Span. tan)
  - **Additive** (also) > coordination (as well as; Fr. ainsi que)
- **Cataphoric** > quotative index (so to say, Fr. ainsi; Germ. so)
- **Recognitional** > approximative (ten students or so, Lat. quasi) > focus marker

Figure 1: exophoric and endophoric uses of MQD-demonstratives
definiteness  entity  place  direction  manner  quality  degree  quantity
ays    sa    aystegh  aystegh  ayspes  ayspisi  ayschap  aysqan
ayd    da    aydtegh  aydtegh  aydpes  aydpisi  aydchap  aydqan
ayn    na    aynptegh aynptegh aynpesis aynpisi  aynchap  aynqan

Figure 2: System of demonstratives in Armenian

- reinforcement and renovation of exophoric demonstratives (thus, such, so)
- few, if any, changes in form; primarily semantic change
- historical evidence and plausible semantic reconstruction
- increase in syntactic variability; de-categorization

3. Other uses
A detailed look at individual languages and cross-linguistic similarities reveals a variety of other, mainly discourse-structuring uses of demonstratives beyond their well-described exophoric and endophoric ones. The major challenge for their analysis and thus for this conference is to provide a convincing systematization and semantic analysis for such uses. In what follows five use types will be distinguished. The basis for these distinctions is primarily a semantic one. The basic semantic structure of demonstratives is a very simple one and comprises two semantic dimensions: (i) a deictic one, identifying a referent in terms of its distance from the center of orientation (origo in the sense of Bühller) as proximal, medial or distal (languages with a three-term distinction) or proximal vs. distal (languages with two-term distinctions) and (ii) an ontological (content) dimension, classifying a referent in terms of such basic semantic notions inter alia as entity, object, human being, place, time, manner, quality and degree. In all of the uses distinguished below one of these aspects is either reduced or enriched. The resultant semantic distinctions can then be related to certain functions on the basis of their syntactic environments and their meaning.

Again, I will, primarily though not exclusively, use examples and data from my focal area of MQD-demonstratives.

3.1. Coordination of contrasting terms
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, non-specific reference points, thus expressing both quantification and vagueness:

(1)a. Engl. here and there, now and then, this and that, hither and thither, so so;
b. Germ. so oder so, sowieso ‘anyway’, ‘de toute façon’, solche und solche ‘they come in all colors/kinds’, ‘there are those… and those…’; hin und her, ‘back and forth’, dies und das; mal so, mal so;
c. Fr. ici et là; ça se fait comme-ci ou comme-ça;
d. Span. asi o asa; It. Così o cosa;
(2)a. You still find antisemitism here and there.
b. (In general these people are tolerant). Aber, es gibt solche und solche.

In many European languages, these binomials typically have the proximal expression in first position, but this may differ from language to language. In Japanese, a language with a pervasive three-term system, only the medial or distal member of the paradigm invariably precedes the proximal one (cf. (3)). If there is no paradigmatic contrast in the system, the sole
demonstrative may be used twice or – as the Spanish example shows – a second term may be specifically created for these constructions.

(3) soko-koko ‘here and there’; ati-koti; are-kore ‘this one and that one’; sonna-konna; soo-koo; aa-da koo-da;

3.2. Idiomatic combinations as discourse-structuring devices

Another use of demonstratives characterized by a loss of their deictic components is manifested by their idiomatic combinations with other deictic expressions. The following examples from English are cases in point:

(4)a. Now then (attention getter and topic change)
   b. So there (closing an argument by maintaining a decision or view)
   c. And that’s that. (responsive; closing an argument.)
   d. That’s it! (responsive; closing an argument)
   d. Here goes! (initiative; introduction to doing something risky, foolhardy)
   e. Here we go again (responsive; comment on the recurrence of an unpleasant situation )
   f. Here we go. (initiative; )
   g. There you go (responsive; accepting an unsatisfactory situation)
   h. There we were/he was (closing; summing up, slowing down story)
   i. Now you’re talking. (responsive; confirming the relevance of preceding turn for an argument)

The preceding examples show that the demonstratives as essential components of such expressions have largely lost their ontological meaning as identifying a location or point-in-time and completely lost their deictic meaning component.

Analogous expressions with MQD-demonstratives are more easily found in German:

(5)a. Ach so. (responsive; removing epistemic asymmetry)
   b. So, so! (responsive; accepting a previous statement and its implications)
   c. So! (responsive; indicates the completion of actions; boundary signal)
   d. Also…. (initiative)
   e. Na so was! (responsive; comment expressing surprise)

Idiomatic expressions of this type may have a use as speech act (Here is to you; now, now!), but are more typically used as discourse-structuring devices and relate to overarching purposes and intentions of speakers and goals of an argument or discourse. There are of course striking differences in the form and meaning of such expressions within a language and across languages, but a common feature can be seen in the discourse-structuring function of either closing or opening a sequence of an argument or interaction. These functions are obviously related to the anaphoric and cataphoric uses of the relevant demonstratives.

Responsive conversational moves have a retrospective orientation as opposed to the forward-looking initiative moves. The examples from English furthermore suggest that local and temporal demonstratives are most frequently used for such idiomatic extensions.
3.3. Reference via different point or orientation

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 somewhat defective demonstrative of degree so provides particularly good illustration of this shift of what Bühler called the ‘origo’, which could also be described as a loss of the standard anchoring points of a deictic dimension. Consider the following examples:

(6)a. The fish I caught yesterday was so (+ gesture) long. (exophoric, gestural use)
   b. Why don’t you do it like so (+gesture)?
   c. Her hair always has to be just so. (point of orientation provided by norm)
   d. You can only eat so much. (point of orientation provided by capacity)
   e. Mrs. Jones is (ever) so/sooo helpful. (point of orientation provided by expectation)
   f. I am so taking a long nap today. (point of orientation provided by contradictory view)

In our first two examples, the point of orientation is provided by the speech situation and a pointing or mimicking gesture. This exophoric use of so, denoting manner or degree is marginal in Present-Day English, like that and that being typically used instead (Why don’t you do it like this? The fish was that long.). On the other hand, these two examples also show that so can still be used exophorically. The other uses of so are nor exophoric ones. The point of orientation in (6c) is a normative one (‘like it should be’) and in (6d) a point is indicated denoting the quantitative limit of a specific action, that of eating in this case. The example in (6e) is generally analyzed as an exclamation and identifies a point surpassing a certain standard as point of orientation. Finally, (6f.) is an instance of a recent development in American English, the relevant use of so being generally referred to as pre-verbal use (Boulonnais, 2005) or as ‘generation-X’ so (Zwicky, 2007). In that use so invariably bears a focal stress and emphasizes the truth or factuality of a statement in the context of a contradictory view. The points identified by these different degree uses of so and their underlying points of orientation can be illustrated by the following diagram:

---x------------------------------- x------------------------------- x------------------------------- x
assertion of truth gestural identification (as it should be) norm capacity beyond standard

Figure 2: degree-denoting uses of so in English

3.4. Connectives expressing rhetorical relations

Our fourth type of non-canonical uses of demonstratives is characterized by an enrichment of meaning, rather than a loss of meaning. Again using examples from our focal area of MQD-demonstratives, the adverbial use of English so provides rich resources for our discussion. The following examples illustrates the ability of English so (< OE swa), to express a variety of rhetorical relations:

(7)a. I did not like it. So I wrote to him. (causal)
   b. The whole thing was tied up in knots, so that we were not able to undo it. (resultative)
   c. He went into lower gear, so (that) his car would slow down. (purposive)
d. He is very sick. Even so he goes to work. (concessive)
e. So you are a linguist, eh? So what? (inferential)

How can we best characterize these uses? Since so does not relate to preceding utterances, but states of affairs or propositions, the above examples are not instances of textual deixis. Their retrospective character certainly gives them an anaphoric character, but their semantic enrichment through the accompanying co-text differentiates them clearly from the anaphoric use as VP-anaphora and propositional anaphora found in examples like the following:

(8)a. Bill writes his essays in the library and Mary does so at home.
   b. A. Italy is in a very difficult situation at the moment. – B. I think/suppose/guess so.

Another question requiring a clear answer concerns the decision between polysemy and vagueness for the uses in (7). For the time being I will opt for polysemy, postponing a detailed discussion to a later point.

Similar uses to (7) can be found for so in German and ainsi in French. One of the rhetorical relation in the preceding list of examples that is notably absent is conditionality. The conditional use of the connective so, though quite common in Early Modern English (cf. (9b)), is somewhat archaic and formal in Modern English, in contrast to the unrestricted use of German so and French si/ainsi in both the protasis and the apodosis of conditionals in German and French.

(9)a. So(fern) er rechtzeitig kommt, können wir in die Oper gehen. So Gott will, können wir morgen nach Italien fahren. (conditional)
   b. It is no matter how dirty a bag it is conveyed to him in, he will accept it, so the money is good. (necessary condition)
   c. S’il venait aussi, (ainsi) nous pourrions jouer au tennis. (cf. It. se, Span. si) (conditional)

It is a characteristic feature of German that so combine with several adverbs, adjective and prepositions to derive subordinating conjunctions (10) and adverbs (11).

(10) sofern ‘provided’, sobald ‘as soon as’, soweit ‘as far as’, so lange ‘as long as’, so viel ‘as far as’;
(11) sowohl, sofort, sogleich, somit, sowieso;

If we go beyond our focal area, Engl. hence, thence, therefore, thereby, hereby, but then, thus also have to be included in the use type under discussion.

4. Conclusion

The subgroup of ‘motivated specializations’ addresses the question raised in the conference program of “how the structure of a demonstrative paradigm interacts with discourse functions”. In languages with three-term deictic distinctions like Japanese and Armenian, for example, it is the hearer proximal manner demonstrative (Jap. soo; Armen. aydpes) which is used as a propositional anaphor, whereas the speaker-proximal anaphor (Jap. koo; Armen. ayspes) is used as a quotative marker. Or, to give another example from a three-term system, in Finnish the proximal form näin is used in quotatives.
Adverbial connectives are generally based on the medial demonstrative in Japanese, thus confirming a hypothesis formulated by Diessel (1999). As far as the content dimensions are concerned, local, manner and degree demonstratives seem to be the most frequent roots for additional uses.
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