Demonstrative words in Passamaquoddy equative constructions[1]

EVE NG
State University of New York at Buffalo

0. Introduction

Crosslinguistically, demonstratives have been documented to have developed into a wide range of other grammatical items (Diessel 1999a). When the phonological form of the resultant item is no longer identical to that of the source item, the fact that grammaticalization has occurred is clear. However, grammaticalization need not always result in changes to the form of the stem; in such case, where, minimally, there has been change in the item's *function*, there can also be other formal properties of the item that may be evidence of grammaticalization.

In this paper, I present data from passamaquoddy[2], an Algonquian language of Maine and New Brunswick, Canada, where words with phonological forms of demonstratives occur in certain NP-NP constructions. I use the label **equative construction** (after Hengeveld 1996) as the general term, and:

(a) **predicative nominal construction** will refer to NP-NP[3] sentences where the predicate NP is a kind rather than a uniquely identifiable entity, e.g.:

[1] [A penguin] is [a flightless bird].
[2] [Maya Angelou] is [a remarkable writer].

(b) **equative constructions** will refer to NP-NP sentences where a strict identity between the two nominal expressions is asserted, e.g.:

[3] [The capital of Canada] is [Ottawa].
[4] [You] are [the one who has my heart].

In considering whether grammaticalization of demonstratives has occurred for

[1] Thanks to my primary language consultant, David A. Francis at the Sipayik reservation, Maine, for all his assistance, and to Matthew Dryer and Karin Michelson for useful discussion.

[2] The language is called Maliseet in the communities of New Brunswick.

[3] I use 'NP' loosely to also include participles.

the Passamaquoddy data, we will examine what functional and formal changes the items in question have undergone. Firstly, in order to argue that an item has in fact become functionally differentiated from some source demonstrative, we need to define what functions are those associated with demonstratives proper. In the general linguistics literature, demonstratives are frequently described as deictic morphemes that orient the addressee's attention to something in the speech situation or in the linguistic discourse:

> Demonstratives are deictic expressions. They are primarily used to focus the hearer's attention on objects, persons, or locations in the speech situation, but they may also refer to linguistic entities in discourse." (Diessel 1999b: 19, after Lyons 1977: 636-677)

We should note, however, that the endophoric use of demonstratives, referring to things in the linguistic discourse, is not always strictly deictic in the sense of encoding relative spatial location; for this reason, distinguishing (adnominal) demonstratives used for anaphoric deixis from definite article uses, for example, can be tricky (but see Hawkins 1978). Minimally, however, we can say that demonstratives take part in some sort of referential act, whether they are used to refer to beings, objects, places, or more abstract phenomena.

Secondly, with respect to formal characteristics, we will examine an item's syntactic distribution, inflectional behavior, and its substitutional possibilities in terms of which items from the demonstrative paradigm can be used. For convenience, in the discussion to follow, the term "demword" will be used for any item that has the phonological form of a word from the demonstrative paradigm.

It will be argued that while the demwords in Passamaquoddy equative constructions retain certain of the morphological properties of referring demonstratives, they have lost any deictic or referential meaning, as well as displaying other grammatical properties distinct from referring demonstratives. Hence, they can be considered to be the early results of processes of grammaticalization of demonstratives into other grammatical morphemes.

1. Passamaquoddy demonstrative forms

Table 1 gives the non-absentative[4] demonstrative forms of Passamaquoddy. They are morphologically differentiated for three deictic distances — near speaker (NS), near addressee (NA), and away from both speaker and addressee (ASA) — as well as for number, animacy, and, for animate forms, obviation (proximate vs obviative).

[4] Passamaquoddy demonstratives (and nouns) have special absentative forms for reference to things which are dead or otherwise absent from the field of discourse. Only the non-absentative forms appear in the equative sentences to be presented.

Table 1: Passamaquoddy non-absentative demonstrative forms

			near speaker	*near addressee*	*away from speaker and addressee*
Animate	*sg*	*prox*	wot	not	yat
		obv	yuhtol	nihtol	yehtol
	pl	*prox*	yuktok, yukt, yukk	niktok, nikt, nikk	yektok, yekt, yekk
		obv	yuhuht	nihiht	yeheht
Inanimate	*sg*		yut	nit	yet
	pl		yuhtol	nihtol	yehtol

[5] and [6] are examples of referring demwords:

[5] Eci wolinaqahk yut posonut.

eci	woli-naq-ahk	yut	posonut
very	good-appear.II-CH.CONJ	0SG.NS	basket.INAN

This/The basket is beautiful.

[6] Nkisi iywa not amsqocehkan.

n-kisi iyw-a	not	amsqocehkan
1-like.II-INDC.-3SG:3SG	3SG.NA	doll.AN

I like that/the doll.

In Section 2, we look at the occurrence of demwords in predicate nominal sentences, and in Section 3, the demwords in equational sentences. In the interests of space, only affirmative sentences will be presented; negative sentences in some cases have certain words in a different order, but such differences do not affect the thrust of the arguments that will be presented.

2. Demwords in predicate nominal sentences

The data differ depending on whether the subject is a pronoun or is headed by a noun.

2.1. Sentences with pronoun subjects

When the subject of a predicate nominal sentence is a pronoun, there is a simple juxtaposition of [PREDICATE]-[SUBJECT], with no demword linking the two:

[7] Taktal nil.[5]
doctor.AN 1SG
I'm a doctor.

[8] Tuwihput nit.
table.INAN 0SG.NA
That's a table.

2.2. Sentences with noun-headed subjects

When the subject NP is a headed by a noun, a form of a NA demword agreeing in animacy and number with the subject must be present. In affirmative sentences, this demword occurs between the two nominal expressions, but the nominal expressions may generally occur in either order, although there may be a preference for the subject NP to occur first in some constructions.

Although the subject and predicate nominal NPs usually match in animacy, occasionally they do not. For example, in [9], the subject NP *maltuhsis* 'hammer' is animate while the predicate *wehkewakon* 'tool' is inanimate. We see that the demword is the animate form *not*, agreeing with the subject, not the predicate.[6]

[9] Wehkewakonnot maltuhsis. (*or* Maltuhsis not wehkewakon.)
tool.INAN 3SG.NA hammer.AN
A hammer is a tool.

[10] is an example of the construction with a plural animate subject, and the demword between subject and predicate is the animate plural NA form *nikt*:

[10] Nutokehkimucik nikt Mali naka Tepit.
(*or* Mali naka Tepit nikt nutokehkimucik.)
nut-okehkim-ucik nikt Mali naka Tepit
regularly-teach.TA-PTCP.3I:3'PL 3PL.NA Mary and David
Mary and David are students.

The following are the corresponding sentences with inanimate subjects. In [11], the demword *nit* agrees with the inanimate singular subject *nukcoktihikon* 'maul', while in [12], we get the inanimate plural demword nihtol for the subject *kompiyuhtawol* 'computers':

[5] Unless otherwise noted, Passamaquoddy examples come from elicitations conducted by the author.

[6] Although copula agreement with the subject is the familiar pattern for English and a number of other European languages, agreement with the predicate nominal also exists, as Diessel (1999a) argues for Hebrew.

[11] Nukcoktihikon nit wehkewakon.
(*or* Wehkewakon nit nukcoktihikon.)
maul.INAN 0SG.NA tool.INAN
A maul is a tool.

[12] Kompiyuhtawol nihtol pili mosinol.
kompiyuhta-wol nihtol pili mosin-ol
computer.INAN-PL 0PL.NA new machine.INAN-PL
Computers are new machines.

2.3. Grammatical status of these demwords

Can the demwords in the Passamaquoddy predicate nominal sentences in Section 2.2 still be understood as demonstratives? If we take, for example, a sentence like [10], one analysis might be to group the demword *nikt* grammatically with the predicate nominal to form a clause, with *nutokehkimucik* 'students' being some sort of topic NP in apposition, as given in [13]:

[13] Nutokehkimucik nikt Mali naka Tepit.
[they are students] [Mary and David]
or Mali naka Tepit nikt nutokehkimucik.
[Mary and David] [they are students]
Mary and David are students.

There are, however, two counter-arguments to this. Firstly, although both the word orders [SUBJECT]-[DEMWORD]-[PREDICATE NOMINAL] and [PREDICATE NOMINAL]-[DEMWORD]-[SUBJECT] are possible, the demword can never occur either clause-initially or clause-finally. For example, the following permutations in [14] are unacceptable:

[14] * Nikt nutokehkimucik Mali naka Tepit.
* Mali naka Tepit nutokehkimucik nikt.

This is puzzling if *nikt* is a pronoun subject in a equational clause associated with *nutokehkimucik*, as set forth in [13], since subject NPs are found both clause-initially and clause-finally in Passamaquoddy (although the clause-final position is the unmarked one).

Secondly, if the demword in the predicate nominal sentences is a pronoun, one would expect that it would be possible to have not just the NA forms, but also the NS and ASA forms, but this is not the case:

[15] *Wehkewakonwot/yat maltuhsis.
(*or* *Maltuhsis wot/yat wehkewakon.)
tool.INAN 3SG.NS/3SG.ASA hammer.AN
(A hammer is a tool.)

Hence, there are two types of grammatical restrictions, one distributional and the other substitutional, which are distinct from those of entity-referring demword pronouns. The demword in question is restricted to a syntactic position between the two nominal expressions, and restricted to the NA forms. Such characteristics are arguments for considering these demwords as being grammatically distinct **copulas** rather than demonstratives of any sort. The grammaticalization of copulas into demonstratives has been documented in other languages such as Hebrew and Mandarin Chinese (Diessel 1999a; Li and Thompson 1977).

3. Equational sentences

In Passamaquoddy, equational sentences contain a NA demword which show different agreement properties from the demwords discussed in Section 2.2. When the subject is a pronoun, there is a demword that does not agree in animacy when the subject is singular. When the subject headed by a noun, there is a demword which agrees in neither animacy or number with the subject.

3.1. Pronominal subjects

For the elicited equational sentences below, the context was one where one particular item was to be picked out from a number of other items, for example, picking out a particular spoon from a group of several spoons. The demword which occurs between the subject and the predicate is the inanimate singular NA form *nit* for both animate (*emqansis* 'spoon') and inanimate (*mitsut* 'fork') singular subject sentences. The word order must be as presented, i.e. [SUBJECT]-[DEMWORD]-[PREDICATE], in contrast to the unmarked order [PREDICATE]-[SUBJECT] for (affirmative) predicate nominal sentences (see [7]-[8]).

[16] Wot nit emqansis.
3SG.NS 0SG.NA spoon.AN
This is the spoon.

[17] Yut nit mitsut.
0SG.NS 0SG.NA fork.INAN
This is the fork.

In sentences with a sentient personal pronoun as subject, there is some variation amongst different speakers and occasionally from the same speaker as to whether the demword agrees in animacy; hence, I give both the inanimate *nit* and the animate *not* as options. The context in [18]-[19] is one involving identifying the doctor from amongst a group of people:

[18] Kil nit/not taktal?
2SG 0SG.NA/3SG.NA doctor.AN
Are you the doctor?

[19] Nil nit/not taktal.
1SG 0SG.NA/3SG.NA doctor.AN
I am the doctor.

When the pronoun subject is plural, then the demword agrees in both animacy and number with the subject:

[20] Yuktok nikt emqansisok.
yuktok nikt emqansis-ok
3PL.NS 3PL.NA spoon.AN-PL
These are the spoons.

[21] Yuhtol nihtol mitsutiyil.
yuhtol nihtol mitsut-iyil
0PL.NS 0PL.NA fork.INAN-PL
These are the forks.

[22] Nekomaw/Niktok[7] nikt taktalok.
nekomaw/ niktok nikt taktal-ok
3PL 3PL.NA 3PL.NA doctor.AN-PL
They're the doctors.

We will consider the identities of the demwords in this section in Section 3.3.

3.2. Noun-headed subjects

We now look at equational sentences where the subject is headed by a noun. In the following elicited sentences, the context is one where one wishes to exhaustively identify who all of the tribal council members are:

[23] Mali not nit litposuwin.
Mary 3SG.NA 0SG.NA tribal.council.member.AN
Mary is the tribal council member.

[24] Mali naka Tepit nikt nit litposuwinuwok.
Mali naka Tepit nikt nit litposuwin-uwok
Mary and David 3PL.NA 0SG.NA tribal.council.member.AN-PL
Mary and David are the tribal council members.

Note that there are now two demwords present between the subject and predicate NPs, the first agreeing in animacy and number with the subject, the second being invariantly *nit*. If we compare these sentences with their predicate nominal counterparts, as in [10], one obvious analysis is to treat the first demword in [23]-[24] as being parallel to the demwords in Section 2, i.e. as copulas that are agreeing with the subject. This would then leave the following *nit* as being some other morpheme.

[7] *nekomaw* is the sentient third-person plural pronoun; *niktok* is the animate plural NA demword.

3.3. Grammatical status of these demwords

Consider the following text example, where there is a topicalized NP followed by a clause. In that clause, there is an animate subject demword *not*, translated as a pronoun 'he', followed by the inanimate NA demword form *nit* which we discussed in Section 3.2, and then the predicate *kci sakom Kanawak* 'great chief at Kahnawake'.

[25] From *Lewis Mitchell: The Wampum Records* (Leavitt & Francis 1990)

Nihtol lu nikihkuwal, not nit kci sakom Kanawak.

nihtol	lu	Ø-nikihk-uwal	not	nit	kci	sakom
3'SG.NA	FOC	3-parent.AN-PL.POSS.OBV	3SG.NA	0SG.NA	great	chief.AN

Kanawak
Kahnawake.LOC

As for their parent, he was the great chief at Kahnawake.

An obvious possible identity for the *nit* demword here and the other instances of it in Section 3.2 is that of a copula. Although their morphological properties differ from the demwords in predicate nominal sentences discussed in Section 2, the two types of demword are both restricted distributionally and substitutionally.

Complicating the picture somewhat, there are also equational sentences with singular pronoun subjects[8] containing *two* occurrences of *nit* demwords which do not agree in animacy with the subject. The semantics that differentiate the sentences in [26] from the corresponding ones where only one *nit* occurs are not completely clear, but it seems that the context for [26] involves the speaker picking out a particular item, and commenting on its identity as being the exact object that s/he or the addressee has in mind:

[26]

Wot	nit	nit	emqansis?	Wot	nit	nit	emqansis.
3SG.NS	0SG.NA	0SG.NA	spoon.AN	3SG.NS	0SG.NA	0SG.NA	spoon.AN
Is the spoon this one?				The spoon is this one.			

If we analyze one *nit* as a copula, we are still left with another *nit* demword to account for.

Note that the demword immediately preceding the predicate in [26] must be the form *nit*; it cannot be a demword agreeing in animacy or be of some non-NA form:

[8] There are no equivalent plural pronoun subject sentences of this sort, which would be rendered with a single demword between subject and predicate, as in [20]-[22]. An asymmetry between singular and plural sentences is not unexpected in grammaticalization data, since sentences involving singular subjects are far more common and hence tend to undergo greater grammaticalization (e.g. see Heine, Claudi, and Hunnemeyer 1991).

[27] *Wot nit not emqansis.
3SG.NS 0SG.NA 3SG.NA spoon.AN
(The spoon is this one.)

* Wot nit yut/yet emqansis.
3SG.NS 0SG.NA 0SG.NS/0SG.ASA spoon.AN
(The spoon is this one.)

Hence, while the adjacency of the second *nit* in [26] to the nominal predicate might lead one to wonder it could now somehow be understood as modifying the predicate, we should point out that this *nit* would have to be a rather odd sort of adnominal demword, since these generally agree in number and animacy with the head noun, and are not restricted to NA forms (see Section 1).

Let us consider [25] again. This is an example of the topic-comment construction that Li and Thompson (1977) proposed would allow a pronominal subject in the comment clause to become reinterpreted as a copula when the whole sentence is reanalyzed as a subject-predicate construction. We can represent this for [25] as follows:

[28] [TOPIC] [COMMENT]
Nihtol lu nikihkuwal, not nit kci sakom Kanawak.
3'SG.NA FOC their parent 3SG.NA 0SG.NA great chief at Kahnawake
As for their parent, he was the great chief at Kahnawake.

↓

loss of topic-comment structure
subject-predicate reanalysis: demword as copula

↓

[SUBJECT] [PREDICATE]
Nihtol nikihkuwal not nit kci sakom Kanawak.
3'SG.NA their parent 3SG.NA 0SG.NA great chief at Kahnawake
(copula)
Their parent was the great chief at Kahnawake.

In the reanalyzed subject-predicate sentence, the *not* demword which had been the subject of the comment clause in the topic-comment sentence is reanalyzed as a copula. Our analysis is that this is the demword which we saw in equative constructions with noun-headed subjects, predicate nominal sentences in Section 2.2 as well as equational sentences in Section 3.2.

If we take the *not* demword in the reanalyzed [28] sentence as the copula, we are still left with the *nit* demword which follows it to account for. Since this is no longer linking a subject and predicate, it would seem to have lost any copula status it had. Perhaps the reanalysis shown in [28] forces a further reanalysis of this *nit*, although, like the second *nit* discussed for sentences like [26], it is hard to

say what its function is in isolation from the rest of the construction.[9]

To summarize, we encountered four sorts of demwords in Section 3. Firstly, there is a demword which agrees in both animacy and number with the subject NP, occurring as the first demword in equational sentences with noun-headed subjects, and this we analyzed as being the same demword as examined in predicate nominal sentences with noun-headed subjects discussed in Section 2.2, i.e. a copula. Secondly, the equational sentences with pronoun subjects presented in Section 3.2 have a demword where agreement for animacy does not occur with singular demword subjects and occurs varyingly with singular sentient personal pronoun subjects; this also looks like a copula. Thirdly, a particular type of equational sentence with a singular pronoun subject, as given in [27], has two demwords between subject and predicate; assuming that one of the demwords is the same as the one in the Section 3.2 sentences, the other one appears to be associated specifically with the construction exemplified by [27]. Finally, the second demword in equational sentences with noun-headed subjects does not agree in animacy with either singular or plural subjects; again, the meaning of this demword seems best defined in the context of the construction.

The phenomenon of multiple occurrences of demwords in equational sentences has also been reported for another Algonquian language, Fox (Goddard 1989), although further investigation is required to see what similarities and differences those data show compared with Passamaquoddy.

4. Summary and thoughts for future research

Demwords occurring in Passamaquoddy equative constructions all differ from referring demonstratives in being distributionally restricted to occurrence between the subject and the predicate, and being substitutionally limited to NA forms. Amongst them, however, there are differences in morphological properties of animacy and number agreement with the subject in the sentence, which led us to distinguish four different types of demwords.

We proposed that there are two types of copula, one type agreeing in both animacy and number with the subject which occurs in equative constructions (both predicate nominal and equational) where the subject is headed by a noun, and another occurring in equational sentences with pronoun subjects which agrees in animacy in the plural but not consistently in the singular. The other two types of demwords did not ever agree in animacy with the subject, and the data were such that we chose not to try to assign functions to these demwords independent of the constructions in which they appeared. It seems clear, however, that all of the demwords discussed no longer have the referential function which 'demonstratives' are generally understood to, and hence, we conclude that the demwords in equative constructions have developed functionally as well as formally into morphemes which are grammatically distinct from referring demonstratives.

[9] Thanks to Emmon Bach for suggesting this during my oral presentation at BLS-26.

With respect to further research, Passamaquoddy has other demwords not discussed here that are also morphologically derived from items in the demonstrative paradigm, hence demonstrating in a single language the phenomenon of what Craig (1991) has called 'polygrammaticalization', i.e. one type of item developing into a range of other grammatical morphemes. Ideally, a broader investigation of Passamaquoddy demwords would lead to the elucidation of a more unified account, one including both synchronic description of the demwords' functional and formal characteristics as well as plausible accounts for how they developed their current properties through diachronic change. Also, the phenomenon of demwords with a range of non-deictic and/or non-entity-referring functions is not unique to Passamaquoddy (e.g. see Cyr 1996, Cyr 1993 on definite articles in Montagnais and Cree), and similar investigations in other Algonquian languages would allow a comparative perspective to be brought to the Passamaquoddy data, as well as shedding more light on the general topic of demonstratives and grammaticalization.

Abbreviations

0PL	inanimate plural
0SG	inanimate singular
1SG	first person singular
3I	indefinite third person subject
3SG	(animate) third person proximate singular
3'PL	(animate) third person obviative plural
3'SG	(animate) third person obviative singular
-3SG	(animate) non-third person singular
AN	animate
ASA	away from speaker and addressee
CH.CONJ	changed conjunct mode
FOC	focus (gloss for *lu/olu*)
II	inanimate intransitive verb
INAN	inanimate
INDC	indicative mode
LOC	locative
NA	near addressee
NS	near speaker
PL	plural
POSS.OBV	possessive obviative (obviative marking grammatically required by virtue of third-person possession)
PTCP	participle
SG	singular
TA	transitive animate verb. Participants are glossed as *x:y*, where *x* is the agent and *y* is the patient.

References

Craig, Colette. 1991. Ways to go in Rama: a case study in polygrammaticalization. In Elizabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*. 2 volumes. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cyr, Danielle. 1996. Between grammar and cognition: the expression of definiteness in Plains Cree. *Studies in Honour of H.C. Wolfart*, Memoir 13. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Cyr, Danielle. 1993. Cross-linguistic quantification: definite articles vs demonstratives. *Language Sciences* **15**.3:195-229.

Diessel, Holger. 1999a. *Demonstratives: form, function, and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger. 1999b. The morphosyntax of demonstratives in synchrony and diachrony. *Linguistic Typology* **3**:1-49.

Goddard, Ives. 1989. Equational sentences in Fox. Paper presented at the SSILA winter meeting. Washington D.C,.

Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and indefiniteness: a study in reference and grammaticality prediction*. London: Croom Helm.

Heine, Bernd, Ulrike Claudi, and Friederike Hunnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. *Non-verbal predication: theory, typology, diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Leavitt, Robert M. and David A. Francis (eds.). 1990. *Wapapi akonutomakonol — the wampum records: Wabanaki traditional laws*. (Revised edition of Lewis Mitchell's recounting, originally published in Prince 1921.) Fredericton: Micmac-Maliseet Institute, University of New Brunswick.

Li, Charles & Sandra A. Thompson. 1977. A mechanism for the development of copula morphemes. In Li, Charles (ed.), *Mechanisms of syntactic change*, 414-444. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*, 2 volumes. Cambridge, UK and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Prince, John D. 1921. *Passamaquoddy texts*. Vol. X, Publications of the American Ethnological Society, ed. by Franz Boas. New York: G.E. Stechert & Co,.

Eve Ng
Department of Linguistics
609 Baldy Hall
State University of New York at Buffalo
Buffalo NY 14260-1030
USA

eveng@acsu.buffalo.edu