

Predicative Demonstratives

Author(s): Holger Diessel

Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General Session and Parasession on Pragmatics and Grammatical Structure (1997), pp. 72-82

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Predicative demonstratives
Holger Diessel
State University of New York at Buffalo

1. Introduction

Demonstratives are commonly subdivided into demonstrative pronouns, which substitute for a NP, and demonstrative determiners, which modify a noun. In this paper I argue that many languages have, in addition, a particular class of *predicative demonstratives*. Predicative demonstratives occur in the topic position of identificational sentences with a predicate nominal.¹ I call them predicative demonstratives because they are especially common in nonverbal clauses, where they are often glossed as 'this/that is' (e.g. Dayley 1989:145; Carlson 1994:241). Two initial examples from Karo Batak (a) and Tümpisa Shoshone (b) are given in (1):

- (1) a. Énda kampuh.
This sarong
'This is a sarong.' (Woollans 1996:123)
b. Asü hipikkahni.
That is bar
'That's a bar.' (Dayley 1989:145)

Predicative demonstratives are usually considered demonstrative pronouns in subject function. Challenging this view, I argue that in many languages the demonstratives in identificational sentences constitute a particular grammatical class of demonstratives that is distinct from the class of demonstrative pronouns. My hypothesis is based on three different observations: first, the demonstratives in identificational sentences are often phonologically distinct from demonstrative pronouns; second, they frequently have particular morphological features; and third, their syntactic behavior often differs from the syntactic behavior of the demonstrative pronouns that function as subjects in other syntactic constructions. If the demonstratives in identificational sentences have a particular phonological form, or if their morphological or syntactic features are different from demonstratives that occur in other contexts, I assume that there is a particular class of predicative demonstratives in the language.

It must be emphasized that, although many languages distinguish predicative demonstratives from demonstrative pronouns, it is by no means unusual that a language uses the same demonstratives in identificational sentences as in other syntactic contexts. In English, for instance, the demonstratives in identificational sentences have the same phonological form and the same morphosyntactic properties as the demonstrative pronouns that occur in other constructions, and thus I assume that English does not have a particular class of predicative demonstratives. To put it another way, predicative demonstratives are not simply the demonstratives that occur in the topic position of identificational sentences; rather, they are defined as a particular grammatical class of demonstratives with specific phonological, morphological, and/or syntactic properties that are distinct from those of demonstrative pronouns. If the demonstratives in identificational sentences have the same grammatical features as the demonstratives in other syntactic contexts, there is no evidence for a categorical distinction between predicative demonstratives and demonstrative pronouns in the language.

My study is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the evidence for the central hypothesis of this paper, that many languages employ a particular class of predicative demonstratives distinct from demonstrative pronouns. Section 3 shows, in addition, that predicative demonstratives provide the historical source for the

development of certain nonverbal copulas. My analysis challenges previous studies in which it is claimed that nonverbal copulas derive from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (e.g. Li and Thompson 1977; Schuh 1983; Devitt 1994)

2. Evidence for a particular class of predicative demonstratives

2.1. Phonological evidence

In many languages the demonstratives that occur in the topic position of identificational sentences have a different phonological form than the demonstratives that occur in other syntactic contexts. I take this as one piece of evidence for my hypothesis that the demonstratives in identificational sentences are often categorically distinct from the demonstrative pronouns. Examples from Supyire, Izi, Ponapean, Karo Batak, and Kilba are given below.

The predicative demonstratives in Supyire (2) differ from the demonstrative pronouns in that the latter have an initial nasal consonant which does not occur with the predicative demonstratives. (2) shows the full paradigms of the demonstrative pronouns and the predicative demonstratives, and it provides two sentences that show the two types of demonstratives in context: *ɲgé* in (2a) is a demonstrative pronoun, while *ké* in (2b) functions as a predicative demonstrative in a nonverbal clause.

- (2)
- | | pronoun | | predicative |
|-----|----------|------------|---------------------------|
| NC1 | ɲgé (sg) | m̄pií (pl) | we (sg) pii (pl) |
| NC2 | ɲké (sg) | ɲje (pl) | ke (sg) ye (pl) |
| NC3 | ɲdé (sg) | ɲcii (pl) | le (sg) cii (pl) |
| NC4 | | nté | te |
| NC5 | | m̄pé | pe (Carlson 1994:159-161) |
- a. Mu à pyi a ɲké cé la?
 you perf past perf DEM.G1S know Q
 'Did you know this/that one?' (Carlson 1994:190)
- b. Ku ké.
 it(G2S) here.is(G2S)
 'Here/there it is.' (Carlson 1994:241)

In Izi (3), demonstrative pronouns begin with a rounded mid back vowel and they have at least two syllables. By contrast, the predicative demonstratives *wáà* and *nóò* begin with a consonant and consist of only one syllable (the double consonants indicate a long vowel carrying a particular tone).

- (3)
- | | pronoun | | predicative |
|----------------|----------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| 'that' | òno / òno!ya | | wáà |
| 'this' | òwá / òwána | | nóò |
| 'that (other)' | òphùù / òphùná | | -- (Meier et. al. 1975:150-1, 264-5) |
- a. á zóhā ké òno.
 one forget one that
 '...one should forget that one.' (Meier et. al. 1975:168)
- b. wáà ké òkpóbé ònyà mù.
 this true friend mine
 'This is (for) my true friend.' (Meier et. al. 1975:166)

In Ponapean (4), demonstrative pronouns have an initial bilabial nasal, which is replaced by a high front vowel if a demonstrative occurs in the topic slot of an identificational sentence, that is, if it is used as a predicative demonstrative.

- | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----------|--------------|--|
| (4) | | pronoun | | predicative |
| | near S | met (sg) | metakan (pl) | iet (sg) ietakan (pl) |
| | near H | men (sg) | menakan (pl) | ien (sg) ienakan (pl) |
| | away S/H | mwo (sg) | mwohkan (pl) | io (sg) iohkan (pl) (Rehg 1981:143-54) |
- a. Met pahn mengila.
 'This will wither.' (Rehg 1981:143)
- b. Io sounpadakho.
 'There is that teacher.' (Rehg 1981:143)

In Karo Batak (5), *éna*, *ah*, and *oh* are used as predicative demonstratives in nonverbal clauses, while *énda* and *é* function as demonstrative pronouns.

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|--|---------------------------------|
| (5) | | pronoun | | predicative |
| | 'this' | énda | | éna |
| | 'that' | é | | ah / oh (Woollans 1996:122-123) |
- a. É la kubegi.
 that not I.hear
 'I didn't hear that.' (Woollans 1996:123)
- b. Ah motorta.
 that vehicle.our
 'There's our vehicle.' (Woollans 1996:123)

Finally, in Kilba (6), predicative demonstratives are monosyllabic, while demonstrative pronouns consist of two or more syllables.

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------|--|--------------------------|
| (6) | | pronoun | | predicative |
| | proximate | (nə)nə́nna | | ná |
| | distal | (nà)ndánda | | ndá |
| | removed | (ŋgə)ŋgə́ŋgà | | ŋgá (Schuh 1983:315-317) |
- a. Kətəŋ nə.
 'It's a sheep.' (Schuh 1983:318)
- b. (no example including a demonstrative pronoun is given in Schuh 1983)

Note that the predicative demonstratives in these examples show the same deictic distinctions as the demonstrative pronouns: the distinction between proximate and distal reference, for instance. This is an important fact, because it shows that predicative demonstratives are genuine deictic expressions; they are not just existential markers like the expletives *it* and *there* in English. In fact, predicative demonstratives are especially common in face-to-face conversations, where they are often accompanied by a pointing gesture. As pointed out in several studies, one of the most common uses of predicative demonstratives is in answer to questions such as 'Who' or 'What is this?' (e.g. Schuh 1983; Carlson 1994). An example from Modern Hebrew is given in (7).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----------------|------|----------------------|-------------|
| (7) | Mi | ze? | Ze | aba | sheli. |
| | who | this | this | father | mine |
| | | 'Who is this?' | | 'This is my father.' | (Informant) |

2.2. Morphological evidence

There are a number of languages in my language sample in which predicative demonstratives have the same demonstrative stems as demonstrative pronouns, but differ in their morphological behavior. Examples from Nunggubuyu, Tümpisa Shoshone, Ambulas, French, and German are given below.

In Nunggubuyu (8), demonstrative pronouns take two noun class markers, one that is prefixed and another one that follows the demonstrative stem. Unlike the demonstrative pronouns, the predicative demonstratives only occur with one noun class marker, namely the one that is suffixed. The examples in (8) show the masculine, singular forms; like all other demonstrative forms, they can be expanded by certain morphemes such as the marker for anaphoric reference *-yuŋ* in (8a).

(8)		pronoun		predicative
	proximate	na:-ʔ-gi		ya-gi
	immediate	na:-da-gi		da-gi
	distant	nu:-ʔwa:-gi		yuwa-gi
	anaphoric	nu:-ʔba-gi		ba-gi (Heath 1984:272-274)
	a. niyaŋgi	buguni		nu:-ʔba-gi-yuŋ
	he went	to there (Anaph)		that one (Msg Anaph)
		'That man went there.' (Heath:1980:160)		
	b. ya:-gi	na-walyi-puŋ		
	this-Msg	Msg-male-HumSg		
		'Here is the man.' (Heath 1984:278)		

In Tümpisa Shoshone (9), demonstrative pronouns take number and case suffixes, and they may occur with the proximate marker *s-*, if they refer back to the most topical NP in the previous discourse. By contrast, predicative demonstratives are unmarked for number; they take a particular case suffix (*-sün*); and they never occur with the proximate prefix *s-*, that is, predicative demonstratives are only used in the obviative form.

(9)		pronoun		predicative
		subj	obj	
	this here	sg (s)-i-tü	(s)-i-kka	i-sü(n)
		du (s)-i-tungku	(s)-i-tuhi	
		pl (s)-i-tümmü	(s)-i-tümmi	
	this nearby	sg (s)-e-tü	(s)-e-kka	e-sü(n)
		du (s)-e-tungku	(s)-e-tuhi	
		pl (s)-e-tümmü	(s)-e-tümmi	
	that visible	sg (s)-a-tü	(s)-a-kka	a-sü(n)
		du (s)-a-tungku	(s)-a-tuhi	
		pl (s)-a-tümmü	(s)-a-tümmi	
	that invisible	sg (s)-u-tü	(s)-u-kka	u-sü(n)
		du (s)-u-tungku	(s)-u-tuhi	
		pl (s)-u-tümmü	(s)-u-tümmi	
	neutral	sg ma-tü	ma-kka	ma-sü(n)
		du ma-tungku	ma-tuhi	
		pl ma-tümmü	ma-tümmi (Dayley 1989:137-138)	

- a. U punikka setü.
it see this
'This one saw it.' (Dayley 1989:141)
- b. Esü nahim pungku.
This our (dl) pet
'This is our pet.' (Dayley 1989:145)

In Ambulas (10), *kén* and *wan* are used as predicative demonstratives in nonverbal clauses. The demonstrative pronouns involve the same demonstrative forms, but *kén* and *wan* are combined with the personal pronouns, yielding complex pronominal forms, which are differentiated for gender and number.

- | | | | | |
|-----------|--|---------------------|-------------|-------------|
| (10) | pronoun | | | predicative |
| proximate | dé-kén (m.sg) | bé-kén (pl) | de-kén (du) | kén |
| | lé-kén (f.sg) | | | |
| distal | dé-wan (m.sg) | bé-wan (pl) | de-wan (du) | wan |
| | lé-wan (f.sg) | (Wilson 1980:55-57) | | |
| a. | wu-na kayékni dé-wan. | | | |
| | I-pos reflection he-that | | | |
| | 'My reflection is that.' (Wilson 1980:157) | | | |
| b. | Kén bakan walkamu taalé. | | | |
| | this just little place | | | |
| | 'This is just a little place.' (Wilson 1980:454) | | | |

In French (11), the demonstrative that is primarily used in identificational sentences is the particle *ce*. *Ce* is a predicative demonstrative with different morphological features than the demonstrative pronouns *celui* and *celle*; the latter inflect for gender and number, while *ce* is uninflected.

- | | | | | |
|---------------|---|------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| (11) | pronoun | | | predicative |
| proximate (m) | celui-(ci) (sg) | ceux-(ci) (pl) | | ce |
| proximate (f) | celle-(ci) (sg) | celles-(ci) (pl) | | |
| distal (m) | celui-(là) (sg) | ceux-(là) (pl) | | |
| distal (f) | celle-(là) (sg) | celles-(là) (pl) | (Calvez 1993:62-65) | |
| a. | Donne-moi ce livre-là et garde celui-ci pour toi. | | | |
| | give me this book and keep this one for you | | | |
| | 'Give me that book and keep this one for you.' (Calvez 1993:63) | | | |
| b. | C'est Paul. | | | |
| | this-is Paul | | | |
| | 'It's Paul.' (Calvez 1993:64) | | | |

Finally, German uses the demonstrative *das* in the topic position of identificational sentences. The predicative demonstrative *das* is homophonous with the neuter, singular, nominative/accusative form of the demonstrative pronouns, but its morphological behavior is rather different. Demonstrative pronouns agree in gender and number with their reference object (12a). By contrast, the predicative demonstrative *das* does not agree with its semantic antecedent. In (12b) the antecedent of the predicative demonstrative *das*, *eine junge Frau* 'a young woman', has feminine gender; the sentence would be ungrammatical if *das* were a demonstrative pronoun. The reason why (12b) is acceptable is that the predicative demonstrative *das* is unspecified for

- (14) a. Das sind meine Eltern. a'. Das bin ich.
 that.sg are my.pl parents that.sg am I
 'These are my parents.' 'That's me.'
- b. Dit zijn goede boeken.
 this.sg are good books
 'These are good books.' (Shetter 1994:37)
- c. Ce sont de vers, ce n'est pas de la prose.
 that.sg are art verses it/this neg-is neg art prose
 'They (these) are verses; they are not (this is not) prose.' (Calvez 1993:64)

Finally, there are languages in which predicative demonstratives and demonstrative pronouns behave differently if they occur with a coreferential NP in the previous discourse. An anaphoric demonstrative pronoun usually agrees with its semantic antecedent, if there is any agreement marking between pronouns and antecedent NPs in the language. By contrast, if a predicative demonstrative occurs with a coreferential NP, it does not always agree with its semantic antecedent. Consider the following examples from Spanish (15) and Modern Hebrew (16).

- (15) a. Ese es mi padre.
 this (m.sg) is my father (m)
 'That's my father.' (Informant)
- b. Esa es mi madre.
 this (f.sg) is my mother (f)
 'That's my mother.' (Informant)
- (16) a. Ze aba sheli.
 this (m.sg) father (m) my
 'This is my father.' (Informant)
- b. Zot ima sheli.
 this (f.sg) mother (f) my
 'This is my mother.' (Informant)

The demonstratives in (15) and (16) inflect for gender and number, but they do not agree with their semantic antecedent; rather they agree with the predicate nominal in the same clause. That the agreement features of the predicative demonstratives are controlled by the predicate nominal is shown in the following example from Spanish (17), where the semantic antecedent and the predicate nominal have different genders. The predicative demonstrative *ese* has the same gender as the predicate nominal, *mi padre* 'my father', both are masculine; but its gender does not match the gender of its semantic antecedent, *esa persona* 'a person', which is feminine.

- (17) Ves esa persona allá? Si, ese (*esa) es mi padre.
 see.2sg this (f.sg) person (f) there yes this (m.sg) (*f.sg) is my father (m)
 'Did you see this person? Yes, that was my father.' (Informant)

3. The reanalysis of predicative demonstratives as nonverbal copulas

Crosslinguistically, demonstratives provide a common historical source for the development of a wide variety of grammatical markers. For instance, demonstrative pronouns very frequently develop into relative and third person pronouns, and demonstrative determiners are often reanalysed as definite articles and noun class markers (e.g. Greenberg 1978; Lehmann 1982; Harris and Campbell 1995; Diessel 1997). Li and Thompson (1977) have furthermore shown that demonstratives are also

frequently reanalysed as nonverbal copulas. More specifically, they argued that nonverbal copulas derive from anaphoric pronouns, either from anaphoric personal pronouns or from anaphoric demonstrative pronouns. Subsequent studies by Schuh (1983), Eid (1983), Gildea (1993), and Devitt (1994) supported their finding.

In this section I argue that Li and Thompson's analysis is only partially correct. I agree with their hypothesis that nonverbal copulas often develop from a third person pronoun; but I do not believe that nonverbal copulas based on demonstratives develop from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. Before I discuss the development of nonverbal copulas from demonstratives, I will briefly describe the mechanism by which personal pronouns develop into copulas. The mechanism is shown in (18).

$$(18) \quad [NP \ NP] / [NP_i \ (PRO_i \ NP)] \quad \Rightarrow \quad [NP_i \ COP_i \ NP]$$

Li and Thompson argued that the reanalysis of an anaphoric pronoun as a nonverbal copula originates from a construction that involves a topicalized NP and a nonverbal clause with an anaphoric subject pronoun. Since the topicalized NP and the pronominal subject are coreferential they usually agree, if there is any agreement marking in the language. When a nonverbal clause with a preceding topic is routinely used to express an identity relation between the topicalized NP and the predicate nominal, the topicalized NP is eventually reanalysed as the subject and the anaphoric pronoun as the copula of a new type of identificational sentence. Li and Thompson based their analysis on evidence from a number of languages including Modern Hebrew where the reanalysis of personal pronouns as copulas is very recent; so recent, indeed, that their status as copulas is not immediately obvious. Consider the following examples.

- (19) a. *ha-sha'on_i hu_i matana.*
 the-clock (m.sg) is/he (m.sg) present (f.sg)
 'The clock is a present.' (Glinert 1989:189)
- b. *Hevrat_i bóing hi_i taagid anaki.*
 company (f.sg) Boeing is/she (f.sg) corporation (m.sg) giant
 'The Boeing company is a giant corporation.' (Glinert 1989:158)

In (19), *hu* and *hi* agree with the preceding NP, which is either the subject or the topicalized NP of a nonverbal clause. If the initial NP is the subject, *hu* and *hi* would be copulas; but if it is a topicalized NP, *hu* and *hi* would function as pronouns. Following a study by Berman and Grosu (1976), Li and Thompson argue that *hu* and *hi* are copulas in these examples. They present several arguments in support of their view: First, they point out that the NP preceding *hu* and *hi* can be a first or a second person pronoun as shown in (20):

- (20) *ani / ata / hu hu hašoter.*
 I / you / he he the policeman
 'I am / you are / he is the policeman.' (Berman & Grosu 1976:271)

If *hu* were a pronoun in this example, the sentence would be ungrammatical, because pronominal *hu* and *hi* have to agree with their antecedent. Second, a topicalized NP is usually separated from the following clause by an intonational break. Since *hu* and *hi* follow the sentence-initial NP without a pause, the initial NP must be the subject rather than a topicalized NP that is resumed by a pronoun. And third, the predicate nominal of an identificational sentence like in (21a) can be

questioned (21b), while it is not possible to question the postverbal NP of a sentence with a topicalized (i.e. left-dislocated) NP as shown in (22).

- (21) a. moše hu xayal.
 Moshe he soldier
 'Moshe is a soldier.' (Berman & Grosu 1976:277)
- b. ma hu moše?
 What he Moshe
 'What is Moshe?' (Berman & Grosu 1976:277)
- (22) a. moše, hu ohev et rivka.
 Moshe, he loves ACC Rivka
 'Moshe, he loves Rivka.' (Berman & Grosu 1976:277)
- b. * et mi moše, hu ohev?
 ACC whom Moshe, he loves
 * 'Who is such that Moshe, he loves her.' (Berman & Grosu 1976:277)

Thus far, I agree with Li and Thompson's analysis that nonverbal copulas are derived from personal pronouns such as *hu* and *hi* in Modern Hebrew. However, I disagree with their claim that a nonverbal copula based on a demonstrative is derived from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. In contrast to their view, I maintain that nonverbal copulas based on demonstratives derive from a predicative demonstrative in a nonverbal clause.

Crucial evidence for my hypothesis comes from Modern Hebrew. Modern Hebrew has not only copulas that are derived from personal pronouns, but also nonverbal copulas that are based on a demonstrative source: *ze* (m), *zot* (f), and *éle* (pl). Like the nonverbal copulas that developed from personal pronouns, the nonverbal copulas that are based on demonstratives are still used with their original function; that is, apart from their usage as copulas, they are still used as demonstratives. If *ze*, *zot*, and *éle* are used as demonstratives, they function either as demonstrative pronouns or as predicative demonstratives. Demonstrative pronouns and predicative demonstratives have the same form, but they differ in their agreement behavior: anaphoric demonstrative pronouns agree in gender and number with a NP of the previous discourse, while predicative demonstrative agree with the predicate nominal that follows. Consider the following examples.

- (23) a. Ten li kasda_i aHéret, ani sane et zot_i.
 give me helmet (f.sg) other I hate ACC this (f.sg)
 'Give me another helmet, I hate this (one).' (Glinert 1989:100)
- b. Zot_i ha-siba_i.
 that (f.sg) the-reason (f.sg)
 'That is the reason.' (Glinert 1989:171)

The demonstrative pronoun *zot* at the end of (23a) agrees with a noun in the preceding clause, while the predicative demonstrative at the beginning of (23b) agrees with the predicate nominal that follows. (24) shows a demonstrative that is used as a copula.

- (24) ha-báyit shelHa zot_i dugma_i tova.
 the-house (m.sg) your is/this (f.sg) example (f.sg) good
 'Your house is a good example.' (Glinert 1989:189)

In this example, the nonverbal copula *zot* does not agree with the preceding subject, *ha-báyit* 'the house', rather it agrees with the predicate nominal, *dugma* 'example', that follows. Since this is parallel to the agreement pattern of the predicative demonstrative in (23b), I conclude that the *zot*-copula is derived from a predicative demonstrative in a nonverbal clause, rather than from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun as previous studies have claimed. (25) shows the mechanism by which a nonverbal copula derives from a predicative demonstrative.

(25) [NP] [PRED-DEM_i NP_i] ⇒ [NP COP_i NP_i]

(25) differs from (18), which shows the development of nonverbal copulas from personal pronouns, in two ways: first, the demonstrative/copula in (25) does not agree with the preceding subject, but rather with the predicate nominal that follows; and second the reanalysis of a predicative demonstrative as a copula occurs in a construction that is formed from two intonation units in discourse, a topical NP and a nonverbal clause that merge into one construction, rather than from a sentence with a topicalized (i.e. left-dislocated) NP.

Additional support for my analysis comes from languages in which predicative demonstratives and demonstrative pronouns have different forms. If there is a nonverbal copula based on a demonstrative in such a language, the nonverbal copula is usually homophonous with the predicative demonstrative in a nonverbal clause, while differing from the demonstrative pronouns. Two examples from Kilba (25) and Ambulas (26) are given below. In both languages the nonverbal copula (25a-26a) has the same form as the predicative demonstrative (25b-26b), while the demonstrative pronouns are phonologically or morphologically different (the forms are given in (6) and (10) above).

- (25) a. *ùsman Kilba ná.*
 Usman Kilba this
 'Usman is a Kilba' (Schuh 1983:321)
- b. *Kàtəŋ ná.*
 sheep this
 'It's a sheep.' (Schuh 1983:318)
- (26) a. *kus mayéra wan kapéredi mu.*
 Sorcery that very.bad thing
 'Sorcery is a very bad thing.' (Wilson 1980:159)
- b. *Wan kiyadé-na kayékni.*
 this who-pos reflection
 'Whose reflection is that.' (Wilson 1980:157)

4. Conclusion

In this paper, I have presented data from a wide variety of languages in which the demonstratives in identificational sentences are phonologically, morphologically and/or syntactically different from demonstrative pronouns. Based on these data, I have argued that many languages have a separate grammatical class of predicative demonstratives that is distinct from demonstrative pronouns. In the second part of this paper, I have shown that predicative demonstratives provide the historical source for the development of certain nonverbal copulas. My analysis challenges previous studies that claimed that nonverbal copulas based on demonstratives derive from an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun.

NOTES

¹ Hengeveld (1992) presents a typology of non-verbal predications, including both predicate nominals and predicate adjectives. My study is confined to sentences with predicate nominals, because most grammars that I consulted do not provide enough information to determine whether the demonstratives in sentences with a predicate adjective are like predicative demonstratives or like the demonstrative pronouns that occur in sentences with a verbal predication.

REFERENCES

- Berman, Ruth A. and Alexander Grosu. 1976. Aspects of the copula in Modern Hebrew. Studies in Modern Hebrew syntax, ed. by Peter Cole, 265-285. North Holland, Amsterdam.
- Calvez, Daniel J. 1993. French reference grammar. Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.
- Carlson, Robert. 1994. A grammar of Supyire. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dayley, Jon D. 1989. Tümpisa (Panamint) Shoshone grammar. Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford: University of California Press.
- Devitt, Dan. 1994. Copula constructions in cross-linguistic and diachronic perspective. Buffalo, NY: SUNY Buffalo dissertation.
- Diessel, Holger. 1997. The diachronic reanalysis of demonstratives in cross-linguistic perspective. Chicago Linguistics Society 33.
- Eid, Mushira. 1983. The copula function of pronouns. *Lingua* 59.197-207.
- Gildea, Spike. 1993. The development of tense markers from demonstrative pronouns in Panare (Cariban). *Studies in Language* 17.53-74.
- Glinert, Lewis. 1989. The grammar of Modern Hebrew. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers, vol. 3, ed. by Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson, and Edith A. Moravcsik, 48-82. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Harris, Alice L. and Lyle Campbell. 1995. Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1980. Nunggubuyu deixis, anaphora, and culture. Chicago Linguistics Society 14.151-166.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1984. Functional grammar of Nunggubuyu. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1992. Non-verbal predication. Theory, typology, description. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1976. Towards a universal definition of 'subject'. Subject and topic, ed. by Charles N. Li, 305-333. New York: Academic Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1982. Thoughts on grammaticalization: a programmatic sketch. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1977. A mechanism for the development of copula morphemes. Mechanisms of syntactic change, ed. by Charles N. Li, 419-444. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Meier, Paul and Inge Meier and John Bendor-Samuel. 1975. A grammar of Izi. A publication of the Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma. Norman.
- Refig, Kenneth L. 1981. Ponapean reference grammar. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.
- Schuh, Russel G. 1983. Kilba equational sentences. *Studies in African Linguistics* 14.311-327.
- Shetter, William Z. 1994. Dutch: an essential grammar. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wilson, Patricia R. 1980. Ambulas grammar. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: Summer Institute of Linguistics. Ukarumpa.
- Woollans, Geoff. 1996. A grammar of Karo Batak, Sumatra. Canberra: The Australian National University.