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### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1st person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADESS</td>
<td>adessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJ</td>
<td>adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverb(ial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>common (gender)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPR</td>
<td>comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEL</td>
<td>delative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAT</td>
<td>elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCL</td>
<td>exclamative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORM</td>
<td>formal/polite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>(respect) honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>(humble) honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILL</td>
<td>illative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTJ</td>
<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MANN  manner (incl. instructive)
N  neuter (gender)
NEG  negative
NR  nominalizer
PASS  passive
PF  perfect
PL  plural
POL  polite
POSS  possessive
POT  potential
PPL  participle
PREC  precative (for request)
PRN  pronoun
PRTV  partitive
PST  past
PTCL  particle
Q  question particle/suffix
QUOT  quotative
RFL  reflexive
SG  singular
SUPESS  superessive
TOP  topic
TRNSL  translative
VOL  volitional
+PROX  proximal to speaker
±PROX  proximal to addressee, non-proximal to speaker
−PROX  non-proximal/distal to speaker and addressee
[ ]  forms according to the semantics of deictically used demonstrative used by the informants
< >  spatial relations between the referent, the speaker and the addressee indicated by demonstrative
=  clitic and suffix boundary
:  morpheme boundary not shown in the L1 text
-  morpheme boundary
.  elements representing lexical and/or grammatical components of a single morpheme
Notes on transcription and Romanization of Japanese words and texts

The system of Romanization adopted in this thesis is a modified Hepburn Romanization System. In this system, moraic nasal is represented as $n$ though the actual pronunciation may vary depending on the consonant that follows. When the moraic nasal is followed by a vowel, an apostrophe is added between the nasal $n$ and the vowel (ex. tan‘i ‘unit, entity’) in order to distinguish it from a mora consisting of a nasal consonant followed by a vowel (ex. tani ‘valley, gorge’). Particles は, へ, を are Romanized as wa, e, o respectively.

Long vowels are marked with a macron. Exceptions are well-known place names such as Tokyo, which with the system described above would otherwise be written as Tōkyō. Regarding long vowels in personal names, especially the ones occurring in references, I follow the Romanization system adopted by Scholarly and Academic Information Navigator (CiNii). If the name is not found in CiNii, I use the form the person concerned has adopted.

Notes on the text examples used in this study

When examples are drawn from the data collected for this study, or taken from the grammar books, the sources are stated. When the source is an informant, it is noted by a code which consists of language name (JP = Japanese, FI = Finnish, SW = Swedish) or institution’s name (AU = Aalto University, FKF = Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan, SU = Stockholm University) together with the informant’s identification number (01–100). Some examples are constructed by the author due to the lack of structurally suitable examples in the data and grammar books. No sources are shown for those examples or for authentic examples that have been overheard in everyday conversations. The constructed examples have been checked with the native speakers of the respective languages.

The examples presented in this study consist basically of 1) the original text in the respective language, 2) morphological glosses (word-for-word translations) and 3) free translations. In the case of Japanese, the original texts are given in both their original Japanese writing and in Romanized form. For the morphological glosses, the principles stated in Eurotype Guidelines and Leipzig Glossing Rules are applied. However, these guidelines and rules are slightly modified to serve the purpose of this thesis. The aim of the morphological glossing is to make the grammatical (morphological) structures of genetically different languages (Japanese, Finnish and Swedish) transparent and comparable. Demonstratives appeared in the examples are, however, as a rule, presented as they are. Other morphological information necessary to illustrate the nature of the demonstratives in each language is given in the glosses, but for the sake of simplicity and readability not all the grammatical morphemes/information are annotated. When detailed grammatical information is not annotated, the closest English transla-
tions are given. Square brackets [ ] are particularly used together with abbreviations \( ^{+}\text{PROX}, ^{-}\text{PROX} \) and \( ^{-}\text{PROX} \) to indicate the forms according to the semantics of the demonstrative (spatial relations between the referent, the speaker and the addressee) stated in the grammars and actually used by the informants. The use of angle brackets \( \langle \rangle \) together with these abbreviations indicates the spatial relations between the referent, the speaker and the addressee given in the situations. If the examples are taken from other sources’ accompanied glosses, they are adjusted to conform to the present glossing system.

Regarding acceptability of the examples, the acceptability of sentences can vary and is noted as ‘*’ and ‘?’, in ascending order of acceptance in terms of either grammaticality or ambiguity of the sentence. That is, ‘*’ indicates unacceptable and ‘?’ indicates questionable.

Notes on glossing and translations
In the morphological glossing, the element of person (first, second, third) is not separated from the preceding element. For instance, Finnish on is copula, third person and it is expressed as ‘\( \text{COP}3 \)’ (singular, active, positive and non-past is not stated because it is default).

If a morpheme in the original language is rendered by two (or more) English alternatives, these are separated by a slash (/).

Free translations may accompany literal translations, and in such cases the latter are marked ‘lit.’ The free translations as well as the literal translations are my own unless otherwise stated. The free translations are intended to be of help for readers to understand the original examples, but they are not necessarily idiomatic since they are meant to provide the information structure of the original texts as far as possible. Parentheses ( ) in free translation denote unexpressed elements.

Notes on language-specific elements in morphological glossing
Below are listed some important points specific to Japanese, Finnish and Swedish.

Japanese
In presenting clauses or sentences in the Latin alphabet, words are separated by spaces. Particles such as case markers are also separated by spaces, but for other particles such as sentence-final particles, hyphens are used. A hyphen may also be used to separate bases in a compound word and to separate morphological elements in verbs. However, only the crucial elements are segmented and glossed for the sake of simplicity and readability.

Japanese verbs inflect for tense, voice, aspect and mood (including polarity). Number and person are not relevant in the glossing of Japanese verbs. In the word-for-word translation, the default is non-past, active, indicative and
positive. Japanese verbs have so-called te-form (て form) which is used as conjunctive and it is stated as gerund (GER). Other elements important for the analysis are annotated when necessary.

As for nouns, Japanese does not have grammatical number, gender, or articles. When singular and plural must be distinguished, classifier/counters are used and their use is annotated. Regarding pronouns, first, second and third-person personal pronouns for animates (basically for humans) are distinguished. As for gender, the third-person personal pronouns distinguish masculine and feminine, and they are translated into English as he and she respectively.

Regarding adjectives, grammatical number, gender or articles are not relevant. There are two types of adjectives distinguished in Japanese: verbal adjectives (also known as i-adjectives) and nominal adjectives (also known as na-adjectives). The attributive and predicative forms are the same for the verbal adjectives, but the forms differ for the nominal adjectives. Both inflect for tense, aspect and mood (including polarity), but they inflect in different ways. The default in the word-for-word translation is non-past and positive and in predicative form.

Further, it is important to note that different degrees of politeness can be expressed by particular verbs, but also by inflection. The verbs for politeness are marked either HON ‘honorific for respect’ or HUN ‘honorific for humbleness’. Politeness expressed by inflection is marked POL ‘polite’. The default is non-polite in the word-for-word translation.

It is also so that Japanese case markers (case particles) are treated as morphemes rather than enclitics in this study.

**Finnish**

Finnish verbs inflect for mood, tense, voice, number and person. For negation, there is a particular negation verb which is accompanied by the main verb. Together, they inflect for mood, tense, voice, number and person. Default in the word-for-word translation is indicative, non-past, active, singular and positive.

As for nouns, Finnish does not distinguish grammatical gender or definiteness. Finnish nouns inflect for case and number. The default is nominative and singular. As for personal pronouns, the use of first-person and second-person personal pronoun for subject is not always obligatory because Finnish verbs are inflected for person and number. Personal pronouns are used to refer to human beings only. For non-human animate entities and inanimate objects, demonstrative pronouns are used. Demonstrative pronouns are also often used to refer to human beings in colloquial Finnish. The third-person personal pronoun does not differentiate gender as English does. For Finnish personal pronouns, person and number are always annotated. Default in the word-for-word translation is nominative and singular.
As for adjectives, they inflect for number and case to agree with the noun that the adjective is modifying. Default is nominative and singular.

**Swedish**

Swedish verbs inflect for tense, voice and mood. The passive voice is also formed by an inflected verb together with an auxiliary. Person, number and gender are not relevant to describe Swedish verbs and they are not stated unless otherwise necessary. Negation is formed by an adverb for negation. Default in the word-for-word translation is non-past, active and indicative.

Nouns in Swedish distinguish two grammatical genders, common and neuter, which determine the forms of the indefinite and definite articles. Swedish nouns inflect for number and definiteness and the default in the word-for-word translation is singular and indefinite. Grammatical gender is annotated only when necessary. The genitive is formed by adding the suffix –s to the nouns and it is annotated. As for personal pronouns, first, second and third-person personal pronouns are distinguished. First and second person personal pronouns are inflected for number and case (ex. genitive: GEN, accusative: ACC). The third-person personal pronoun is further divided by gender, and masculine, feminine, common and neuter are distinguished. The masculine and feminine third-person personal pronouns inflect for number and case. The common and neuter third-person personal pronouns inflect for number. The default is singular and nominative.

Swedish adjectives inflect for number, grammatical gender and definiteness, to agree with the subject and the head noun. Numbers, gender and definiteness are noted only when necessary.

**A note on the use of the third-person personal pronoun in the singular she**

I use the feminine form *she* to refer to any person whose gender is unknown and when I find no reason to state a gender. The exception is that in referring to the informants who play a role of the person given in the Discourse Completion Tasks, they are referred to with the gender of the character they are playing, regardless of the informants’ real gender.
1. Introduction

1.1. Background and aim of this study

The aim of this thesis is twofold: 1) to investigate and analyze the actual use of spatial-deictic demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and 2) to investigate and analyze interlanguage, the ‘learners’ language’ of Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese regarding their use of Japanese spatial-deictic demonstratives in the light of native speakers’ use. Japanese demonstratives are sometimes called ko-so-a words. They are sets of referring expressions with initial mora ko-, so-, a-, which gives an approximate meaning of proximal ‘this’, medial ‘it/that’ and distal ‘that over there’ respectively. In the studies of Japanese language acquisition as a second language (L2), demonstratives are said to be difficult to learn (Sakai 1987; Moriya 1992; Niimura 1992; An 1996; Sakoda 2001; Sun 2008) and learners’ confusion between medial so-series and distal a-series has been reported (cf. Niimura 1992; An 1996; Sakoda 2001 etc.). The present thesis attempts to describe the interlanguage regarding learners’ use of Japanese demonstratives, particularly spatial deictically used demonstratives (ko-, so- and a-series), by identifying cross-linguistic influence (also known as transfer) by referring to the native data, that is, native speakers’ actual use of demonstratives. The present study also focuses on the role of teaching materials. By doing so, the author intends to shed some light on the learners’ acquisition process of deictically used Japanese demonstratives in the post-secondary education context.

As a teacher of Japanese, the author has had opportunities to observe learners’ “errors.” For example, it has been observed that learners use the so-series to point out a certain thing or person visible but located away from

---

1 Mora is a minimum sound unit in Japanese. As a unit of metrical time, it corresponds to the duration of a short syllable (cf. Brown 2006; OED 2014). Phonologically, it is realized as one of the following: i) (C)V, ii) the first part of a long consonant, and iii) nasal /n/ (Tsujimura 2013, 66).

2 The term L2 (second language) is used here to refer to any language other than the first language (L1), thus including the term foreign language.

3 This use is also called exophoric use (e.g. in Diessel 2006a; b) and situational use (e.g. in Himmelmann 1996)

4 The term “error(s) (by learners)” is used here to mean “observable divergence or deviation from standard and accepted use of language.”
themselves in the discourse context where the use of the a-series would be preferable. Example 1-1 shows that the speaker (a Swedish-speaking learner of Japanese) used *sono (hito)* ‘it/that (person)’ to point out the referent (a person) present and visible in the discourse context, located away from the speaker herself. The referent was to be mentioned (pointed out) for the first time in this context and, to mention and/or to point out someone in such context, the use of the a-series such as *ano (hito)* ‘that (person)’ would be preferable.

Example 1-1

? その 人 見て
sono person look:GER

‘Look at the* person’

Another commonly observed case is, as Example 1-2 shows, that learners use the demonstrative *ano ‘that/those’ where the demonstratives *sono ‘it/they’ or *kono ‘this/these’ are preferable. Example 1-2 is a part of a Japanese composition written by a Swedish-speaking learner. In this example, *ano (futari) ‘that/those (two-person)’ was used in order to refer to ‘the two influential men’ mentioned in the previous sentence. However, within the context of Japanese language education, the use of *ano ‘that/those’ in this context is regarded as incorrect; the correct demonstratives should be *sono ‘it/they/these’ or *kono ‘this/these’ (cf. Sakoda 2001).

Example 1-2

昨日
kinō yesterday

二つ*の(sic) 有力な
futatsu* no (sic) yūryōkuna

男の人が
otokonohito ga

握手しました。
akushu-shimashita influential:ATT

あの*
ano*

二人は
futari wa

two (person) TOP

*Yesterday, two influential men met and shook hand. Those* two are Masayuki Naoshima and Masamitsu Sakurai.*

The author has been interested in such errors, or rather, *divergences* from the standard and/or accepted use of the native speakers that occur in the learners’ use of demonstratives. This dissertation project started off with an interest in seeking possible explanations for the learners’ divergences concerning both deixically and anaphorically used5 so-series and a-series. The author’s observations are that the learners use the so-series where the a-series is re-

5 This use is also called tracking use (e.g. Himmelmann 1996).
quired (or at least preferable) when it comes to deictically used demonstratives (as shown in Example 1-1), and they use the a-series where the so-series is required or at least preferable to anaphorically used demonstratives (as shown in Example 1-2). Why do learners do so? Is it due to cross-linguistic influence (transfer), owing to structural (typological) differences regarding demonstrative systems between the two languages? That while the demonstratives in the target language, Japanese, have a three-way contrast, ko-so-a regarding the relative distance from the deictic center to the referent, the demonstratives in the learners’ native language, Swedish, have a two-way contrast, proximal den här and distal den där? Or is it a part of the natural course of learning that all second language learners, irrespective of their native languages, go through? Or are there any other factors that constrain the learners’ use of demonstratives? The learners’ “errors” can occur in both deictically and anaphorically used demonstratives, and “errors” may also occur in other uses, such as in discourse deictic use and recognitional use. However, in this study, the focus is on spatial-deictically used demonstratives since demonstratives are considered by nature to be deictic (Bühler 1990 [1934]; Lyons 1977, 646; Diessel 2006a, 430; 2012b, 2408) and the deictic use of demonstratives is considered to be basic or prototypical (Levinson 1983, 54; 2004, 108; Diessel 2006a; b). Below, the term demonstrative(s) is used to refer to spatial-deictically used demonstrative(s), unless otherwise noted.

To be able to make a reliable claim about cross-linguistic influence, Jarvis (2000a, 245) argues that the collected data should meet at least two, preferably three of the following criteria: (1) intra-group homogeneity, (2) inter-group heterogeneity and (3) similarities between the native language and interlanguage performance. In an attempt to identify possible cross-linguistic influence on the learners’ use of spatial-deictic demonstratives, two investigations were therefore conducted; one investigation was conducted on native speakers of Japanese, Finnish and Swedish regarding their use of demonstratives in their respective languages to yield the native speakers’ data (native data). Another investigation was conducted on the learners, that is, Finnish-speaking learners and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese, regarding the use of Japanese demonstratives to yield the learners’ data (learner data). Regarding the learner informants, the Finnish-speaking learner informants were recruited from two different institutions, thus constituting two groups. These two institutions are Aalto University (AU) and Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan (FKF). The Swedish-speaking learner informants were recruited from Stockholm University (SU). Since the learners from FKF and SU follow the same course syllabus for Japanese studies and the learners

---

6 Diessel (2011).
7 Terminology used by, for example, Himmelmann (1996), Diessel (1999; 2006a).
from AU follow their own, the effect of differences in teaching methods and material was also assessed.

Both the native data and the learner data were collected in written form, elicited by pictures and photographs as stimuli. The learner data were then compared with the native data of the respective language and the Japanese native data. As this thesis attempts to describe the interlanguage of Finnish-speaking learners and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese regarding the use of demonstratives, the study sought to discover any similarities and/or differences between i) the learners’ use and the Japanese native speakers’ use of Japanese demonstratives, and ii) the learners’ use of Japanese demonstratives and the native speakers’ use of demonstratives. Specifically, the study was guided by the following questions and hypotheses.

Research Question 1: What similarities or differences are found between the native informant groups, Japanese (JP), Finnish (FI) and Swedish (SW), regarding the use of demonstratives in the respective languages and in the given situations?

Research Question 2: What similarities or differences are found between the learner groups, the Finnish-speaking groups (AU from Aalto University and FKF from Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan) and the Swedish-speaking group (SU from Stockholm University), regarding the use of Japanese demonstratives in the given situations?

Research Question 3: In relation to Research Question 2, what similarities or differences are found between the learners’ use of demonstratives in Japanese and the use of demonstratives in their respective native languages? What kinds of relations can be established between them?

Research Question 4: What similarities or differences are found between the learners and the native Japanese speakers regarding their use of Japanese demonstratives and what kinds of relations can be established between them?

Research Question 5: Is it possible to relate the learners’ use of Japanese demonstratives to similarities or differences in teaching materials and methods?

These research questions can be illustrated as shown in Figure 1-1. As seen, Research Question 1 (Q1) deals with the comparison between the native use of demonstrative in the respective languages (JP, FI and SW), and Research Question 2 (Q2) deals with the comparison between the learners’ (AU, FKF and SU) use of demonstratives in Japanese. Research Question 3 (Q3) deals
with a comparison of the learners’ use of Japanese demonstratives and the native use of deictic demonstratives in FI and SW. Research Question 4 (Q4) deals with a comparison between the learners’ use and the native use of deictic demonstratives in Japanese. Finally, Research Question 5 (Q5) deals with the impact of teaching materials.

At the onset of the study, the overall hypothesis was that, based on the observations in previous studies, typological (structural) similarities between Japanese, Finnish and Swedish would play some role in both the native informants’ use of demonstratives in their respective languages and the learner informants’ use of demonstratives in Japanese.

It was then hypothesized that Japanese native informants and Finnish native informants might show some kind of similarity in their usage patterns (which demonstratives to be used in a certain situation) which is different from Swedish native informants’ usage patterns, because Japanese and Finnish share typological similarities regarding the number of deictic contrasts expressed by the demonstratives; Japanese and Finnish demonstrative systems have a three-way deictic contrast. On the other hand, the Swedish demonstrative system has a two-way deictic contrast, so the Swedish native speaker group might show its own particular pattern.

In a similar manner, it was also hypothesized that the Finnish-speaking learner groups (AU and FKF) might show some common ways of using Japanese demonstratives that differed from the Swedish-speaking learner group (SU) because of the Finnish demonstratives’ typological similarity to Japanese demonstratives. Swedish demonstratives, on the other hand, are
more typologically distanced from Japanese demonstratives, so the Swedish-speaking learner group may show another way of using Japanese demonstratives (cf. Cenoz 2001, see Section 3.3.1). Further, the typological similarities between Japanese and Finnish might facilitate the Finnish-speaking groups (AU and FKF) to learn Japanese demonstratives and they might show more target language-like (Japanese) usage in the given situations.

It was also hypothesized that similarities and/or differences regarding the ways in which Japanese was taught, such as the methods and materials used to teach grammar in the three institutions AU, FKF and SU, might have an effect on the differences or similarities in the learners’ use of demonstratives. If there was such an impact from education, the Finnish-speaking learner group FKF and the Swedish-speaking learner group SU would show some similarities in their use, since these two institutions follow the same syllabus and AU, another Finnish-speaking learner group, might show some differences.

In contrast to all the above statements, there are previous studies which suggest that the learners might make the same types of errors irrespective of their native language (cf. Sakoda 2001), and contradictorily enough, this means that no particular differences would be found among all the learner groups.

By addressing these research questions, this thesis attempts to elucidate the native use of demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and the learners’ use of demonstratives in Japanese. The approach adopted to carry out the study can be characterized as typologically oriented.

1.2. Structure of the thesis

This thesis consists of eight chapters. The present chapter, Chapter 1, introduces the study and presents its aim and purpose. It also gives the outline of the dissertation.

Chapters 2 and 3 provide theoretical frameworks for the thesis. Chapter 2 reviews deixis and deictically used demonstratives. Sections 2.1 and 2.2 deal with general issues concerning deixis, and Section 2.3 discusses the characteristics of deictically used demonstratives. These sections are followed by the description and comparison of deictically used demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish (Section 2.4). The description and comparison are typologically oriented. Chapter 3 reviews the issues regarding interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence in the third language (L3) learning environment. It begins with terminological issues (Section 3.1), which is followed by a review of interlanguage (Section 3.2–3.4) in which research on the interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence in relation to this thesis is discussed. The Chapter closes with implications for this study (Section 3.5)
The purpose of Chapter 4 is to give an overview of previous studies regarding contrastive studies on demonstratives between Japanese and other languages, namely English, Chinese, Turkish and Thai (Section 4.1) and the acquisition of Japanese demonstratives (Section 4.2).

The data used in this study and the method employed for analysis are discussed in Chapter 5. This chapter begins with an overview of the data and presentation of the instrument. The data investigated in the study comprise two parts. One is the native speaker informants’ data regarding the use of demonstratives in their respective languages, Japanese, Finnish and Swedish. The other is the learner’ data concerning the use of Japanese demonstratives collected from Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese. The data are cross-sectional and the method used in the analysis is both qualitative and quantitative, and typologically oriented. The native speaker informants’ data are presented and discussed in Chapter 6 and the learners’ data, in comparison with the native data, are presented and discussed in Chapter 7 in order to identify cross-linguistic influences.

In Chapter 8, the most important findings from Chapter 6 and 7 are discussed and the overall conclusion is drawn. The implications of the present study are also discussed and suggestions for further research are made.
2. Deixis and deictically used demonstratives

One of the central aims of the present thesis is to investigate Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners’ use of spatial-deictic demonstratives in the light of native speakers’ use of demonstratives; this chapter will account for the issues relevant to the key notions deixis and deictically used demonstratives. Sections 2.1–2.3 summarizes what has been discussed about deixis and demonstratives⁸ as deictic expressions: the ways in which demonstratives are dealt with in Japanese, Finnish, Swedish (Section 2.4). The chapter concludes with a summary (Section 2.5).

2.1. Deixis

The term deixis (adj. deictic) has its origin in the Greek word for “showing” or “pointing” and it may be simply explained as “indication, pointing out” in dictionaries (e.g. the Online Oxford English Dictionary). In linguistics, it primarily concerns “the way in which the reference of certain elements in a sentence is determined in relation to a specific speaker and addressee and a specific time and place of utterance” (Matthews 2007), and the term deixis has also been used to refer to the characteristics of such linguistic elements whose interpretation and understanding are heavily dependent on the context of utterance at the time of the speech event (cf. Levinson 1983, 54; 1994, 853). Any linguistic expressions or elements that have functions to bring about such an effect can be called deictic expressions, or simply, deictics. In natural language, deixis is pervasive and its context-dependent nature (also called indexicality) raises important issues about semantics and communicative interaction between the speech participants (cf. Diessel 2012b, Chapter 90). It is also considered critical for our ability to learn a language (Levinson 2004, 97).

In English, typical examples of deixis can be found in the form of personal pronouns such as *I*, temporal adverbs such as *now*, spatial adverbs such as *here/there*, and demonstratives such as *this/that*. These correspond to the three categories (also called deictic parameters) normally distinguished within deixis: person “I,” time “now” and place/space “here/there.”

---

⁸I use demonstrative as a general term covering demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adjectives (including determiners) and demonstrative adverbs.
“this/that.” In addition, the categories discourse deixis and social deixis may also be distinguished. Discourse deixis is about reference to certain parts of an ongoing discourse, either previously mentioned or a forthcoming one, expressed by, for example, “the previous” and “the next.” Social deixis deals with expressions that mark social relationships between the discourse participants, for example in Swedish the second-person plural pronoun ni can be used as a honorific, the courteous second-person singular. (See even Section 2.2.)

2.1.1. Traditional view on deixis

Basic semantics

Much of the present view on deixis can be attributed to Bühler’s ([1934] 1990) work Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. According to Bühler, any person who is awake, “is oriented in a given situation of actual perception” (Bühler [1934] 1990, 143), and “all sensory data that come to him are inscribed in an order, a coordinate system” (ibid., 143). Bühler calls this coordinate system deictic field and he postulates that the origin of the coordinate system is typically what the deictic expressions here, now and I point to. The speaker who utters here, now and I is the zero-point in the coordinate system (deictic field) called origo. The origo of deixis is thus the speaker. On the premise that deixis is about pointing/indicating (differentiating it from naming), it is viewed as a phenomenon of pointing/indicating organized around the speaker as a zero-point (or deictic center as Bühler calls it) occurring within a deictic field. As the zero-point (the deictic center) for the coordinate system is determined by the speaker’s position, it changes according to the location of the speaker at the time of the speech event (cf. Bühler [1934] 1990, 119).

Bühler ([1934] 1990) further claims that there is one deictic field in language (ibid., 94); in other words, deixis is egocentric in his view. However, modes of pointing are various and they operate on different levels. These levels are: (i) perceptual (ocular), which is concerned with reference to elements in the ongoing discourse, (ii) imaginative, which is concerned with reference to fictional worlds, and (iii) textual (anaphoric), which is concerned with reference to textual/linguistic elements (ibid., Ch. 8). In Bühler’s view on deixis, the speaker is the only deictic center (zero-point), and by virtue of being the speaker, she (= the speaker) casts herself in the...
role of ego and relates everything to her viewpoint (cf. Lyons 1977, 638). Thus egocentricity is a key point and fundamental characteristic in Bühler’s view on deixis, and this view is often referred to as an egocentric view of deixis. The egocentric view has been predominant in the literature of deixis, and it is therefore often referred to as a traditional (Green 1995, 9) or standard (Jones 1995, 27) account.

Alternative view
In contrast with the standard account of deixis, Jones (1995, 47) argues for an alternative view. He claims that the words (terms) I, here, now are purely relational and gain their values only by their opposition to other terms such as you, there, then etc. (ibid., 33); there is thus no speaker unless there is simultaneously a hearer/addressee. According to this view, we cannot determine the dimensions of a “center” and fix its position without establishing the dimensions and location of a “periphery” (ibid.). Jones also points out a difficulty in pinning down the meaning of “now”; “now” may be defined as “the moment of utterance” (cf. Lyons 1977, 638), but how long is “now” actually and what determines its length (Jones 1995, 34)? In the same manner, he points out that pinning down the meaning of “here” is quite difficult (ibid.). Jones’ claim here is that it is futile to attempt to determine I-here-now or any deictic expressions only by sensory clues independent of the purpose of the communicative participants. His argument is that “there are no deictic expressions which do not assume for their interpretation a social context of intentional action” (ibid., 35). In his view, it is a social interaction that constitutes and structures the deictic field and gives meaning to sensory clues. Jones describes the nature of deixis as sociocentric.

2.1.2. Deixis and indexicality
Deixis can be characterized by its context dependency. The context-dependent feature of language is also called indexicality and context-dependent expressions indexicals. The terms indexicality and indexicals have been used especially in the philosophical approach to the deixis attributed to C.S. Peirce’s introduction of these terms (cf. Levinson 1994, 854; 2004, 97; Corazza 2006, 593). The terms deixis and indexicality are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature. In the present study, I would like to make a distinction, following Levinson (2004, 97), by treating indexicality as “broader phenomena of contextual dependency” and deixis as “narrower linguistically relevant aspects of indexicality.” However, the terms indexicality and indexicals may be used in this thesis to refer to other source texts.

Deixis and indexicality have been of interest to both linguists and philosophers because they raise some interesting questions about “the nature of
meaning” in natural languages and about the relations of semantics and pragmatics (cf. Levinson 1994, 853). On the one hand, deixis is known for its contextual dependency, and on the other hand, within formal semantics and philosophical approaches to language, language expressions (including deixis) have been considered to disembvy into invariant, context-free elements that can build a (disembodied) representational system, independent of current circumstances (cf. Levinson 2004, 97–98; Diessel 2012b, 2409). Deictic expressions are indeed not devoid of lexical meaning (semantic meaning, or, borrowing Bühler’s term, “symbolic meaning”) (cf. Green 1995, 12) and Levinson notes that “it is the constancy of lexical meanings, together with invariant rules of sentential composition, that are normally taken to be the principles that allow us to generate unlimited numbers of sentences, and yet still understand associated meanings” (Levinson 1994, 854). However, statements that contain deictics such as I am hungry and It’s Monday today cannot be assigned truth value without context and this means that they cannot be understood “properly” without context. The recent view of deixis is that it is “fundamentally grounded in our bodily experience and situated interactions between the interlocutors” (Diessel 2012, 2409) and that the use of deictics “presupposes a theory-of-mind that enables the communicative partners to adopt the perspective of another person” (ibid.). I agree with the traditional view that deixis is basically egocentric in describing the use of deictics in situations with no apparent addressee, that is, situations not necessarily requiring a social context for their meaningful interpretation, for example in situations where the speaker is talking to herself. However, even in situations where the speaker is talking to herself, there is actually an addressee who happens to be the speaker. To capture the intricate nature of deixis, I see more merits in Jones’ view of deixis that the nature of deixis is sociocentric, and that it should be studied by taking a pragmatic approach.

2.2. Deictic categories

In the literature, deictic expressions are usually considered to constitute grammatical categories based on the type of reference: person deixis, time deixis, and place/space deixis. Person deixis involves reference to i) speech participants, that is, the speaker (Bühler’s origo, deictic center) and the ad-

---

11 Note also that Kaplan (1989) distinguishes two different kinds of indexical: pure indexicals and true demonstratives. In his opinion I and today are pure indexicals whose reference and content are determined partly by themselves; i.e., the reference of ‘I’ is always the speaker of the actual utterance and ‘today’ is the day on which the actual utterance is made.

12 Even if deictic expressions are given lexical meaning such as I to be “the person who is saying this,” then all such deictics may involve token-reflexivity, i.e., refer to themselves; I means then “the who is uttering this token of the word I” (cf. Levinson 1983, 57; Corazza 2006, 593–594).
dressee, usually indicated by the first and second-person personal pronouns *I* and *you* respectively, but also reference to ii) non-speech participants, indicated, for example, by a third-person personal pronoun such as *he*. Time deixis involves reference to a temporal reference point, relative to the time of the speech event, such as *now* and *then*. Place/space deixis involves reference to a spatial location, relative to the moment of utterance, such as *here* and even certain objects and persons indicated by *this*/*that* (e.g. Lyons 1977 chap.15; Levinson 1983, 68–94; Anderson and Keenan 1985, 259). Further, as mentioned, discourse deixis and social deixis are also distinguished (Levinson 1983, 68–94; 1994, 855–57; Fillmore 1997, 61; Sidnell 2005).

Discourse deixis concerns reference to parts of an ongoing discourse, either previously mentioned or a forthcoming one, expressed by, for example, *the previous*, *aforementioned* and *the next*, *the following* (cf. Levinson 1994, 856; Diessel 2012b, 2414). Social deixis is involved with expressions that mark social relations between the discourse participants, for example in Finnish and Swedish, the second-person plural pronouns (*te* and *ni* respectively) can be used as honorifics, the courteous second-person singular. In Japanese, there are also two expressions for the second person singular: *omae*, casual ‘*you*’, and *anata* courteous ‘*you*’. Table 2-1 summarizes the deictic categories based on the types of reference with examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person deixis</td>
<td><em>I</em>, <em>you</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place/space deixis</td>
<td><em>here</em>, <em>there</em>, <em>this</em>, <em>that</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time deixis</td>
<td><em>now</em>, <em>then</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse deixis</td>
<td><em>the latter</em>, <em>the former</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social deixis</td>
<td><em>omae</em> (<em>you</em>; casual), <em>anata</em> (<em>you</em>; polite) in Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is also another category, empathetic deixis, discussed in Lyons (1977, 677) and Rauh (1983, 40). Empathetic deixis is concerned with expressions which distinguish (psychological) degrees of distance and thereby relate to emotional domains. For instance, the use of English *this* in certain contexts may indicate psychological closeness to the referent compared to what *that* indicates (cf. Lyons 1977, 677; Rauh 1983, 40).

Somewhat different categorizations are proposed in Green (1995) and Diessel (2012b). While the previously mentioned categories involve semantic distinctions based on referent types, Green and Diessel take pragmatic

---

13 Note that *person* here is not same as the speech participants (cf. Diessel 1999, 36).
14 Lyons (1977, 667) calls it textual deixis.
15 Translations into English shown here are not exhaustive; *omae* can also imply intimate/masculine and *anata*, intimate/feminine.
dimensions (in the case of Green, also syntactic dimensions) into consideration (cf. Diessel 2012b, 2414). The categories proposed by Green (1995, 21–22) are (i) Referential deixis, (ii) Origo-deixis, (iii) Spatio-temporal deixis, (iv) Subjective deixis, (v) Discourse deixis, and (vi) Syntactic deixis. Referential deixis includes deictics whose function is to refer, such as demonstratives. Origo-deixis includes first and second-person pronouns and vocatives. Subjective deixis includes terms which encode the subjective experience of the encoder, particularly, epistemic and deontic modal verbs. Discourse deixis includes elements which orientate between the text itself and the interlocutors (both the encoder and the addressee), for example, spatial (place) and temporal expressions. Concerning syntactic deixis, Green claims that deixis operates within a certain syntactic frame and in his opinion, certain syntactic forms, such as interrogatives and imperatives (used without other pragmatic activity), may be used for deictics.

Diessel (2012b, Ch. 90) considers that the distinctions made in the conventional categories ignore differences in their pragmatic use (i.e., communicative functions), and he proposes a division of deictics into two basic types: participant deixis and object deixis (Diessel 2012b, 2414). In his opinion, participant deixis is concerned with deictic phenomena “related to the speech participants” (ibid.), which include traditional categories of person and social deixis. In his opinion, object deixis concerns “deictic phenomena that involve a referential link to elements of the situational or discourse context” (ibid.). This includes traditional categories of place, time and discourse deixis. Diessel (2012b) is not against using existing, traditional terms like person, place, time, discourse and social deixis; what he is proposing here is a new classification based on the pragmatic functions.

In the present study, my focus is on demonstratives, and as mentioned, these are primarily spatial (place) deixis. As a matter of fact, demonstratives, especially demonstrative adverbs, are potentially regarded as the most central kind of spatial deixis (cf. Anderson and Keenan 1985, 277; Levinson 2004, 116).

2.3. Demonstratives as deictic expressions

Demonstratives are a group of expressions which usually includes certain pronouns, adjectives (including determiners) and adverbs. English this, that, here, there are typical examples. Their syntactic distribution can be pronominal, adnominal and adverbial.\(^{17}\) Demonstratives are considered to be deictic (e.g. Bühler 1990; Lyons 1977, 646; Diessel 1999, 35; 2006, 430; 2012b, 17)

\(^{17}\) In addition to pronominal, adnominal, and adverbial demonstratives, a particular class of demonstratives in copular or nonverbal clauses is distinguished in many languages (cf. Diessel 1999, 2006).
Even though other uses such as anaphoric use with a referring-back function and recognitional use with a reminding function are acknowledged as pragmatic properties of demonstratives; deictic use to establish joint attention is regarded as the prototypical one (Levinson 1983, 54; 2004, 108; Diessel 2006;). A present-day view of demonstratives is that they constitute a part of grammatical categories, and the term deixis is used with a much broader sense. Hence, demonstratives are considered to be deictic in nature, but deictic expressions are not necessarily demonstratives (cf. Lyons 1977, 637; Kryk 1987). For instance, we have seen that the deictic category in general includes person deixis such as the personal pronoun *I*, and time deixis such as the temporal adverb *today*. According to the deictic category presented in Table 2-1, the demonstratives *this/that* are classified as space deixis. However, any referring expression can be used deictically as long as a direct referential link between language and context is established (Levinson 2004, 101; Diessel 2012b, 2408), but we can differentiate deictics from deictically used expressions.

Demonstratives are considered to be genuine deictics and they can be combined with other non-deictic linguistic elements (e.g. content words) to be regarded as being in “deictic use.” Following Levinson (2004, 103; 106), Diessel (2012b, 2408) describes deictic expressions as “linguistic elements with built-in contextual parameters that must be specified by aspects of the discourse context,” and this description can also be applied to demonstratives. Compared to the previously mentioned personal pronoun *I* (person deixis) and the temporal adverb *today* (time deixis), whose uses do not require any additional accompanying indication, understanding or coding of demonstratives. *this* and *that* (spatial deixis) in their canonical use depend heavily on an extra-linguistic context of utterance at the time of the speech event. We may thus claim that demonstratives are considered to be the most context-dependent, or context sensitive among the various deictics.

---

18 As stated in the footnote 11, *this* and *that* are so-called true demonstratives, which are differentiated from so-called pure indexicals such as ‘*I*’ and ‘*today*’ (Kaplan 1989). Kaplan (ibid.) includes ‘*here*’ and ‘*now*’ in his list of pure indexicals, but this is rather problematic since concerning ‘*here,*’ even though every utterance of ‘*here*’ refers (automatically) to a spatial location that includes the location of the speaker, in reality the extent of the spatial location can vary from utterance to utterance, and even concerning ‘*now,*’ similar remarks can be made; i.e., even though an utterance of ‘*now*’ refers to a moment when the speaker makes an utterance, in reality the reference (and the content) may vary depending on the speech situation.
2.3.1. Characteristics of reference by demonstratives

Deictic contrast and semantics
Demonstratives are considered to be universal and all languages are said to have one or more demonstratives (Diessel 1999; 2006a; b; 2012b; Dixon 2003). Since demonstratives are deictic expressions, their deictic center constitutes the center of a relative frame of reference. The characteristic of this relative frame of reference is that it presupposes a viewpoint provided by the speaker (in some cases, even the addressee) as a center. According to Diessel (2012b, 2411) this relative frame of reference must be distinguished from two other reference frames for spatial orientation: the intrinsic frame of reference and the absolute frame of reference. The intrinsic frame of reference involves an object-centered coordinate system determined by the inherent orientation of an object or person (the location of the referent is defined in relation to a part of another object) and it is typically triggered by prepositional expressions such as in front of, or behind in English (cf. Diessel 2012b, 2411; Levinson 2003, 36–40). An absolute frame of reference involves a system in which the location of the referent is defined in relation to fixed bearings such as four cardinal directions, or certain landmarks in the environment, such as a mountain or a river, in other words, typically a geographical location (Diessel 2012b, 2411; Levinson 2003, 47–48). For example, as shown in Figure 2-1, the referent in the intrinsic frame of reference, the referent (parking/chūsha-jō) is defined in terms of the inherent, front-back (behind) orientation of the bookstore/hon-ya.

Figure 2-1 Example of a relative frame of reference, based on Diessel (2012b) and Levinson (2003).

In the system of absolute frames of reference, the referent bookstore/hon-ya is defined in terms of fixed direction, that is, compass bearings. The deictic center (say, a speaker) and thus the speaker’s perspective, is not involved in

---

19 Levinson (2004, 112) views this as questionable. However, he considers that deictic categories have an universality independent of their grammatical expression.
these two expressions for spatial orientation. Demonstratives as genuine deictics, require a deictic center and the speaker’s perspective for their interpretation, as seen in Figure 2-2. In this example, the location of the referent (bookstore/hon-ya) is defined in relation to the deictic center (the location of the speaker). As deictic expressions, demonstratives are considered to indicate the relative distance of the referent provided in the speech situation in relation to the deictic center, which is the speaker’s location at the time of the utterance (Diessel 1999, 36; 2006a, 430).

![Figure 2-2 Intrinsic frame of reference and absolute frame of reference, based on Diessel (2012b) and Levinson (2003).](image)

In cross-linguistic studies, demonstratives have often been described and studied in terms of their form (morphology), distribution (syntax), reference (semantics) or functions (pragmatics) (cf. Diessel 1999; 2006a; Dixon 2003), and the reference (semantics) is probably the area, which has particularly interested researchers. In the following, I will briefly describe how the reference (semantics) and the function (pragmatics) of demonstratives are discussed in the cross-linguistic studies.

All languages are said to have one or more demonstratives that indicate locations of the referent at two different points on a distance scale, proximal (near) and distal (far) in relation to the deictic center. Thus they show a deictic contrast between a proximal and a distal referent (Diessel 1999, 2; 2006a, 431). Note that the attributes proximal and distal are not used with an absolute sense of distance since the deictic center and the speech situation are conceptual (Diessel 2012b, 2410). The spatial (distance) features (i.e., proximal and distal) indicated by demonstratives are called *deictic features* and are one of two basic types of semantic features belonging to demonstratives.
English, for example, has two demonstrative forms which express a distance contrast between proximal this and distal that. There are some languages which employ demonstratives that do not indicate a distance/spatial contrast, such as German das and French ce. However, in these languages, a deictic contrast between proximal and distal is indicated by combining spatial adverbs (cf. Diessel 2006a, 430). Anderson and Keenan (1985, 279) state that spatial deictic notions are expressed in various parts of speech, but they consider that adverbs (locative adverbs in their terms) are most central. They also consider that demonstrative adjectives (determiners) and demonstrative pronouns express primarily the spatial deictic notion.

There are a number of languages that employ more than two distinct demonstrative terms in order to express distance contrasts. For example, Spanish, Japanese and Korean have a three-way spatial contrast, and Somali (spoken in Somalia) and Hausa (spoken in Nigeria) have a four-way contrast, expressed by three and four demonstrative terms respectively (see below).

Anderson and Keenan (1985, 280–295) distinguish between different systems of spatial deictics (i.e., systems of distance contrast) expressed by demonstratives. They do so according to the number of terms used for a primary dimension of distance from the speaker and other additional cross-classifying dimensions that they identified in a number of languages that they studied. (We may call these terms spatial deictic terms.) The systems they identified are: (1) one-term systems, (2) two-term systems, (3) three-term systems and (4) systems with more than three terms, in which the number of terms (normally) reflects the number of deictic contrasts. The majority of languages have a two-term system that is related to proximity to the speaker and non-proximity to the speaker, and there are a fair number of languages which employ three-term systems (Diessel 2006a, 431; Dixon 2003, 86). The three-term systems can be further divided into two types: type (a) that distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) mid-distance

---

20 Another semantic feature of demonstrative is called non-deictic features, which provide classificatory information about the referent, for instance gender and numbers (Diessel 1999, 35; 2012b, 2419).

21 Since das is non-contrastive in terms of distance, one might question whether it is a genuine demonstrative; it may be more a definite article than a demonstrative. However, Diessel considers das to be demonstrative by claiming that its pragmatic functions are to focus or manipulate the addressee’s attention to certain entities in the speech situation (a fundamental function of demonstratives). According to Diessel, definite articles (or markers) do not have this function.

22 Spatial adverbs are also called local/locational adverbs.

23 Note that the number of distance contrasts and the number of demonstrative (deictic) terms are not necessarily the same.

24 Grammatical class, which is generally distinguishable from the rest of the lexicon of the language (Anderson and Keenan 1985, 280).
to speaker and (iii) distal to speaker,\textsuperscript{25} and type (b) that distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee and (iii) non-proximal to speaker/addressee. Type (a) is sometimes referred to as \textit{distance-oriented systems}, and type (b) as \textit{person-oriented systems} (cf. Anderson and Keenan 1985, 284; Diessel 1999, 50).

Owing to the terms distance-oriented and person-oriented, we might get the impression that these two types are used according to two different systems or principles. However, while in distance-oriented systems, the deictic center, roughly, corresponds to the location of the speaker (i.e., it is the only point of reference to indicate the location of the referent), in person-oriented systems, the location of the addressee is also assigned to serve as a point of reference in addition to the deictic center (Diessel 1999, 50).\textsuperscript{26} Levinson (2004, 109) refers to (a) as \textit{speaker-anchored} (systems) and (b) \textit{speaker/addressee-anchored} (systems). Thus, in both types, demonstratives are characterized in terms of a relative, deictic contrast of distance in relation to the deictic center and to the referent.

Regarding the languages studied in the present thesis, the learners’ target language Japanese is considered to have demonstratives with a three-term system which distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee and (iii) non-proximal to speaker/addressee (what Levinson 2004 called a speaker/addressee-anchored system). Swedish is considered to have a two-term system, which has a two-way deictic contrast between (i) proximal to speaker and (ii) non-proximal to speaker/addressee (i.e. a speaker-anchored system). Finnish is rather problematic. Traditionally, Finnish demonstratives have been described as having a three-term system, but concerning deictic contrast, researchers are not in agreement; we find both type (a) that distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) mid-distance to speaker, (iii) distal to speaker (i.e., a speaker-anchored system),\textsuperscript{27} and type (b) that distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee and (iii) non-proximal to speaker/addressee (i.e., a speaker/addressee-anchored system) in different descriptions of Finnish demonstratives.

It should be mentioned that there are also some linguists who consider the contrasts between these spatial features (proximal and distal) not always to be adequate to describe the characteristics of demonstratives (cf. Enfield 2003; Levinson 2004). Enfield (2003) claims, for example, that the deictically used determiner \textit{nii} in Lao (spoken in Laos), which is often described as having a proximal meaning, has no semantic properties of distance. In his opinion, a proximal interpretation of \textit{nii} in Lao only emerges indirectly from

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} The distances involved for “mid” and “far” terms are relative.
\item \textsuperscript{26} In Diessel (2012b, 2420), this is described as: “both speaker and hearer are included in the deictic center.”
\item \textsuperscript{27} Cf. Laury (1997, 53)
\end{itemize}
the contrastively used nan, which means ‘not here.’ Levinson (2004) also reports that şu in Turkish, which is usually considered to be proximal to the addressee, is actually used to draw the attention of the addressee to a referent in the context. Besides, in some languages, the deictic feature is characterized not only by distance but also by visibility (such as in Tucano, spoken in the border area between Colombia and Brazil) (Dixon 2003, 87). However, as Diessel (2012b, 2419) argues, demonstratives are in general organized in paradigms of contrastive forms, and it seems that in most cases, contrast in distance is somehow involved (cf. also Dixon 2003, 87). As mentioned, since the deictic center and the speech situation are conceptual units (Diessel 2012, 2410), the distance here does not deal with an absolute sense of distance. Diessel (ibid.) shows this by giving examples with here which can refer to locations/areas the speaker (deictic center) is included, but different in distance/size; that is, here can refer to a location (area) which is basically the same as where the speaker’s body is located as in here where I am; on the other hand, here can also refer to the room where the speaker is located as in here in this room.

Spatial deictic expressions usually refer to concrete referents, for example, objects and/or locations in the speech event, but they can have extended uses into other domains and they can thus even be used metaphorically. For instance, the use of proximity to the speaker in concrete spatial reference can be extended to refer to the domain of time comprehended as near to the speaker, such as at this time (Anderson and Keenan 1985, 278). Further, the notion of a concrete, physical proximity can be “interpreted by extension to psychological proximity, that is vividness to the mind of the speaker” (ibid.). Because time and discourse are commonly conceptualized in spatial terms, spatial deixis is normally considered to be more basic than other types of deixis (Diessel 2012b, 2417).

Functions
As mentioned before, demonstratives are generally regarded as spatial deictics. They indicate the relative distance of an object, location or person and the deictic center (cf. Diessel 1999, 36). The fundamental function of demonstratives as deictic expressions is to establish joint attention between the referent and the speech participants by pointing and guiding the listeners’ attention to the referent (Lyons 1999, 21; Diessel 2006a, 434; 2012b, 2417). According to Diessel (2012b, 2417) joint attention involves three components. These are the actor/speaker, the addressee and an object of reference. In successful communication, the speaker and the addressee jointly focus their attention on the same entity (referent) in the speech situation; the speaker may direct the addressee’s attention to a particular referent by gaze, gesture and/or the use of language. Ehlich (1982, 323) referred to this action of guiding attention as deictic procedure. Diessel (2006a; 2012b) calls this
basic pragmatic function of demonstratives *exophoric use*. While there are other linguistic expressions such as interjections that may direct the addressee’s attention, demonstratives are considered to be the primary device used for this function (Diessel 2012b, 2417).

In addition to this basic *deictic* function (deictic use), Himmelmann (1996) distinguishes three other pragmatic uses of demonstratives as cross-linguistically basic and universal. These are: (1) discourse deictic use, (2) anaphoric use and (3) recognitional use. According to Diessel (2006a, 434), discourse-deictic, anaphoric and recognitional uses are all derived from the basic deictic use. The *discourse deictic* use is to be understood as that the demonstratives in question refer to propositions or events (Himmelmann 1996, 224). Example 2-1 shows discourse deictically used *that* (B1) and anaphorically used *that* (B2) used by speaker B. Discourse deictically used ‘*that*’ in B1 refers to speaker A’s whole utterance or more specifically, the proposition expressed by the utterance.

Example 2-1

| A | I’m going to read Alice Munro’s *The View from Castle Rock* tomorrow. |
| B1 | That sounds good. |
| B2 | That’s a good collection of short stories. |

In the anaphoric use, the demonstrative in question is coreferential with a noun or a noun phrase that has appeared in the previous discourse. The demonstrative thus keeps track of prior discourse referents (cf. Diessel 2006a; b). In Example 2-1, *that* used by speaker B2 refers back to the book, *The View from Castle Rock*, mentioned by speaker A.

In recognitional use, the demonstratives are used to signal that the referent is familiar to both speakers and addressees (cf. Diessel 2006a; b). In sentences such as *I couldn’t sleep last night. That lady downstairs was playing the piano all night* (Diessel 2006a, 432), the knowledge about ‘lady’ mentioned in the second sentence is considered to be shared between the speaker and the addressee.

2.3.2. Demonstratives, definite articles and third-person pronouns

Cross-linguistically, demonstratives are known to provide a common source for definite articles and third-person pronouns, and a difficulty in distinguishing demonstratives from them has been one of the major topics in the study of demonstratives (cf. Himmelmann 1996; 1998; Diessel 2006a; b).

---

28 Himmelmann calls deictic use *situational use*.
29 Himmelmann calls anaphoric use *tracking use*.
Even though there may be general agreement as to what is and what is not regarded as a demonstrative in a given language, drawing the boundary is not problem-free.

According to Diessel (1999, 2006a; b), adnominal demonstratives, that is, demonstratives which accompany a co-occurring noun, provide a common source for definite articles. According to Himmelmann (1998), demonstratives can be differentiated from definite articles in terms of a set of semantic-pragmatic contexts where they tend to be used. In his opinion, demonstratives are used for situational use (called exophoric use by Diessel and deictic use in this thesis), discourse deictic use, anaphoric use and recognitional use, but they are not used for so-called larger situation use and associative anaphoric use (ibid, 323). The larger situation use refers to uses where first mentions of new referents are uniquely identifiable in a given speech community because the referents are considered to be generally known. For example, the use of the President in the USA in 2015 can unambiguously refer to Barack Obama. The associative anaphoric use refers to uses where first mentions of new referents within a speech event are identifiable via another, already linguistically present referent. The use of the brake in “I bought a bicycle yesterday, but the brake was broken” is understood as the previously mentioned bicycle’s brake in the given context. According to Himmelmann, definite articles, on the other hand, permit larger situational use and associative anaphoric use.

Himmelmann’s claim seems to hold true as long as the language in question has both demonstrative(s) and definite article(s). In Japanese, which is considered not to have a definite article, the demonstratives do have associative anaphoric use (see Section 2.4.1).

Regarding third-person pronouns, Diessel (1999; 2006a) states that they can be traced back to pronominal demonstratives in many languages. According to him, this development (grammaticalization) originates from anaphoric demonstratives used for tracking rather unexpected discourse topics, such as referents which are difficult to access. Demonstratives are then reanalyzed as third-person pronouns when their use is extended to discourse referents that are more easily accessible (cf. Diessel 2006a, 432). Regarding the relationship between third-person pronoun and demonstratives, Bhat (2013) shows on the World Atlas of Language Structures Online (WALS online) that 125 of the 225 languages examined have some sort of relation between them.30 In the case of 52 of the 125 languages, this relation is established either from the fact that 1) any of the demonstratives can be used as third-person pronouns, or from the fact that 2) demonstratives and third-person pronouns share the same stem. A problem to distinguish between demonstratives and third person pronouns may arise when the demonstratives are used as third- person pronouns and they share the same form. For

example, Finnish se can be both a demonstrative (pronoun) and a singular third-person pronoun (cf. Juvonen 2000, 36).

These problems in distinguishing demonstratives from definite articles and third-person pronouns suggest that the demonstratives, conventionally distinguished in the languages in question, may need further criteria to be analyzed as demonstratives.

2.4. Deictically used demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish

This section introduces the meaning and use of deictically used spatial demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish. It starts with a general, brief description of the forms, semantics and function of demonstratives in each language. Then the characteristics of their uses as spatial deictically used demonstratives are reviewed in the light of previous research. In what follows, the example sentences used are constructed, based on grammar books, textbooks and consultation with native speakers of the respective languages, unless otherwise stated.

2.4.1. Demonstratives in Japanese

Forms
A set of expressions (words) with initial morae ko-, so- and a- that have particular pointing functions are traditionally called “pointing-words,” demonstratives. Ko-, so-, a- are thus called demonstrative roots or deictic markers. Traditionally, Japanese demonstratives have often been described and classified in terms of the type of referent (denotatum) they refer to. Syntactically, they occur pronominally, adnominally, adjectivally and adverbially (cf. Coulmas, 1982). As parts of speech, they correspond to pronouns, determiners, adjectives and adverbs respectively. The morae ko-, so-, and a- are demonstrative roots that give expressions basic, deictic features, and Japanese demonstratives are sometimes called ko-so-a words. The morae ko-, so-, and a- have been traditionally described as having a meaning of proximal (near), medial (slightly away) and distal (away) respectively, from the speaker’s point of view. However, after Sakuma (1992) pointed out that the morpheme so- refers to the “addressee’s sphere,” the prevailing view of their semantics was that ko- indicates a referent located proximal (near) to the speaker, so- indicates a referent located proximal (near) to the addressee, and a-

31 Ko-, so-, a- are explained as “stem-morphemes” (e.g. Coulmas 1982) or “deictic root” (e.g. Diessel 1999). They are also explained as “segmented spatial elements/syllables (e.g. Dixon 2003).
*a-* indicates a referent distal (far) to both speaker and addressee. A detailed description of the deictic feature is given in the next section. Table 2-2 and Table 2-3 show an overview of commonly used Japanese demonstratives based on the syntax and prototypical denotatum types. Note that the denotatum types stated in the Table are prototypical ones and they are not exhaustive. As shown in the Table, pronominal, adnominal, adjectival and adverbial demonstratives are distinguished in Japanese. Pronominal demonstratives are further divided according to denotatum types. Note that pronominal demonstratives whose denotatum type is “location” in Table 2-3, that is, the locational demonstrative in Japanese is pronominal, are not adverbial, as in many other languages such as English (cf. Coulmas 1982, 212).

Table 2-2 Commonly used modern Japanese demonstratives: distinguished by their distributions and semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>proximal (addressee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal</td>
<td>kore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adnominal</td>
<td>kono N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectival</td>
<td>konna N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial (manner)</td>
<td>kō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N stands for a head noun.

Table 2-3 The pronominal demonstratives of modern Japanese included in the study: distinguished by their denotatum types and semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>denotatum types</th>
<th>semantics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal (speaker)</td>
<td>proximal (addressee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thing</td>
<td>kore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location</td>
<td>koko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction 32</td>
<td>kocchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kochira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>koitsu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 2-2–Example 2-6 show how Japanese demonstratives are syntactically distributed. Example 2-2 shows the pronominal demonstratives kore, sore, are, used for denotatum type ‘thing.’ Example 2-3 shows adnominal demonstratives. Adjectival demonstratives and adverbial demonstratives are shown in Example 2-4 and Example 2-5 respectively. Example 2-6 shows how pronominal demonstrative with denotatum type location is used.

32 The difference between kocchi/socchi/acchi and kochira/sochira/achira is that kocchi/socchi/acchi are regarded as more casual and kochira/sochira/achira as more polite.
Basic semantics: Deictic features

As briefly mentioned in the previous section, deictic features of Japanese demonstratives, proximity and distance are indicated by the initial morae ko- and so-. The prevailing view of their deictic features is that it is a three-way deictic system in which ko- is proximal to speaker, so- is proximal to addressee and a- is distal (or non-proximal) to both speaker and addressee (cf. Shōho 1981; Dixon 2003, 74; Levinson 2004, 110; Diessel 2012b, 2420). However, researchers do not always agree on the status of so-, and how the deictic center of so- is to be conceptualized has been discussed. As seen, so-
is often viewed as being proximal to the addressee, but it is traditionally explained as being medial to the speaker as well. The question is whether the deictic feature is conceptualized relative to the area determined by the speaker’s location alone (i.e., the speaker is the only deictic center), or whether it is conceptualized relative to the common domain of both the speaker and the addressee (both the speaker and addressee are included in the deictic center) when we say that *so* is proximal to the addressee. Diessel (2012b, 2420) states that these two ways of conceptualizing the deictic center are observed in languages with more than three deictic terms, such as Hausa (Chadic language). Based on Wolff’s (1993) data, Diessel (2012b, 2420) states that Hausa has four demonstratives that form two contrastive pairs, *nân* ‘proximal to speaker’ vs. *nan* ‘proximal to addressee,’ and *cân* ‘medial to speaker and addressee’ vs. *can* ‘distal to speaker and addressee,’ where the relative deictic contrast of the former is conceptualized/interpreted based on the speaker’s location alone, whereas the deictic contrast of the latter is conceptualized/interpreted based on the common domain of speaker and addressee. As seen, Japanese has three deictic terms, not four (or more), but it seems that the deictic term *so* can be conceptualized based both on ‘only speaker as the deictic center’ and on ‘both speaker and addressee are included in the deictic center.’ In fact Takahashi (1992) and Shōho (1981, 75) have a similar view on *so*; they acknowledge that *so* can indicate both ‘proximal to addressee’ and ‘medial to both speaker and the addressee.’ This is also a view which is advocated by Horiguchi (1992) and Sakata (1992). See Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4.

Figure 2-3 Conceptualization of deictic center, based on Shōho (1981, 75)
Even though Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4 differ slightly, both figures show how *so-* can be interpreted as i) proximal to addressee and ii) medial to both speaker and addressee. On the one hand, Figure 2-3 (1) and Figure 2-4 (1) show that when *so-* is interpreted as proximal to addressee, the interpretation is based on the speaker’s location alone (i.e. the speaker is the only deictic center). On the other hand, Figure 2-3 (2) and Figure 2-4 (3) show that when *so-* is interpreted as medial to both speaker and addressee, the interpretation is based on the common domain of both speaker and addressee (i.e., both speaker and addressee are included in the deictic center). Further, Figure 2-4 (2) shows that these two ways of conceptualization are not unrelated; there is a sort of transitional phase. Note also that the deictic feature of demonstrative *a-* ‘distal’ may not always be clear-cut in the speech context where *so-* is conceptualized to be proximal to the addressee. Takahashi (1992), for example, states that demonstrative *a-* may not be used in the speech context when speaker and addressee do not share the common deictic center. In Figure 2-4 (1) and (2), demonstrative *a-* is therefore placed in parenthesis and *so* is *a-* in Figure 2-3 (1). Example 2-7 shows a situation where the speaker and the addressee do not share the common deictic center: the speaker as deictic center A and the addressee as deictic center B. The use of *so-* in this situation indicates that the speaker (deictic center A) regards the referent to be located near the addressee (deictic center B), not medial to the two separate deictic centers, A (the speaker herself) or B (the addressee). In the same situation, *a-* is not likely to be used to indicate any distal relation to the deictic center as long as two separate deictic centers A and B are assumed. The deictic feature of *a-* ‘distal’ becomes more distinct when both the speaker and the addressee share a common deictic center, thereby conceptualizing *so-* as medial to both speaker and addressee. See Figure 2-4 (3) and Example 2-8. As seen, the deictic feature of *a*-series *distal* is not always clear, de-
pending on whether the speaker and the addressee share the same deictic center or two separate deictic centers (the speaker and the addressee) are assumed. However, the distal feature of a-series may be best described as indicating an exclusion of the referent from the deictic center.

Example 2-7

ここで/こっちは 浅いけど そこ/そっちは どう？
koko/kocchi wa asai kedo soko/socchi dō
koko/kocchi TOP shallow but soko/socchi TOP how

‘Here/this side is shallow, how about there/your side?’
lit. ‘Here/this side is shallow, but how is there/that side?’

Example 2-8

ここで/そこ/あそこで 休もうか？
koko/soko/asoko yasumō-ka
koko/soko/asoko LOC rest:VOL-Q

‘Shall (we) rest here/there/over there?’

It should also be noted that, as the addressee is normally involved in the conceptualization of so-, the use of so- generally requires the addressee to be present at the time of the utterance. Thus so- may be less likely to be used in monologues and introspections (cf. Horiguchi 1992; Yoshimoto 1992). When the existence of an addressee is not assumed in a speech context (as in monologues), the deictic contrast will normally be indicated only by ko- (proximal to speaker) and a- (distal to speaker), as seen in Example 2-9.33

Example 2-9

よし、ここ/あそこで 休もう
yoshi koko/asoko de yasumō
well, koko/asoko LOC rest:VOL

‘Ok, now/well, (I) am going to rest here/over there’

The deictic features characterized in terms of spatial terms in relation to the deictic center serve as a basis for the interpretation of its meaning. The deictic feature of so-, described as indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee, is often extended to indicate inclusion of the referent in the ‘addressee’s sphere,’ or the ‘addressee’s domain,’ when the addressee is considered to have control over the referent in a given situation. I consider this to be the case when the physical sense of proximity/distance is extended to a psychological sense of proximity/distance. For example, as shown in Exam-

33 However, the use of so- is not denied here.
ple 2-10, a person who is receiving massage may point out a part of his own body by *so-* when he has to tell the masseur that a spot where he is receiving massage hurts. According to a physical spatial sense, it would be natural to think that a speaker would refer to (part of) his own body by *ko-* (proximal to speaker), but *so-* (proximal to addressee) is used in Example 2-10, and this use can be explained by the speaker considering that the part of his body is under the control of the addressee, alternatively his body part is located within the addressee’s sphere.

Example 2-10

`soko wa sukoshi itai-desu`

‘There, it hurts a bit’

Yoshimoto (1992) also mentions a case in which a speaker uses *ko-* (proximal to speaker) of the referent when he feels psychologically close to the referent, even though physical distance to the referent is not proximal. In an example that Yoshimoto (ibid.) presents, there is a mother who refers to her own child (the referent) with a *ko-*series as in *kono ko* ‘this child/kid’, even though the child in question is sitting on someone else’s lap, not on her lap. According to Yoshimoto, the mother’s use of a *ko-*series can be explained by the mother’s psychological proximity to her own child.

The basic deictic features characterized in terms of spatial terms in relation to the deictic center can also form a basis for metaphorical extensions into other domains such as time. The relative proximity/distance in terms of time may be expressed most clearly by *ko-* (proximal to speaker), but less clearly by *so-* (proximal to addressee/medial to both speaker and addressee) and *a-* (distal to both speaker and addressee). For instance, we find examples where *now* and *future*, relative to the time at the speech situation, is indicated by *ko-* as in *korekara* ‘from now on’ and *konosaki* ‘from this time on/in future/hereafter.’ On the other hand, we find that time indicated by *so-* is hardly deictic but rather anaphoric, and the time expressions that contain *so-* are often lexicalized into conjunctions. For instance, *so(re)* in *sorekara* ‘after that/then’ can refer to a certain time point previously mentioned in the discourse regardless of past or future. *Sorekara* functions as the conjunction ‘then’ as well. In regard to time indicated by *sonosaki* ‘after that,’ it refers to a future relative to the time of the speech situation, but it is based on a time point previously mentioned in the discourse. One of the few examples with *so-* that indicates a certain time in future relative to the time of the speech

34 However, Yoshimoto (1992) does not mention how far the distance between the mother (speaker) and the child (child) is.
situation may be *sonouchi* ‘soon’ (cf. Shōho 1981, 115). However, this may be regarded as a lexicalized expression rather than a temporal, deictically used demonstrative.

Regarding time indicated by *a-*, a remote time in the past may be associated with it. However, it seems that *a-* is rather used to refer to a certain point in time, which does not overlap with the time of the speech situation. Demonstrative *a-* may be used when the speaker expects the addressee to recognize the point of time in question. Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999; 2006a) call this type of use *recognitional* use of demonstratives.

**Pragmatic uses**

The basic function of demonstratives is to focus or orient the addressees’ attention on certain entities existing in the speech situation; in other words, demonstratives are employed in order to establish joint attention (Diessel 1999; 2006a; b; 2012; Levinson 2004, 111). This is an essential function of demonstratives in terms of communicative interaction (Diessel 1999, 93) and this is what Tanaka (1981, 46–7) states regarding the fundamental function of *ko/sō/a*; Tanaka (ibid) states that *ko/sō/a*-words are a group of expressions with a pointing-out function and that they indicate that there is something (i.e. object) specific and uniquely identifiable in the speech situation, and, simultaneously, they mark them as the intended referents (ibid.).

The basic pointing-out function, to orient the addressee’s attention, is referred to in various ways in the literature of demonstratives. As stated in Section 2.3.1, Diessel (1999), following Himmelmann (1996), distinguishes the deictic, the anaphoric, the discourse deictic and the recognitional use.35 Even though different terms may be employed in the literature, all these uses are found in the Japanese demonstratives.

As stated in Section 2.3.1, in the deictic use, a certain entity (referent) is pointed out in the speech situation by the demonstratives; the addressee’s attention will thereby be focused on it. For instance, a speaker may say {*kōre/sore/are*} *nani*? ‘What is this/that/that over there?’ in order to orient the addressee’s attention to the referent, which is present at the time of the speech event.

In the anaphoric use, an element in the previous discourse, often a noun or a noun phrase, is referred back by the demonstratives. The element (a noun or noun phrase) in the previous discourse is called the antecedent and the demonstratives in this use refer to the same referent as their antecedent (i.e., the referent of the demonstratives and the antecedent are coreferential). Even though *ko/sō/a* may all be used, the *so*-series is employed most frequently for this use (cf. Mikami 1970, 149; Kinsui and Takubo 1992b, 188-

---

35 Regarding the term deictic use, Himmelmann (1996) employs the term *situational* use and Diessel (1999), *exophoric* use.
For instance, when someone writes a line in his/her diary like Kyō kappu wo watteshimatta ‘Today, I happened to smash a/my cup’ and continues, {sore/sono kappu} wa NN kara no purezento dattanode chotto shokku datta ‘It/the cup was a present from NN and I was kind of shocked,’ {sore/sono kappu} ‘it/the cup’ refers back to kappu ‘mug/cup’ mentioned previously.

In the discourse deictic use, the demonstratives are used to refer to the elements in the surrounding discourse, often previously mentioned elements. However, unlike anaphorically used demonstratives, the discourse deictically used demonstratives are not coreferential with the antecedents, which are nouns or noun phrases. Instead, they are used to refer to propositions in the previous or forthcoming discourse. More specifically, discourse deictic demonstratives can refer to a clause, a sentence, a paragraph or an entire story (cf. Diessel 1999, 101). The Japanese ko- and so-series are used particularly for this function and especially the ko-series is used to refer to a proposition in the forthcoming discourse (cf. Kinsui and Takubo 1992a, 137; 141). For instance, you may say {Sore/sono hanashi}, shitteru ‘I know it/the story,’ after you have heard an anecdote from your friend. On the other hand, you may say {Kore/kono hanashi}, shitteru? ‘Do you know this/this story?’ if you are going to tell the addressee a certain story or anecdote.

In the recognitional use, demonstratives may be used for their reminding function, signaling that the referent, which is considered to be known or familiar to both the speaker and the addressee, should be recognized and updated (refocused) in the addressee’s mind. According to Diessel (1999, 105), recognitional use is restricted to adnominally used demonstratives. In Japanese, the demonstrative a-series is employed especially for this function/use regardless of whether they are pronominal or adnominal (cf. Shōho 1981, 79). For example, I may perfectly well say {Are/ano ken} dō shita? ‘What did you do with that/that matter?’ to the addressee when I expect the addressee to recognize what I am talking about.

Further, when Japanese demonstratives are employed adnominally, so-called associative variations37 are distinguished within (1) deictic use, (2) anaphoric use and (3) discourse deictic use. Associative variations of deictic use and anaphoric use refer to first mentions of new referents within a speech event, such that the referents are identifiable via other, already language-externally present referents (in the case of associative deictic) or linguistically present referents (in the case of associative anaphoric) (cf. Juvonnen 2000, 19). Differences between uses (1)–(3) and their associative variations are that, while in uses (1)–(3), the referents are normally observable in the speech context, either physically in the speech context (in the case of the

---

36 However, Kinsui and Takubo (1992a, 137) question whether the a-series can be employed for the anaphoric use.

37 Also referred to as indirect variations.
deictic use) or linguistically in the discourse (in the case of the anaphoric use and the discourse deictic use), the referents are not directly presented in the associative uses. Thus the understanding of the referents in the associative uses depends much on inferring via another referent already present in the discourse context. For instance, in Example 2-11, the referent *futa ‘cap/lid’* is normally present at the time of the speech event; the speaker is observing a certain cap/lid and asking the addressee which jar the cap/lid belongs to. On the other hand, in Example 2-12 the referent *futa ‘cap/lid’* is not necessarily physically present or observable at the time of the speech event; the speaker may say these sentences to ask where the cap/lid is when he is pointing at a jar without a cap or lid.

Example 2-11

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \text{この／その／あの} \} & \text{ふたは} & \text{何の} & \text{ふた？} \\
\{ & \text{kono/sono/ano} \} & \text{futa wa} & \text{nan no} & \text{futa?} \\
\{ & \text{kono/sono/ano} \} & \text{cap/lid} & \text{TOP} & \text{what GEN cap/lid}
\end{align*}
\]

‘What is this/that cap for?’

Example 2-12

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \text{この／その／あの} \} & \text{ふたは} & \text{どこ？} \\
\{ & \text{kono/sono/ano} \} & \text{futa wa} & \text{doko?} \\
\{ & \text{kono/sono/ano} \} & \text{cap/lid} & \text{TOP} & \text{where}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Where is the lid (for this/that)?’

Similarly, in the associative anaphoric use and the associative discourse deictic use, the referent is not necessarily presented linguistically in the previous text. However, the addressee is still able to identify the referent via another referent presented in the discourse context. The following are examples of the associative anaphoric use (Example 2-13) and the associative discourse deictic use of demonstratives (Example 2-14).

Example 2-13

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{昨日} & \text{面白い} & \text{本を} & \text{読んだが、} & \text{今日} \\
\text{kinō} & \text{omoshiroi} & \text{hon wo} & \text{yonda ga} & \text{kyō} \\
\text{もう} & \text{その} & \text{名前を} & \text{覚えていない。} \\
\text{mō} & \text{sono} & \text{namae wo} & \text{oboete-inai.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘(I) read an interesting book yesterday, but today I’ve already forgotten the name (of it).’
Example 2-14

さっき カップを 割ったので 今
a.moment.ago mug ACC smash:PST therefore now

その 片付けを しているところ。
sono katazuke o shite-iru tokoro.
do:GER-ASP NR

‘I’ve just smashed a mug and I’m clearing up the mess’

The associative deictic use, associative anaphoric use and associative discourse deictic use may not be regarded as demonstrative functions (uses) in other languages (cf. Himmelmann 1996 on the associative anaphoric use). In English and Swedish, for example, the associative uses mentioned above belong to nouns with definite articles or nouns with a possessive attribute. Consider how a phrase shown in Example 2-15 can be expressed in English; in this example, the adnominal demonstrative together with its head sono tomodachi ‘sono friend’ does not have an antecedent in the previous text. However, the referent of sono tomodachi ‘sono friend’ is inferable (associable) from the noun dansei ‘man/male’ and in English, it will be expressed by ‘his friend,’ in which ‘he’ refers to the man the speaker met.

Example 2-15

昨日 会った 男性 と その 友達
kinō atta dansei to sono tomodachi
yesterday meet:PST man and sono friend

‘A man I met yesterday and {his/*that} friend’

In Japanese, the demonstratives ko/so/a are all used for associative deictic use, but only so- seems to be used for the associative anaphoric and the associative discourse deictic use (cf. Shōho 1981; Tanaka 1981).

2.4.2. Demonstratives in Finnish

Forms

The Finnish demonstrative system can be described as involving three different parts of speech: demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adverbs and demonstrative adjectives (cf. Laury 1997, Juvonen 2000). These are distributed as nominal (including pronominal and adnominal) demonstrative, adverbial demonstrative and adjectival demonstrative respectively. The Finnish demonstrative pronouns have three forms, tämä, tuo, and se, which correspond approximately to ‘this,’ ‘that’ and ‘it/that’ in English. The demonstrative pronouns and the demonstrative adjectives are inflected for numbers and
most morphological cases. In the paradigm of Finnish demonstratives shown in Table 2-4, the pronouns and the adjectives are presented in the singular form. In the same table, the adverbs are presented in the nominative case. How demonstrative pronouns are inflected for number and case is shown in Table 2-5. The demonstrative forms shown in the tables are the written language forms found in the grammar books prescribing the normative grammar of Finnish. In colloquial, spoken Finnish, there are other variants.

Table 2-4 Standard written Finnish demonstratives in the singular, distinguished by their distributions and semantics (Based on Laury, 1997 and Juvonen 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>semantics</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>distal (non-proximal)</th>
<th>proximal (addressee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrative pronouns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominal</td>
<td>pronominal</td>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adnominal</td>
<td></td>
<td>tämä N</td>
<td>tuo N</td>
<td>se N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrative adverbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>locational</td>
<td>täällä (in/on)</td>
<td>tuolla (in/on)</td>
<td>siellä (in/on)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>täällä (from)</td>
<td>tuolla (from)</td>
<td>siellä (from)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tänne (to)</td>
<td>tuonne (to)</td>
<td>sinne (to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>täten</td>
<td>nain</td>
<td>siten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nain</td>
<td>noin</td>
<td>niin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverbial</td>
<td>temporal</td>
<td>tällöin</td>
<td>tuolloin</td>
<td>silloin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>demonstrative adjectives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectival</td>
<td>pronominal</td>
<td>tiällainen</td>
<td>tuollaainen</td>
<td>sellainen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tämmöinen</td>
<td>tuommoinen</td>
<td>semmoinen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The commonly distinguished part of speech is stated in the left column and in bold. For demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adjectives, only the singular forms are given. For demonstrative adverbs, all standard forms are given.

As seen in Table 2-4, the Finnish demonstratives (demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adverbs and demonstrative adjectives) share in general common demonstrative stems (roots), tä-, tuo- and se-, which are connected to the singular forms of the demonstrative pronouns. An exception is adverbial demonstratives of manner (manner adverbs), which are connected to the plural forms of the demonstrative pronouns nämä, nuo and ne.

The same table shows that there are three adverbial demonstratives for location (locational adverbs) differentiated by case endings -lla, -lä and -ne. These locational adverbs are normally regarded as lexicalized and described as being related etymologically to the outer local cases of corre-

---

38 We may question whether the demonstrative stem (root) of tämä is tämä or tä. In this thesis tä- is used to represent the stem (root) of tämä, following Etelämäki (2009).

39 A represents here either å or a.

There are two variations of manner adverbs. The manner adverbs näin, noin, and niin are connected to the plural forms of the demonstrative pronouns, corresponding approximately to ‘this way,’ ‘that way’ and ‘so’ in English (cf. Juvonen 2000). The other manner adverbs tätten and siten are connected to the singular forms of the demonstrative pronouns, corresponding approximately to ‘hereby’ and ‘in such a way’ in English (ibid.).

There are also two variants of demonstrative adjectives, with case endings -lainen and -moinen. These two variants have developed from independent adjectives, lajinen and moinen (both can be translated as ‘kind, sort’) in the context of a pronoun in the genitive case (ibid.).

| Table 2-5 Standard written Finnish demonstrative pronouns tämä, tuo and se, and a part of their declensions |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| PROXIMAL | DISTAL (NON-PROXIMAL) | PROXIMAL (ADDRESSEE) |
| case | SG | PL | SG | PL | SG | PL |
| NOM | tämä | nämä | tuo | nuo | se | ne |
| GEN | tämän | näiden/näitten | tuon | noiden/noitten | sen | niiden/niitten |
| PRTV | tätä | nätä | tuota | noita | sitä | niitä |
| ACC | tämä/tämän | nämä | tuo/tuon | nuo | se/sen | niiden/niitten |
| INESS | täässä | näissä | tuossa | noissa | siinä | niissä |
| ELAT | täästä | näistä | tuosta | noista | siitä | niistä |
| ILL | tähän | näihin | tuohon | noihin | siihen | niihin |
| ADESS | tällä | näillä | tuolla | noilla | sillä | niillä |
| ABL | tältä | näiltä | tuolta | noilta | siltä | niiltä |
| ALL | tällä | näille | tuolle | noille | sille | niille |

Table 2-5 shows a part of the declension of the demonstrative pronouns tämä, tuo and se. The table shows that there are demonstrative pronouns which are case-inflected in the local inner case (inessive, elative, illative) and the outer case (adessive, ablative, allative). These case-inflected demonstrative pronouns are also used to refer to the locations in addition to the series of locational adverbs mentioned above (see Table 2-4). According to Etelämäki (2009, 27–28), there is an overlap between the demonstrative pronouns that are inflected in the inner case forms and the demonstrative locational adverbs. In her opinion, the criteria between the inner case forms of the demonstrative pronouns and the demonstrative locational adverbs are grammatical; however, the difference between them is semantically vague. (This matter is discussed in the following section with examples.)

Traditionally, the demonstrative pronouns tämä and tuo have been considered to be deictic and it has been agreed that, from the point of view of the speaker (deictic center), tämä is proximal and tuo is distal (cf. Juvonen 2000). The status of se has been more difficult to specify. For example, it has been described as indicating medial in distance (cf. Laury 1997, 53), or
being neutral in terms of spatial relations or ‘addressee-oriented’ (cf. Juvonen 2000, 32, Duvallo 2005). It has also been described as anaphoric rather than deictic (cf. Karlsson 1999, 138). The pronoun *se*, according to Juvonen (2000, 36), is “the most multifunctional Finnish pronoun” as it is also used as a formal subject and a third-person personal pronoun. It also forms (or is a part of) various conjunctions and connective adverbs such as *sitten* ‘then’ and *sen jälkeen* ‘after that’ (ibid.). As briefly discussed in Section 2.3.2, it is thus difficult to distinguish demonstrative *se*- from *se*- as other parts of speech. However, according to Laury (1997, 77) the most clear case of spatially deictically used *se*- can be identified when *se*- was in the local cases and pointed to the location of the addressee. See the next section for further discussion of the basic semantics of *tämä*, *tuo*, and *se*-series. Example 2.16 and Example 2.17 show how demonstrative pronouns in the nominative and singular form can be used. In Example 2.16 *tämä*, *tuo* and *se* are used nominally and in Example 2.17 adnominally.

Example 2.16, based on Karlsson (1991, 138)

\{Tämä/tuo/se\} on kirja.
\{tämä/tuo/se\} COP3 book
‘This/that/it (that) is a book.’

Example 2.17, based on Karlsson (1991, 138)

\{Tämä/tuo/se\} kirja on minu-n.
\{tämä/tuo/se\} book COP3 I-GEN
‘This/that/it (that) book is mine.’

Example 2.18–Example 2.20 show how demonstrative manner adverbs and demonstrative adjectives are used. In Example 2.18, the manner adverbs *näin* and *noin* are used as ‘like this’ and ‘like that.’ In Example 2.19, the manner adverb *niin* is used as ‘so’ in English. Example 2.20 shows the demonstrative adjectives *tällainen* and *tuollainen*.

Example 2.18, an overheard example

Älä tee \{näin/noin\}.
NEG: IMP 2 do: IMP2 \{tämä:MANN/tuo:MANN\}
‘Don’t do like {this/that}.’
Example 2-19, taken from Karlsson (1991, 155)

Niin me ajattelimme=kin.
se: MANN I:PL think:PST I:PL=too

‘That’s just what we thought.’
(‘We thought so, too’)

Example 2-20, based on Karlsson (1991, 139)

Paljon=ko {tällainen/tuollainen} auto maksaa?
much=Q {tämä:ADJ/tuo:ADJ} car cost3

‘How much does {this/that} kind of car cost?’

Example 2-21 shows that tāssā, the demonstrative pronoun tāmā inflected in the inner case (inessive) form, is used to refer to a location. This example can be compared with Example 2-22 in which tāällä, a demonstrative locational adverb, is used to refer to a location. As mentioned, the difference between the case-inflected demonstrative pronouns and the demonstrative locational adverbs is semantically diffuse. Note that in Example 2-21, the case-inflected demonstrative pronoun tāmā is used pronominally.

Example 2-21, taken from Karlsson (1999, 56)

Tā-ssā on mukava istua.
tā-INESS COP3 nice sit:INF

‘Here is nice to sit’/’it is nice to sit here’

Example 2-22, taken from Karlsson (1999, 83)

Lapse-t ovat tā-ällä.
child-PL COP:PL3 tā-ADESS

‘The children are here’

**Basic semantics: deictic features**

As briefly described above, tāmā and tuo are considered to be deictic. The demonstratives’ deictic features indicated most clearly by the demonstrative roots tā- and tuo- show that the referent of tā- is closer to the deictic center (proximal) than the referent of tuo- (distal, away from the deictic center). The status of demonstrative se, on the other hand, is often described as neutral in terms of proximity/distance and se has been deemed less clearly demonstrative compared with tāmā- and tuo. For example, Diessel (2011), who studied distance contrasts of demonstratives in 234 languages, considers that se does not indicate distance; he considers that the relative deictic
contrast of Finnish demonstratives is two-way, which exists between tämä and tuo. That se is not regarded as yielding deictic contrast in Diessel (2011) may be due to the fact that he studied the number of distance contrasts expressed only in adnominally used demonstratives but not in the whole system of Finnish demonstratives. VISK\(^40\) (2008, §722), on the other hand, states explicitly that there are three demonstrative pronouns, tämä, tuo and se (thus including adnominally used demonstratives) and that this three-division can occur in the relative proximity of the referents to the speaker and the addressee. VISK (ibid.) explains that all three demonstratives concern relative proximity/distance of the referent. Note that in VISK’s view of relative proximity/distance, not only the speaker but also the addressee is involved as a part of the deictic center (cf. Diessel 2012b).

Thus according to VISK (ibid.), proximal tämä can be used as in Sovita tätä ‘try this’ on a clothes-shopping occasion when the speaker is referring to the clothes he is holding in his hand and which he offers to the addressee. In a similar clothes-shopping situation, if the clothes are hanging on the pole away from the speaker, Sovita tuota ‘try that’ may be used.\(^41\) Further, VISK (ibid.) explains that the speaker may use Sovita sitä ‘try it/that’ when the addressee is just examining the clothes in question. We find here that demonstrative se carries the deictic feature proximity to the addressee, similar to the Japanese so-series. This deictic feature of se is described as listener-oriented (addressee-oriented) in Juvonen (2000, 32). Note, however, that the deictic center is still the speaker according to Diessel (2012b).

As is the case with demonstratives in general, these deictic expressions in Finnish are employed to indicate a location of the referent, or point in time relative to the deictic center. However, as Diessel (2012b, 2410) cautions, the distance between the referent and the deictic center, commonly characterized as proximal (near) and distal (far), should not be taken in the absolute sense of the terms because “the deictic center and the speech situation are conceptual units that cannot be equated with physical location in which the speech event occurs” (ibid.). A similar point is also made by Laury (1997, 59):

The speaker’s current sphere is equivalent to the speaker’s täällä ‘here’. If we consider the fact, readily observable in ordinary conversation, that speakers may shift what they consider ‘here’ from one utterance to the next, so that ‘here’ can from one moment to the next mean the earth, as opposed to the rest of the universe, and in the next use, the exact place in the text the speaker is examining, as opposed to other parts of that text [...]

\(^40\) VISK = Ison suomen kielioopin verkkoversio ‘Great Finnish grammar online version’
\(^41\) The location of the addressee is not mentioned in VISK (2008).
Further, Etelämäki (2009), who studied naturally occurring conversation data, argues that the mere spatial relation (between the referent and the speaker) does not motivate the speaker's choice of the demonstratives (Etelämäki 2009, 33). She reports, for example, a case in which a female speaker used *tuo-* to refer to her own hand, after she had referred to the same hand using *tä-* . Etelämäki’s argument is that the primary indexical context for demonstrative reference is based on on-going activities rather than spatial distance to the referent. Similarly, VISK (2008, §722) also shows a case, given in Example 2-23, in which *tämä/tuo/se* are used for the same referent.

Example 2-23, taken from VISK (2008, §722)

Näyttää=kö {tämä/tuo/se} sinu-sta tulehtunee-ha?
seem/appear3=Q {tämä/tuo/se} you-ELAT inflame:POT3-ABL

‘Does this/that/it, that look inflamed to you?’

According to VISK (ibid), the speaker of the sentence shown in Example 2-23 may use all these three demonstrative pronouns in order to refer to his own finger. Apparently *tämä/tuo/se* in this example does not indicate a spatial contrast (cf. Diessel 2006a, 430; 2012b, 2419). What is of particular interest here is that the so-called distal *tuo* ‘that’ is used for the referent located close to the speaker. Laury (1997, 73) also shows a case in which a speaker (female) used *tuo* to refer to her own body part, and according to her, such uses of *tuo* are not difficult to find in conversation data. According to Laury, a speaker uses *tuo* to indicate the addressee that a referent is outside the speaker’s current sphere. That is, this use signals that the speaker excludes an object (i.e., the referent) from his own area, and it may also imply that the object (the referent) is available to someone else (ibid, 74). She also claims that “many uses of *tuo* involve a mutuality of perspective shared by the speaker and addressee” (ibid, 75). In this view, the semantics of demonstratives are defined in terms of social interaction.

According to Laury’s (1997) view of demonstratives, *tämä* is used to present referents which the speakers consider to be in their own sphere, and *tuo* to exclude referents from the speakers’ current sphere, or to point out referents outside their sphere (at this point, *tuo* and *tämä* are contrasted). *Se* is used for referents which the speakers consider to be in the addressee’s sphere. Similar descriptions are also found in VISK (2008, §722). That is, this use of *tämä* indicates that the speaker shows that he/she is locating the referent in his/her own scope of attention (sphere), which may also be open to the addressee. The use of *se* indicates that the referent is within the addressee’s scope of attention (the addressee’s sphere) and that the referent has the addressee’s attention. Further, *tuo* is used to draw attention to the referent, which is located outside the current scope of both the speaker’s and the addressee’s focus of attention (ibid.).
As seen, even though the semantics of the Finnish demonstratives pronouns can be described in terms of spatial distance (i.e., they express the proximity of the speaker or the addressee to the referent), it is not always the case that the distance should be interpreted as physical distance. As Laury claims, the semantics of the Finnish demonstratives can be described as based on how speakers define their spheres of attention according to the ongoing discourse activities. This view is also supported by Etelämäki (2009).

So far, we have seen that the basic semantics of the Finnish demonstratives (pronouns) are that: 1) *tämä* indicates proximal to the deictic center, which is the speaker, and establishes the speaker’s sphere. It also signals that the referent is within the speaker’s sphere; 2) *tuo* indicates distal to the deictic center, which is the speaker alone, or also includes the addressee. It is used to exclude a referent from the speaker’s current sphere, or to point out the referents outside the speaker’s sphere; and 3) *se* indicates that the referent is considered to be in the addressee’s current sphere.

As is the case of demonstratives in other languages, the deictic features characterized in terms of spatial terms in relation to the deictic center can serve as a basis for metaphorical extensions into other domains. As seen in Table 2-4, there are series of temporal adverbs that contain demonstrative stems *tä*, *tuo*, and *se*; for instance *tällöin* means ‘at this time,’ *tuolloin* means ‘at that time,’” and *silloin* ‘then’ (cf. Laury 1997, 53).

**Pragmatic uses**

The essential function of demonstratives in terms of communicative function, to orient addressees’ attention in the speech situation (Diessel 1999; 2006a; b; 2012; Levinson 2004, 111), is quite explicitly stated in VISK (2008, §722). Laury (1997, 58) puts it in a slightly different way but claims that speakers use the Finnish demonstratives to express their orientation and stance toward referents in a dynamic manner. As stated in the previous section, in her view, speakers use demonstratives actively to place the things (the referents) in the speech participants’ current spheres. In terms of communicative interaction, demonstratives are thus considered to function dynamically in order to create/constitute place and perspective rather than just to refer. I consider that this claim is fundamentally the same as what Diessel claims to be a basic function of demonstratives mentioned above. However, while Laury (1997) considers “the ways the demonstratives put dynamically/actively the referent in the speech participants’ sphere” to be the basic semantics of the Finnish demonstratives, I consider this as a part of the function of the Finnish demonstratives.

In relation to Diessel’s (1999) description of major uses of demonstratives, researchers have identified the following uses in Finnish demonstratives: (1) deictic use, (2) anaphoric use, (3) discourse deictic use and (4) recognitional use. Further, so-called associative variants of anaphoric use
seem to exist according to Laury’s (1997) description of se. The author’s personal correspondence with native speakers of Finnish also showed that what we may call associative variation of deictic use seems to exist for tämä.

Example 2-24, presented previously, shows instances of deictically used tämä, tuo and se.

Example 2-24

{Tämä/tuo/se} kirja on minu-n.
{Tämä/tuo/se} book COP3 I-GEN
‘This/that/it (that) book is mine.’

According to VISK (2008, §722), se is usually anaphoric, but tämä is also anaphorically used, as shown in Example 2-25. In the given situation, two persons, Aulis and man, are mentioned in the first sentence. Aulis is the subject and the man is the object in the first sentence. While Aulis is referred to by a third-person personal pronoun hän ‘he’ in the second sentence, the man is referred by tämä ‘this.’ Tämä in the example is pronominal, but adnominal tämä (and adnominal se) are also used anaphorically (Juvenen 2000, 99–100).

Example 2-25, partially taken from VISK (2008, §1432), bold and italic type is mine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kahdesti</th>
<th>Aulis</th>
<th>vaati</th>
<th>vielä</th>
<th>mies-tä</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>twice</td>
<td>Aulis</td>
<td>demand:PST3</td>
<td>yet</td>
<td>man-PRTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pysähtymä-ään</td>
<td>ja</td>
<td>luopuma-an</td>
<td>sorkkarauda-sta.</td>
<td>Kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stopping3-ILL</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>abandoning3-ILL</td>
<td>crowbar-ELAT</td>
<td>when</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>totellut,</td>
<td>hän</td>
<td>tähtäsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>NEG3</td>
<td>obey:NEG:PST</td>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>aim:PST3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maah-an</td>
<td>mie-hen</td>
<td>jalkoje-n</td>
<td>eteen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ground-ILL</td>
<td>man-ACC</td>
<td>foot:PL-GEN</td>
<td>in.front.of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja</td>
<td>painoi</td>
<td>liipaisin-ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td>press:PST:3SG</td>
<td>trigger-PRTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Twice, Aulis demanded the man to stop and abandon/drop the crowbar. When this/he did not obey, he aimed at the ground in front of the man’s feet and pressed the trigger.’

Example 2-26 shows discourse deictically used tämä. As seen, tämä in the example does not have an antecedent in the form of a noun phrase. The demonstrative pronoun tämä ‘this’ refers to the proposition of the previous sentence, that is, the process that nanobacteria do. Laury (1997, 89) found that all three demonstrative pronouns tämä, tuo and se were used for discourse deixis in her conversation data.
Nano-bakteerit
nanobacterium:PL
accumulae:PL3
kertyvä
fibroblasti-in
fibroblast-ILL
ja
and

Tämä
viittaa
se-ACC
siihen,
indicate:PL3
että
that

nano-bakteeri
COP

Tämä
viittaa
se-ACC
siihen,
indicate:PL3
että
that

nanobacterium NEG3

ja

fibroblast-ILL

Nanobacteria are accumulated in fibroblast and kill it. This indicates that the nanobacterium is not harmless.'

By their recognition use the demonstratives signal that the referent is familiar or known to both speaker and addressee (cf. Diessel 2006a, 432). Laury (1997, 102–103) also mentions that the recognition use involves “some degree of uncertainty whether the addressee can identify the referent.”

Recognition use can be either first or later mention of a referent (Juvonen 2000, 100). As tuo is characterized as having its referents outside the speaker’s current sphere, as well as involving a mutuality of perspective between the speaker and the addressee, tuo is considered to have a recognition function. Juvonen (2000, 37–38), citing Helasvuo (1988) and Vilkuna (1992), states that the demonstrative adjective semmonen ‘such’ (colloquial form) can be used for its face-saving function, which may be a characteristic of recognition use.

Associative variants of deictic use and anaphoric use refer to first mentions of new referents within a speech event, which are identifiable only via another already present referent (i.e. indirectly) (cf. Juvonen 2000, 19). The associative variants of anaphoric use are, from a cross-linguistic point of view, not normally regarded as the function of demonstratives but of the definite articles (cf. Himmelmann 1998; Diessel 1999). Even though associative anaphoric use may not be a standard use of Finnish demonstratives, Laury (1997) finds that certain first mentions of se ‘that/it’ in her data are examples of this use.

Juvonen (2000, 102), on the other hand, states that clear cases of associative anaphoric linking found in her data were made by first-mention posses-

42 By using semmone the speaker can signal that the referent should be known to the addressee, but even if it is not, the addressee need not to be embarrassed.


44 For instance, in one of her example, se kauhee kohina (ku.) ‘the awful roar’ (Laury’s translation), se together with a noun kohina (gushing sound) is the first mention in a discourse, and yet it is understood to refer to the gushing sound of the running water from the open tap; an explicit relation was made from the previously mentioned hana auki ‘(a) tap opened’.
sive constructions. She found some cases of associative anaphoric linking in which possessive constructions were accompanied by adnominal se. Such adnominal se seems to have an associative anaphoric function; however, it seems to be difficult to distinguish associative anaphoric use from recognitional use in such cases.

The term associative variant of deictic use or associative deictic use may not be a common term in the description of Finnish grammar. However, in the correspondence with native speakers of Finnish, what we might call an associative deictic use for tämä ‘this’ was found. According to native speakers of Finnish, a noun phrase tämän kansi ‘this-gen lid’ can be used for first mentions even if the lid is absent at the speech event, as shown in Example 2-27. This use of tämän kansi can be compared with the use of Japanese kono futa ‘this lid’ seen in Example 2-27, which is also used associative deictically. However, in Finnish, tämä ‘this’ is in the genitive case (possessive construction) and the interpretation of tämän kansi can be more like ‘its lid’, that is, the lid of a jar without a lid for the time being.

Example 2-27

(Tiedät=kō) minne tämä-n kansi on kadonnut?
know2=Q where tā-gen lid COP3 missing

‘(Do you know) where the lid is (missing)?’

2.4.3. Demonstratives in Swedish

Forms

In Swedish grammar, there is no particular part of speech or category called “demonstratives,” but there are four demonstrative pronouns den här ‘this,’ den där ‘that,’ denna ‘this’ and den ‘it’ as a part of pronouns (cf. Holm and Nylund 1970; SAG 1999, 1:161; Dahl 2003, 50). The demonstrative adverb is not a traditionally established category either, but what correspond to demonstrative adverbs, that is, deictically used locational adverbs, which are distributed as adverbial demonstratives, are usually included in the category of adverbs. Swedish här ‘here’ and där ‘there’ are adverbs that indicate a deictic contrast, and they can be regarded as adverbial demonstratives. The four forms of Swedish demonstrative pronouns, den här ‘this,’ den där ‘that,’ denna ‘this’ and den ‘it/that,’ inflect for number and gender. The forms mentioned above are presented in the singular and common form regarding gender, and in the following I use the singular and common forms unless otherwise stated. All these demonstrative pronouns are used both pronominally.

45 SAG = Svenska Akademiens Grammatik.
and adnominally. Among Swedish demonstratives, *den* ‘it/that’ is rather problematic since its form is identical with the inanimate personal pronoun and definite article. In this study, only adnominally used *den* (taking a form of *den N-def*) is analyzed as demonstrative, since this form is clearly distinguishable as demonstrative *den*. Table 2-6 shows an overview of

Table 2-6 Demonstrative forms in Swedish distinguished by their distributions and semantics (based on SAG 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>distribution</th>
<th>semantics</th>
<th>(a) Nominal</th>
<th>proximal</th>
<th>distal (non-proximal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neuter</td>
<td>common</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronominal</td>
<td>det här</td>
<td>den här</td>
<td>det där</td>
<td>den där</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detta</td>
<td>denna</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adnominally</td>
<td>det här N-def</td>
<td>den här</td>
<td>det där</td>
<td>den där</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>detta N</td>
<td>denna N</td>
<td>det N-def</td>
<td>den N-def</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Adverbial</td>
<td>proximal</td>
<td>distal (non-proximal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>locational</td>
<td>här</td>
<td>där</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hit</td>
<td>dit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For nominal demonstratives, only the singular forms are given.

Example 2-28 below shows pronominally used *den här* and *den där*. The common form (*den här/där*) will be used when the intended referent belongs to a noun with the common form, such as *bok* ‘book.’ The neuter form (*det här/där*) will be used if the intended referent belongs to a noun with the neuter form, such as *bord* ‘table.’ The following Example 2-29, Example 2-30 and Example 2-31 show adnominally used *den här/där, denna and den* respectively. As in Example 2-28, the choice between the common form (*den här/där, denna and den*) and the neuter form (*det här/där, detta, and det*) depends on the intended referent; the common form will be used if the intended referent belongs to a noun with the common form, and the neuter form will be used if the intended referent belongs to a noun with the neuter form. Further, the head (noun) will be in the definite form if it is with *den här/där* and *den* and it will be in the indefinite form if it is with *denna*. An example of the demonstrative adverbs *här* and *där* is shown in Example 2-32.

---

46 *N-def* stands for noun (*N*) with definite article (*-def*).
Example 2-28

{Den här/det här} är {min/mitt},
{den här/det här} COP {I.POSS:C I.POSS:N}
{den där/det där} är {din/ditt}
{den där/det där} COP {you.POSS:C you.POSS:N}

‘This is mine, that is yours.’

Example 2-29

Jag skulle vilja ha den här/den där kaka-
I AUX:PST AUX:INF have:INF {den här/den där} cake-DEF
tack
thank.you

‘I would like to have this/that cake, thank you/please.’

Example 2-30

Läs {denna / denna bok} tills måndag nästa vecka
read-IMP {denna / denna book} by Monday next week

‘Read this /this book by Monday next week.’

Example 2-31

Kan du ge mig den bok-en?
Can you give:INF I.ACC den book-DEF?

‘Could you give me that book?’

Example 2-32

Jag ska sitta här och
I AUX sit:INF här and
du ska sitta där.
you AUX sit:INF där

‘I am going to sit here and you are going to sit there.’

Basic semantics: deictic features

Demonstratives in Swedish have a two-way deictic contrast and the deictic features are indicated by proximal här ‘here’ and distal or non-proximal där ‘there,’ which are also adverbia locational demonstratives. Proximity and distance are defined by taking the speaker as the deictic center, and the loca-
tion referred to by här is explained as indicating the same sphere as where the speaker is located (the speaker’s sphere), and the location referred to by där is explained as indicating the space outside the speaker’s sphere. There are also two demonstratives with proximal meaning, den här (N-def) and denna (N), and two demonstratives with distal (non-proximal) meaning, den där (N-def) and den N-def. As proximal DEM, den här (N-def) and denna (N) are described as indicating the referent’s proximity, closeness to the speaker. As distal DEM, den där (N-def) and den N-def are described as indicating the referent’s distance (remoteness) from the speaker.

The difference between den här (N-def) and denna (N) is that while den här is considered to be basically colloquial, denna is mainly used in formal written Swedish (SAG 1999, 2:306; 308). The difference between distal den där N-def and den N-def, on the other hand, does not concern colloquial or written variants as was the case with den här (N-def) and denna (N), since den N-def can be used in both spoken (thereby “informal/casual”) and written (thereby “formal/prestigious”) language (ibid., 323).

The difference between den där (N-def) and den N-def concerns rather the way in which they are used to put the referent in contrast to other possible objects/referents. For instance, regarding the use of spatial deictic distal den där in Example 2.33, SAG (1999, 2:320) explains that the “speaker is pointing out a shirt that he does not want to include in his own “here” (proximal sphere); it may be a shirt that someone else is wearing or the one which is located away from the speaker than the other, current or topical shirt” (my translation). Thus the use of den där skjortan ‘that shirt’ in the example puts the denoted referent in contrast to the other possible/conceivable referent that can be referred to by proximal den här (N-def). In other words, the use of den där N-def here presupposes the existence of other possible referents that are contrasted with the denoted referent itself in terms of distance. The use of spatial deictic distal den N-def, on the other hand, may not necessarily presuppose the existence of other possible referents contrasting in terms of distance. SAG (1999, 2:323) explains that with den N-def, “a certain referent (referents) is/are pointed out among a number (of similar referents) given in the speech situation” (my translation).

Example 2.33, taken from SAG 1999, 2:320

Ta den där skjorta-n.

‘Take that shirt.’

---

47 Denna is also used colloquially in the dialect spoken in South and West Sweden (SAG 1999, 2:306; 308).
Example 2-34, taken from SAG 1999, 2:323

Ge mig den sax-en.
give:IMP I:ACC den scissor-DEF

‘Give me that (pair of) scissors.’

As for Example 2-33 and Example 2-34, SAG (ibid., 320; 323) explains that the speaker of Example 2-33 uses den där skjortan ‘that shirt’ to point out a certain shirt that he does not want to include in his “here,” in his proximity. On the other hand, den saxen ‘that pair of scissors’ can be used (Example 2-34) when “in a given, or thinkable number of pairs of scissors of similar kinds, only a certain pair of scissors is intended to be referred to in contrast to the remaining” (ibid., 323, my translation). Here, the intended referent is presented in contrast to the other possible referents, and the distance is rather irrelevant. SAG (ibid.) states further that den saxen ‘that pair of scissors’ can be used even if only one pair of scissors is presented in the speech situation; den N-def is used in this case in order to direct the addressee’s attention towards the referent (a pair of scissors). Thus we may claim that the differences between den där N-def and den N-def lie in the pragmatic features encoded by demonstratives rather than in the deictic features (cf. Diessel 1999, 51).

As in Japanese and Finnish, the deictic features characterized in terms of spatial terms in relation to the deictic center serve as a basis for metaphorical extensions into other domains, for instance time. The physical sense of proximity/distance may also be extended to a psychological sense of proximity/distance. For instance, concerning Example 2-35 a and b, SAG (1999, 2:316) explains that while det här ljudet ‘this sound’ refers to a sound surrounding the speaker at the time of the speech event, or a sound that the speaker is thinking of producing at any moment, det där ljudet ‘that sound’ refers to a sound which just faded away (thus not sounding any longer), or a sound which the speaker does not see the source of. In these cases, den här ‘this’ and den där ‘that’ make use of an extension of the spatial sense of proximity/distance to the domain of time; den här ‘this’ is equated to the present and/or near future, and den där ‘that’ is equated to the past.

Example 2-35a and b, taken from SAG 1999, 2:316

a.

Har du hört det här ljudet förr?
have you hear:PF det här sound-DEF before

‘Have you heard this sound before?’
b.

Har du hört det där ljudet förr?

Have you heard that sound before?

Adnominal demonstratives *den här* ‘this’ and *den där* ‘that’ can also take a head (noun) that expresses time, for instance *vecka* ‘week,’ in order to express a proximity/distance in terms of time. However, while *den här veckan* ‘this week’ indicates the week that the speaker is experiencing or the forthcoming week at the time of utterance, *den där veckan* ‘that week’ does not seem to indicate merely a remote time in relation to the deictic center and at the time of speech; it is used rather in recognitional manner (cf. Himmelmann 1996; Diessel 1999, chap. 5) or anaphoric manner. The speaker, by the use of *den där veckan* ‘that week,’ seems to refer to a certain point in time (i.e. week), which does not overlap with the time at the speech situation, but that he expects the addressee to recognize. Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999) call this recognitional use.

Further, regarding the psychological proximity/distance expressed by Swedish demonstratives, adnominal *den där* ‘that’ in general is described as indicating the speaker’s distance-taking attitude (SAG 1999, 2: 320); pronominal *den där* ‘that’ is employed to refer to persons and is said particularly to indicate a distance-taking attitude of the speaker in addition to a pejorative nuance (Example 2-36). Adnominal *den där* used to refer to a state of affairs within the speech event may also indicate the speaker’s distance-taking attitude (Example 2-37) (ibid.). A speaker can make an utterance as shown in Example 2-37 when he looks at a movie on TV and after watching it for a few minutes.

Example 2-36

Ser du *den där*? Det är han som vann match-en igår.

Do you see that (man)? It is he who won the game yesterday.

(distance-taking, pejorative)
Example 2-37

*Den där film-en är tråkig!*  
*den där movie-DEF COP boring*

‘That movie is boring!’ (distance-taking)

Regarding psychological proximity expressed by *den här* ‘this,’ it indicates a certain degree of speaker involvement in the ongoing speech situation (ibid., 2:318). Example 2-38, for instance, shows the speaker’s involvement in the certain branch of business in question. Concerning psychological proximity/distance expressed by *denna N* and *den N-def*, even though both *denna N* (proximal) and *den N-def* (distal) can be used to indicate the speaker’s particularly strong feelings or emotions, such as feelings of admiration or despair toward the referent, these uses do not seem to be based on the spatial proximity/distance of the demonstratives; examples in SAG (see Example 2-34) show that *denna N* as well as *den N-def* can express the speaker’s both positive and negative attitudes toward the referent (SAG 1999, 2:313, 324).

Example 2-38, taken from SAG 1999, 2:318

*Det är bara så inom den här bransch-en*  
*it COP just so within den här line.of.business-DEF*

‘It is just so within this line of business.’

Example 2-39, a. and b. taken from SAG 1999, 2:313

a.  
*Dessa evinnerlig-a predikning-ar!*  
*denna:PL eternal-PL sermon-PL*

‘These eternal sermons!’

b.  
*Alltid talar du om denne fantastiske Åke Bengtsson.*  
*always talk you about denna:M fantastic:M Åke Bengtsson*

‘You are always talking about this fantastic Åke Bengtsson.’

**Spatial deictic feature: on the spatial contrast between *här* and *där***

We have seen that the difference between *den här N-def* and *den där N-def* can be described in terms of proximity: *den här* is proximal, indicated by *här*, and *den där* is distal, indicated by *där*. However, it is important to note that in SAG (1999, 2:641), proximity and distance are explained in terms of
“speaker’s space” and “outside speaker’s space,” where här is equated with “speaker’s space/scope”\footnote{In Swedish, “rum inom talarens utrymme.”} (i.e. speaker’s sphere) and där is equated with “outside the space/scope that the speaker consider to be his/her own”\footnote{In Swedish, “rum utan för det utrymme som talaren betraktar som sitt.”} (i.e. outside the speaker’s sphere). SAG (ibid.) further states that “the speaker’s sphere always includes a part of his/her physical body, but the extent of the sphere depends on the speaker, with respect to the related factors in the context and speech situation.” Nevertheless, we find that the difference between här and där concerns a contrast in locations of referent (proximal-distal) relative to the deictic center, which is usually considered to be the location of the speaker. Note that in SAG’s description of där, the location of the addressee is not included. It is important to emphasize that this contrast concerns a relative distance of a referent to the deictic center, and not an absolute, measurable one (cf. Diessel 2012b, 2410). A good example of this fact may be the following: a man can say Där var nyckeln! which literally means ‘There was the key!’ just when he felt the key that he was searching for in the pocket of his jacket.\footnote{This is an authentic example observed by the author.} Similarly, we can say Den där var bra! lit. ‘That was good!’ for a book that we have just read and are still holding in our hands.\footnote{This is an authentic example observed by the author.} We can thus use distal där/där in order to refer to an object even if it is located very close to ourselves so we can touch it. It is also important to note that we can also use proximal här/den här as Här var nyckeln! lit. ‘Here was the key!’ and Den här var bra! lit. ‘This was good!’ in the respective situations.

Above we have seen the cases in which the use of proximal demonstrative (här/den här) and distal demonstrative (där/den där) are not restricted by the absolute distance of the referent to the deictic center.

**Pragmatic uses**

The basic function of demonstratives, to focus or orient the addressees’ attention on certain entities existing in the speech situation (Diessel 1999; 2006a;b; 2012b; Levinson 2004, 111) is an essential function of demonstrative in terms of communicative interaction (Diessel 1999, 93); and even though it may not be explicitly stated in the literature on Swedish grammar,\footnote{E.g. Holm and Nylund (1970), SAG (1999) and Holmes and Hinchliffe (2003)} this seems to be basic even for Swedish demonstratives. In SAG (1999) for example, all of the four demonstratives, den här N-def, den där N-def, denna N and den N-def are described as pointing out a certain entity/referent and thereby distinguishing/differentiating it from “the others” or the remaining ones. It may be reasonable to assume that the essential function of focus-
ing/directing the addressee’s attention is embodied in the “pointing-out” function.

As seen before, this basic pointing-out function (and thus the function to orient the addressee) is realized and referred to as various “uses” of demonstratives. The previously mentioned four uses distinguished by Himmelmann (1996) and Diessel (1999), (1) deictic use, (2) anaphoric use, (3) discourse deictic use and (4) recognitional use are all found in Swedish demonstratives.

By using deictically used demonstratives, a certain entity (referent) is pointed out in the speech situation, thereby focusing the addressee’s attention on it. For instance, *Är inte denna målning/den här målningen fantastisk!*? ‘Isn’t this painting fantastic!?’ may be said in order to orient the addressee’s attention to a certain painting located near the speaker, and *Är inte den målningen/den där målningen fantastisk!*? ‘Isn’t that painting fantastic!?’ may be said for the same purpose, but for a painting located at a distance from the speaker.

As a case of the anaphoric use of the demonstratives, we find, for instance: *Jag läste NNs nya bok* ‘I read NN’s new book’ and continuing *Denna bok var fantastisk* ‘This book was fantastic.’ In this example, the speaker is referring back to NNs nya bok ‘NN’s new book’ by *denna*. Instead of *denna, den här/där boken* ‘this/that book’ and *den boken* ‘that book’ may also be used.

As an example of the discourse deictic use, we find a statement such as: *{Detta/det här/denna historia/den här historien/den där historien/den historia} känner jag till* ‘I know {this/this/this story/this story/that story/that story},’ said when your friend just told you about a piece of news or an anecdote that you already know. By employing the discourse deictic demonstratives, you are not referring to a previously mentioned noun phrase but to the whole utterance or proposition. In SAG (1999), there are some cases called descriptive anaphoric use, which I deem to be discourse deictic use; according to SAG, a demonstrative, especially adnominally used *denna* ‘this’ (appearing as *denna N*) can be employed to add new, unrestrictive (non-restrictive) information or a description of the referent, and this use is called descriptive anaphoric use. For example, in *Regeringens talesman blev lång i ansiktet [...] C. missade inte denna fantastiska chans* ‘The government’s spokesman expressed his disappointment [...] C. did not miss this fantastic opportunity’ (taken from SAG 1999, 2:311), the use of *denna N* equals the fact that the government’s spokesman expressed his disappointment with a fantastic opportunity for C.

Regarding the recognitional use, SAG and other studies of Swedish demonstratives state that demonstratives *den här* (proximal) and *den där* 53

(distal) are used to signal that the referent is considered to be familiar to both the speaker and the addressee and should be recognized and updated (refocused) in their mind (SAG 1999, 2:319–320; Fraurud 2000, 6; Lindström 2000, 93). SAG (ibid.) described this as a reminding function of demonstratives. This function is said to be limited to den här (proximal) and den där (distal). The difference between den här and den där at this point is that if the referent is a person, den där indicates a certain distance or distance-taking attitude on the part of the speaker, while den här is rather neutral. See Example 2-40 and Example 2-41. A proximal demonstrative is used in Example 2-40 and a distal demonstrative in Example 2-41; in both cases, the referent is a person.

Example 2-40
Såg du den här Eriksson/mann-en igår?
see:PST you den här Eriksson/man-DEF yesterday

‘Did you see this Eriksson/man yesterday?’ (neutral)

Example 2-41
Såg du den där Eriksson/man-nen igår?
see:PST you den där Eriksson/man-DEF yesterday

‘Did you see that Eriksson/man yesterday?’ (distance-taking)

It is also said that when the referent is a thing, den här (proximal) seems to refocus the referent more than den där (distal) and the topicality indicated by den här (proximal) is therefore higher than den där (distal) (SAG 1999, 2:317). See Example 2-42 and Example 2-43. Note that the referent is not present at the speech situation. According to SAG (ibid.) the referent in question is usually something uniquely identified among the speech participants. Further, SAG states that proximal den här used in this way cannot usually be replaced by another proximal denna.

Example 2-42
Den här medicin-en mot huvudväck, den här medicine-DEF for headache

tror du den är bra?
believe/think you it COP good

‘This medicine for headaches, do you think it is good?’
(The medicine is topical)
Example 2-43

\[
\text{Den där medicin-en mot huvudvärk, den där medicine-DEF for headache}
\]

tror du den är bra?
believe/think you it COP good

‘That medicine for headaches (you know), do you think it is good?’
(The medicine is not topical as indicated by *den här*.)

2.5. Summary

This chapter discussed the issues of deixis and deictically used demonstratives. It started with an overview of deixis and the characteristics of reference by demonstratives as deictic expressions. Thereafter, deictically used demonstratives of Japanese, Finnish and Swedish were reviewed.

Deixis means pointing or indicating. It can be characterized by its context-dependent nature, and it poses some interesting questions about the semantics of natural languages and communicative interaction between the speech participants. Within formal semantics, it has been considered that language expressions (including deictic expressions) can be disembodied into invariant, context-free elements and that they can build a (disembodied) representational system, independent of current circumstances. Deictic expressions are indeed not devoid of lexical meaning, but a recent view of deixis is that it is “fundamentally grounded in our bodily experience and situated interactions between the interlocutors” (Diessel 2012b, 2409) and that the use of deictics “presupposes a theory-of-mind that enables the communicative partners to adopt the perspective of another person” (ibid.). Thus deixis may best be studied by taking both formal semantic and pragmatic approaches.

Much of the present view on deixis can be attributed to Bühler's (1990) work *Theory of Language. The Representational Function of Language*, and his view on deixis is often referred to as the traditional (or standard) view (or account). In this view, deixis is seen as a phenomenon occurring within a coordinate system where the speaker is the origo (deictic center). Deixis in this traditional view is thus regarded as egocentric. I agree with this egocentric view of deixis even though there are some criticisms of it. The traditional view also distinguishes three deictic categories: space (place), person and time deixis.

Demonstratives are a group of expressions which usually includes certain pronouns, adjectives (including determiners) and adverbs. Demonstratives are deictics and among the various deictic expressions such as I (person
deixis), and today (time deixis), they are regarded as spatial deixis. Being deictic expressions, demonstratives are thought of as indicating the relative distance of the referent in the speech situation in relation to the deictic center, which is the speaker’s location at the time of the utterance. Cross-linguistically, demonstratives can be characterized according to the number of contrasts indicated by this relative distance. Anderson and Keenan (1985, 280–295) classified the system of spatial deictics expressed by demonstratives, identifying (1) one-term systems, (2) two-term systems, (3) three-term systems and (4) systems with more than three terms. Among them, three-term systems are further divided into two types. Type (a) is the system which distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) medial to speaker, (iii) distal to speaker. Type (b) is the system which distinguishes between (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee and (iii) non-proximal to speaker and addressee.

In the review of demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, a general, brief description of the forms, semantics, and function of demonstratives was made for each language. Thereafter, the characteristics of the spatial deictically used demonstratives were reviewed.

Japanese has a three-term system, which reflects a three-way contrast of spatial relations: (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee, (iii) non-proximal to speaker and addressee.

Finnish also has a three-term system, which also reflects a three-way contrast of spatial relations: (i) proximal to speaker, (ii) proximal to addressee, (iii) non-proximal to speaker and addressee.

Swedish has a two-term system, which reflects (i) proximal to speaker and (ii) distal (or non-proximal) to speaker.
3. Interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence

Interlanguage (IL) is the learners’ language. As one of the aims of this thesis is to investigate the interlanguage of Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese, this chapter provides an overview of the ways in which interlanguage and related issues, cross-linguistic influence in particular, have been viewed and studied in the studies of language acquisition/learning. Since the present thesis can be seen as a study of the third language (L3) or later learning, the factors that may influence L3 learning are also discussed. This chapter starts with a presentation of the terminology used in the study (Section 3.1). Interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence are then reviewed (Sections 3.2.2–3.4) and implications for this study are drawn (Section 3.5).

3.1. Terminology

In this study, the terms acquisition and learning are used interchangeably, even though acquisition may, strictly speaking, be distinguished from learning. That is, acquisition can refer to an implicit, subconscious process of rule-internalization which results from natural language use, and learning can refer to an explicit, conscious process of rule-internalization which results in metalinguistic knowledge (cf. Krashen 1981). The terms mother tongue(s), native language(s) (NL) and first language(s) (L1) are also used interchangeably to refer to the language(s) that a person acquires/learns to speak first.

A language or languages acquired in addition to one’s native language can be referred to as a second language (L2) and a third language (L3) and so on according to the chronological order of acquisition. However, most non-native language acquisition studies, especially from the 1960s through the 1980s, were conducted in terms of second language acquisition (SLA). In these studies, as a rule, the researchers treated the learner’s L1 as the only background language without differentiating L2 and any other languages (if any) learned later. This research area has in fact been called second language acquisition studies. Even in a recent publication, Ellis (2008, 5) explained that the term second was generally used (and thus in his book) to refer to any language(s) other than the first language, even though he admitted that this
naming was rather unfortunate considering that there are learning settings such as those in South Africa where the term *additional language* may be more appropriate to describe English language learned by multilingual learners. In recent years, research on multilingualism has been gaining interest and studies on L3 acquisition have grown in the natural course of events. A number of scholars started to realize the necessity for distinguishing between bilingualism and multilingualism and between L2 learning and L3 learning (e.g. Hammarberg 2001; Cenoz Iragui 2006; De Angelis 2007; Kemp 2009 etc.). As mentioned, language(s) learned in addition to one’s native language can be labeled in a chronological order, as the second language (L2), the third language (L3) and so on. However, to label the non-native language(s) according to the chronological order of acquisition is problematic in several ways. For instance, it is unclear on what basis we can say that languages other than one’s native one(s) are learned or acquired, or what the proficiency level has to be. It is also difficult to determine the chronological order of acquisition in a multilingual society since several first languages and/or non-native languages may be acquired simultaneously.

In 1980s, as the processes of multilinguals gained attention and started to be examined more closely and systematically (cf. De Angelis and Dewale 2009), they began to be recognized as learners and speakers in their own right who should not be compared with L2 learners without careful attentiveness (De Angelis 2007, 1). In recent years, it has become common to treat L3 learning separately from L2 learning (e.g. Hammarberg 2009).

Hammarberg (2009, 6) explains L1, L2 and L3 and so on as following the course of defining a multilingual:

A multilingual is then defined as a person with knowledge of three or more languages. A first language (L1) is any language acquired during infancy, and a second language (L2) any language encountered and acquired after infancy, as stated above. In dealing with the linguistic situation of a multilingual, the term third language (L3) will be used for a non-native language which is currently being used or acquired in a situation where the person already has knowledge of one or more L2s besides one or more L1s.

According to Hammarberg, an L3 is “a special case of the wider category of L2” (ibid.), not necessarily being language number three in order of acquisition (ibid.; Hammarberg 2001, 22). All other languages known by the L3 user, irrespective of number, can be called prior L2s and Hammarberg (ibid) calls L1(s) and L2(s) all together background languages. In his opinion, the term fourth language (L4) is not necessary. Hammarberg further proposes the use of the terms primary (language), secondary (language) and tertiary (language), instead of first (language), second (language) and third (language). He also comments that the abbreviations L1, L2 and L3 can be kept with the interpretation mentioned above (ibid, 7).
In this study, I share Hammarberg’s view of L1, L2 and L3. I also share his view that L3 learning is different from L2 learning (also De Angelis 2007; Jordà 2005), since most of my learner informants, if not all, are studying Japanese as L3 or the later language. However, I use the term and the abbreviation second language (L2) as it is used in the literature I refer to, and the term may also include L3 and other later learned languages.

3.2. Interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence

Since Selinker presented the article Interlanguage in 1972, this notion has been a central issue in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) studies. In this section, the notion of interlanguage and the related issues, particularly cross-linguistic influence, are reviewed and discussed.

3.2.1. Interlanguage

In the frequently cited article Interlanguage, Selinker (1972) uses the term to refer to a linguistic system observed in an adult L2 learner when he uses the language being learned in natural settings. Selinker explains that interlanguage is the systematic knowledge of an L2 which is independent of the learner’s native language (NL; L1) and the target language (TL) and yet is considered to be linked to both NL and TL by the learner’s psychological processes through so-called interlingual identifications. Similar conceptualizations of learner language have been made and discussed by several different researchers, such as transitional competence by Corder (1967) and approximative system by Nemser (1971), but the term interlanguage is perhaps the most frequently used term in the area of SLA studies (cf. Tarone 2006).

As mentioned, interlanguage is a linguistic system observed especially in adult learners, that is, learners after puberty. According to Selinker (1972), the foremost characteristic is that it fossilizes, it ceases to develop, while L1 learning will not fossilize. Since the way in which L2 is acquired seems to differ from the way L1 is acquired, it is assumed that different psychological processes are involved in these two ways of learning. In Selinker (1972), the definition interlanguage and related assumptions were made based on the

54 Interlingual identification is a term used originally by Weinreich (1953). The term was used then to describe how a bilingual finds (identifies) a certain linguistic element/feature (phoneme) astride the limits of the two languages (Weinreich [1953]2010, 7). We may re-describe here that the bilingual finds that a certain linguistic element/feature in a language is identical (or similar) to another element found in another language.

55 For instance, while children usually/normally learn/acquire their native language completely and successfully, it is rather seldom that adult learners learn/acquire L2 to the level of their NL.
learners’ native language (NL/L1) and second language (L2), while the status of L2 remained rather undefined and not clear.

According to Ellis (2008, 968), the term has come to be used with three different, but related meanings: (1) to refer to the series of interlocking systems which characterize acquisition, (2) to refer to the system that is observed at a single stage of development and (3) to refer to particular L1/L2 combinations. In a recent publication, Selinker (2014) submitted a newer, modified working definition of interlanguage. According to this modified definition, interlanguage is “a linguistic/cognitive space that exists between the native language and the language that one is learning” (ibid., 223). He describes further that interlanguages are “non-native languages which are created and spoken whenever there is language contact” (ibid.). In this modified working definition, the target language is expressed as “the language that one is learning”, that is, not necessarily one’s second language L2, and it is therefore more adaptable to multilingual settings.

In this thesis, interlanguage refers to a linguistic system in the mind of a learner observed in her when she uses the language (target language; TL) that she is learning, which is characterized by being different from both the previously learned language(s) (including L1) and the TL, although considered to be linked to both the previous language(s) and TL through psychological processes.

3.2.2. Interlanguage, transfer and cross-linguistic influence

The central arguments in the theory of interlanguage are: i) the processes related to L2 acquisition are different from the processes related to L1 acquisition, since while adults seldom reach native level/proficiency, children do not usually fail to reach native proficiency in their acquisition of L1; and ii) the adult learners’ linguistic system (that shown when they acquire and use the TL) is different from both their L1 and TL, but still linked to both L1 and TL by interlingual identifications.56 Thus the objectives of interlanguage research have been to elucidate the differences between the psychological processes when acquiring an L1 versus those when acquiring an L2 (or TL) and to describe them. How do these processes differ? Why do learners of L2 fail to reach native proficiency level in the target language?

Among a set of assumptions of second language learning that Selinker (1972, 228–230) posited in his article, the issues most frequently discussed are perhaps the notion of i) latent psychological structure, ii) fossilization together with the five processes that are thought to underlie fossilization and iii) interlingual identifications that are linked across three linguistic systems: the learners’ native language (NL/L1), the target language (TL) and the interlanguage (IL).

56 Note that L3 and later language acquisition were not differentiated in Selinker (1972).
Latent psychological structure is a putative, pre-formulated arrangement (structure) in the brain of L2 learners, which is supposedly activated when he/she tries to use the TL (cf. ibid 212, 229).

Fossilization is a phenomenon in which the learner’s interlanguage ceases to develop in spite of continued exposure to the TL. In consequence, the learners fail to reach native proficiency in the TL. Fossilization is considered to be involved in building and developing the interlanguage (Selinker 1972, 229–230), and it is assumed to exist as a latent psychological structure. The five central processes which are thought to underlie fossilization are: 1) language transfer (from NL), 2) transfer of training, 3) learning strategies, 4) communication strategies and 5) overgeneralization of TL linguistic materials (Tarone 2006 describes these as rules). Note that the use of the term language transfer above is limited in its scope; much emphasis is on the influence of a learner’s native language on the target language. Today, the term is usually used in a wider sense, as it usually also includes influence from TL on NL (Ellis 2008, 370). Note also that the term transfer has often been associated with interference, that is, an impediment to learning due to old habits from the previous language(s); this appeared in the behaviorist\textsuperscript{57} theory of learning. Interference, causing difficulty in learning and errors, is also called negative transfer, which refers to the negative influence of a certain language on TL. However, there is evidence of a phenomenon known as positive transfer, which has a positive effect (for example, facilitating the learning) of a certain language over the TL. The recent use of the term language transfer includes both positive and negative transfer. Odlin (1989) explains transfer as follows:

Transfer is the influence resulting from the similarities and differences between the target language and any other language that has been previously (and perhaps imperfectly) acquired (Odlin 1989, 27 also quoted in Odlin 2003, 436).

Ellis (2008) defines transfer as follows:

Language transfer refers to any instance of learner data where a statistically significant correlation (or probability-based relation) is shown to exist between some feature of the target language and any other language that has been previously acquired (Ellis 2008, 351).

In Odlin’s (1989) definition, the focus is on the sources that transfer results from. Ellis (2008) states, the objective criterion of transfer in terms of statistics. A common aspect of these two definitions is that the languages in-

\textsuperscript{57} Behaviorism is an approach to psychology also applied to linguistics. It seeks objective evidence in observable behavior. In behaviorist learning theory, learning is viewed as the formation of habits.
volved in the phenomenon of transfer are broadly stated in these definition; in other words, transfer involves not only two languages (L2 and L1), but TL (the currently learned language) and any other language(s) previously learned.

Today, the term cross-linguistic influence (CLI) is used in a number of studies as a generic term to cover the transfer phenomenon and other phenomena such as avoidance and borrowing (Ellis 2008). I intend to use the term transfer with the wider sense mentioned above, and I use the term cross-linguistic influence interchangeably. Today, cross-linguistic influence (transfer) is a well-established research subject of its own which has been studied by a number of researchers (e.g. Gass and Selinker 1992; Jarvis 2000a; b; Jarvis and Odlin 2000; Montrul 2014; Odlin 1989; Ringbom 1992). Evidence of cross-linguistic influence is found in both production (or performance) and reception (or comprehension). Within production, pronunciation (phonology), vocabulary (lexicon) and grammar are perhaps the areas in which most of the evidence has been reported, but there is also evidence of transfer reported within discourse, including pragmatics, for example strategies used to apologize (cf. Ellis 2008, 366–372; Ringbom 2001, 59; 2006, Chapter 8). Within the area of reception, there is, for example, a study showing that the reading rate and comprehension of TL were affected by the orthographic features in the learners’ L1 (Akamatsu 2003). The evidence mentioned above is found in linguistic systems, but there is also evidence found in non-linguistic systems, such as in the use of gesture (Yoshioka 2005; Yoshioka and Kellerman 2006). The way learners conceptualize the world, which is thought to underlie their use of linguistic elements in L1, is also thought to affect the use of TL and is referred to as conceptual transfer (Jarvis 2000b; Odlin 2003; 2005).

3.3. Interlanguage in L3 learning settings

So how has interlanguage in L3 (multilingual) settings been studied and what are the findings so far? In multilingual settings, a question has arisen as to how languages learned prior to the current TL (L2 or L2s) influence the acquisition of the TL.

According to Montrul (2014, 76), the characteristic features of interlanguage, transfer, simplification and fossilization, are not unique to L2 learners but are also common to multilinguals. Yet a number of the studies conducted in the area of L3 acquisition have, as a matter of fact, dealt (only) with transfer (cross-linguistic influence). Below, various factors are reviewed that are thought to affect/condition L3 learning and which have been discussed in the

58 However, the comparison of transfer in production and in reception is said to be difficult (Ellis 2008, 367).
literature. Thereafter, the factors thought to condition cross-linguistic influence such as constraints on cross-linguistic influence are reviewed.

3.3.1. The factors that may influence L3 learning

It is probably natural to think that all the prior languages known by the learner, L1(s) and L2(s) and the TL, may influence the current TL learning. How the TL is taught (grammar teaching) and the material used in the instruction may also influence the learning. In the study of L3 learning, the focus seems to have been on the influence of NL/L1 on the L3 (cf. Hammarberg 2001, 22), but Hammarberg (ibid) claims that L2(s) could play a greater role than has usually been assumed. De Angelis and Selinker (2001, 42–58) also provided some evidence of interlanguage transfer, that is, “the influence of a non-native language on the acquisition of an additional language” that may occur in multilingual settings. The results of their study showed that lexical and morphological transfer exists, even though it is restricted to transfer of form (ibid.). Further, Cenoz Iragui (2006, 689) also mentions cross-linguistic influence from L1 and L2 on L3. Limited to teaching adult students in the European context of learning environment, the influence of using English in instruction as a lingua franca is also suggested by Jessner (2008).

Other variables which may influence L3 learning are: i) typological similarity (Cenoz 2001; De Angelis & Selinker 2001; Hammarberg 2001; Ringbom 2001, 60), ii) psychotypological similarity (Hammarberg 2001; 2009; Kellerman 1983; Ó Laoire and Singleton 2009; Ringbom 2001, 59), iii) proficiency (Cenoz 2001; Hammarberg 2001) and iv) recency (Cenoz 2001, 8–9; Hammarberg 2001, 22–23).

Typological similarity deals with a claim that a language which is typologically close to L3 will influence the use and learning of L3 ( TL). While Hammarberg (2001) placed great emphasis on the role of L2, Cenoz (2001) claimed that a typologically close language, irrespective of whether it is L1 or L2, would influence L3 learning. He reported a case in which a typologically close language (Spanish, irrespective of L1 or L2) was influential in the learning of L3 (English)). Cenoz’s study showed that Spanish, which is considered to be closer to English than to Basque, was the most influential in L3 English learning for both L1 Basque-L2 Spanish-speaking learners and L1 Spanish-L2 Basque-speaking learners.

In contrast to typological similarity which deals with a possible/potential influence of typologically close language(s) on TL learning, psychotypological similarity deals with a possible/potential influence of language(s) perceived to be close on TL learning (Kellerman 1983). Kellerman (1983) reports that while Dutch learners of German at the first-year university level tended to accept the Dutch-like idiomatic expressions in TL (German),
Dutch learners of English at the first-year university level tended to reject the Dutch-like idiomatic expressions in TL (English). According to Kellerman this was due to the perceived similarity of Dutch to German being greater than that of Dutch to English in the case of idiomatic expressions. It is important to note that the influence from the perceptually close language is not necessarily positive one (cf. Kellerman 1979, 39).

Regarding proficiency, it has been reported that less proficient learners have a tendency to transfer more elements from their NL than learners with higher proficiency levels (Cenoz 2001, 9, quoting Ringbom 1987, Möhle 1989, and Poulisse 1990). Thus the proficiency level in TL has been in focus in SLA research. There is also a claim, made, for example, in Hammarberg (2001) that if the learner has a good command of L2, and if the L2 has been acquired and used in natural situations, the influence of L2 on L3 will be favored (ibid., 22). At the same time, Cenoz (2001, 9) emphasized the importance of considering proficiency in all the languages known by the speaker.

Recency deals with the idea that L2 will be activated more easily if the speaker has used it recently and thus has easy access to it (cf. Cenoz 2001; Hammarberg 2001).

Another interesting variable/factor in this context is L2 status or foreign language effect, claimed by Hammarberg (2001, 22–23) and supported by Cenoz (2001, 9) and Cenoz Iragui (2006, 689). This deals with a claim that L2 has a tendency to be activated in L3 performance because there may be “a desire to suppress L1 as being ‘non-foreign’ and to rely rather on an orientation towards a prior L2 as a strategy to approach the L3” (Hammarberg 2001, 37). A similar view is noted in De Angelis and Selinker in their account of interlanguage (De Angelis and Selinker 2001). According to them, “the use of an interlanguage, perceived by the speaker as ‘foreign’, may be preferred over the use of the native language because it ‘sounds’ more foreign than the native language does” (ibid., 56).

Hammarberg also stated that, provided that the factors of proficiency, typology and recency are at a sufficient level, L2 seemed likely to be more favored than L1/NL as the supplier language at the early stage of L3 learning/acquisition. L1 then had a more “instrumental role” (Hammarberg 2001, 36; 2009, 63).

3.3.2. Impact of grammar instruction

Regarding the impact of instructions/teaching grammar in SLA or foreign language learning, there has been a great debate as to whether or not grammar instruction plays any role in language learning, especially after Krashens’s (1981) distinction between language acquisition and language learning (Kachru 2006, 249). In the early 1980s, Krashen (1981) presented a hypo-
esis that there is a distinction between language acquisition and language learning. This hypothesis has had a major impact on the view of how a language should be taught; and within the context of L2 and L3 teaching, the mainstream of teaching methods has shifted from direct and audiolingual methods to communicative language teaching (cf. Kachru 2006, 249). As communicative competence became the primary aim of second language instruction, grammar instruction was thought to contribute to the learners’ monitor but not to acquisition, and grammar instruction became less favored (cf. Little 1994; Master 1994). However, there are research findings that have shown that explicit grammar teaching is beneficial (cf. Ellis 2006, Kachru 2006; Little 1994). There has also been “a great deal of discussion about the nature of grammar instruction suitable for language classrooms” (Kachru 2006, 249), which deals with pedagogical grammar. Pedagogical grammar is grammar intended for use in language teaching (Brown, 2006). This term usually appears in the context of second language (Odlin 1994; Kachru 2006) and/or foreign language learning and acquisition (Aarts 2006).

Odlin (1994) explains, for example, that pedagogical grammar usually denotes the types of grammatical analysis and instruction designed for the needs of second language students. A more extended definition is found in Kachru (2006), in which pedagogical grammar is defined as serving as “a source of information for teachers and learners on grammatical topics and the appropriateness of the use of linguistic structures in specific contexts of spoken or written interaction” (ibid. 249). Further, Kachru describes that one characteristic of pedagogical grammars is to facilitate awareness of the relatedness of grammatical structures (form) to speaker/writer meanings and intentions (ibid.)

Although the term pedagogical grammar may not always be used, the importance of grammar teaching in language (particularly L2, foreign language etc.) acquisition/learning is discussed in various studies (Ellis 2006; Jeon and Kaya 2006; Long 1983; Norris and Ortega 2000; 2006). The question whether instruction makes a difference in second language acquisition was posed, for example by Long (1983), who came to the conclusion that instruction does make a difference. Norris and Ortega (2000) conducted meta-analyses of the experimental and quasi-experimental investigations to gauge the effectiveness of L2 instruction and they conclude that instruction that incorporates explicit techniques is effective. They also state that instruction that incorporates a focus on form (FonF instruction, in which meaning is related to linguistic features), is as effective as instruction that involves a focus on forms (FonFS instruction, in which linguistic features are isolated or extracted from context). Norris and Ortega’s (2000) meta-analytic methodology was repeated in Jeon and Kaya (2006) to investigate the role of instruction in the development of interlanguage pragmatics, and the results showed that direct instruction made a notable difference compared to no
instruction and that explicit instruction was in some cases more effective than implicit instruction.

Ellis (2006) defines grammar teaching as any instructional technique that draws the learners’ attention to some specific grammatical form in such a way that it helps them either to understand it metalinguistically and/or process it in comprehension and/or production so that they can internalize it (Ellis 2006, 84), and he makes some proposals and suggestions about teaching grammar. Among these, he proposes that 1) grammar teaching should put more emphasis on the meanings and uses of different grammatical structures, not just their form and 2) teachers should focus on those grammatical structures that are known to be problematic to learners rather than trying to teach the whole59 (ibid., 102). Ellis (ibid.) also suggests that grammar is best taught to learners who have already acquired some ability to use the language rather than to complete beginners. Ellis, however, adds that grammar can be taught through corrective feedback as soon as learners begin to use the language productively. He concludes the article with a proposal that grammar instruction should take the form of separate grammar lessons in order to make the learners focus on form, in other words, to focus on the accuracy of a single grammatical structure, and it should at the same time be integrated into communicative activities so that the learners focus on meaning with attention to form.

Above, we have seen that the impact of grammar teaching is beneficial in the context of L2 acquisition and/or foreign language learning. The number of studies that deal with the impact of grammar teaching or any classroom instruction in L3 learning context is rather limited. As mentioned in Section 3.1, L3 learning (and learning any later language) is not the same as L2 learning, because learners of L3 already have experience in learning a language other than L1 and it is plausible that their learning is built on L2 learning (cf. Jessner 2008). In this regard, Jessner (2008) emphasizes the importance of language awareness and awareness-raising techniques used in language teaching. Language awareness is thought to bridge previous language(s) and the target language and it is associated with discovery-focused pedagogy (Garrett 2006, 481), which features the development of metalanguage, awareness of strategies of learning and communication, critical evaluation of the process of language learning and working toward more autonomy in learning and use (ibid.). Although Hawkins (1999), a pioneer in applying a notion of language awareness to L2 learning, did not explicitly refer to L3 acquisition, his ideas appear to be viable for L3 teaching as well (cf. Jessner 2008).

---

59 Note however, Master (1994) states that, although restricted to the teaching of the article system, the whole system should be taught rather than one piece of information about the system.
3.3.3. Constraints on cross-linguistic influence

Factors that may serve to constrain cross-linguistic influence have been discussed by a number of researchers. Constraints here can be seen as conditions that promote and inhibit transfer (Ellis 2008, 379); as seen below, some factors overlap with the ones that are considered to affect L3 learning in general.

According to Odlin (2003), cross-linguistic influence depends on interlingual identifications; “the judgments that something in the native language and something in the target language are similar” (ibid., 454). He then stated that a constraint could, accordingly, be “anything that prevents a learner either from noticing the similarity in the first place or from deciding that the similarity is areal and a helpful one” (ibid.). Interlingual identification as a constraint can be seen here as a psychological process (cf. Weinreich [1953] 2010; Selinker 1972). The constraints can also involve “cognitive capacities” (such as perception and memories) and “principles of language either totally or partially independent of other human capacities” (Odlin 2003, 454). Even though Odlin (ibid) acknowledged that the constraints might exist, he also expressed his skepticism about how many kinds of constraints exist and what their nature is. Ellis (2008, 379), on the other hand, acknowledged several different types of factors that would serve as constraints. Among them are sociolinguistic factors, markedness, prototypicality, language distance (typological distance/similarity), psychotopy and developmental factors. Further, age, personality (individual learner differences) and task type (non-linguistic factors) were also given as factors. In addition, as mentioned, language distance (typological distance/similarity) and psychotypology are also suggested as possible factors that influence L3 learning in general.

3.4. Investigating cross-linguistic influence

3.4.1. Methodology to measure cross-linguistic influence

Regarding methodological issues, Ellis (2008, 354–359) suggests several possible ways to measure (or find evidence of) cross-linguistic influence (effect according to Ellis’ term). These are i) negative transfer, ii) positive transfer, iii) avoidance and iv) over-use. Similar statements are found in Odlin (2003, 443–444).

Negative transfer may be observed in the form of errors that learners make. Caution should be taken, however when errors are to be analyzed, because the errors resulting from transfer should be differentiated from the
errors resulting from the general process of language development (intralingual errors).

Positive transfer means that the learner’s background language(s) can facilitate TL learning and this can occur when there are similarities between the learner’s background language and the TL (cf. Ellis 2008, 355). Here, it is also important to differentiate positive transfer from the intralingual process.

Avoidance means that a learner decides not to use a certain linguistic element/structure in the TL; occurrence of avoidance is not easy to identify, but it is said to occur when a learner finds the TL’s linguistic structure is difficult to manage and decides not to use it (cf. Ellis 2008, 954). It is then important to demonstrate that a learner’s non-use or under-use of a certain structure in the TL is not due to a low frequency of the structure in the background language(s) (cf. ibid, 358).

Overuse means that learners use a certain TL feature more frequently than native speakers do (cf. ibid, 974). It is said that overuse may be reflected in an overgeneralization of TL rules or a preference for one form found in TL. Overuse can also be a consequence of avoidance or underproduction of certain structures that a learner finds difficult (ibid, 358). Ellis emphasizes that in the studies of cross-linguistic influence, not only evidence of transfer but also of facilitation, avoidance and overuse should be sought (ibid, 359).

Note that Ellis’ statement above was made in connection with a study of second language acquisition (SLA) where only NL (L1) and TL were dealt with. In L3 or multilingual settings, the learner’s NL is one of his/her background languages. An increase in the number of background languages leads to a complexity and diversity in the study of cross-linguistic influence, since multilingual competence may not be a mere sum of monolingual competences (Cenoz 2001, 9).

3.4.2. Learners’ errors and error analysis (EA)

Learners’ errors\(^{60}\) in the use of L2 (or later languages) is described as a systematic deviation resulting from lack of knowledge of the correct rule (cf. Brown 2006; Corder 1967; Ellis 2008). Learners’ errors are distinguished from the errors that occur in adult native speakers’ speech and in children’s learning of the native language. Adult native speakers’ errors are usually “adventitious artifacts of linguistic performance” which often equal slips of the tongue and do not reflect a defect in their knowledge of their own language (Corder 1967, 166), while children’s errors are seen as transitional forms. On the other hand, learners’ errors are considered to be the results of their underlying knowledge of the language (L2) to date, and systematic. Slips of the tongue can, understandably, also occur in the learners’ speech,

\(^{60}\) For the use of the term error, see Footnote 6 on page 1.
so learners’ errors are usually contrasted with mistakes, which are learner deviation at performance level that occur as a failure to perform their competence (knowledge of the rule). Further, learners’ errors should be distinguished from developmental types of errors. Selinker (1972, 215) considered fossilizable structures to be errors.

Error analysis has been thought to be a useful device for investigating L2 learning (cf. Corder 1967; Ellis 1987; Hulstijn & Hulstijn 1984; James 1998). However, identification of errors is not an easy task. Lennon (1991, 182), for instance, citing Hughes and Lascaratous (1982) gave examples in which some native speaker teachers of English misjudged ‘correct’ English sentences to be erroneous. This difficulty also seems to involve the definition of errors itself (Lennon 1991); for example, there is the question whether grammaticality and appropriateness/acceptability should serve as the criterion or not. And if they do, how should they be used, because an utterance may be grammatically correct but pragmatically inappropriate or unaccept-able (see also Ellis 2008 for the similar view). The following is a (working) definition given by Lennon:

... a linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers’ native speaker counterparts (Lennon 1991, 182).

This may be a rather vague definition, but I consider that it provides a general condition for an error. What we should keep in mind is that errors caused by cross-linguistic influence (transfer) and errors of intralingual origin (intralingual errors) should be differentiated.

3.4.3. Identifying instances and sources of transfer

Identification of transfer in the collected data is considered to be problematic (cf. Ellis 2008, 351–352). Odlin (2003, 445) mentions two mainstreams of approaches concerning the methods. One approach relies on comparisons of the use of a certain structure in the NL, TL and IL. Another approach relies on a comparison of how learners with two (or more) NLs manage with regard to a TL structure present in one NL but not in the other. A combination of both approaches is considered to be advantageous (Odlin 2003, 448), and Jarvis’ (2000a) claim of three criteria for identification of transfer seems to be promising.

The three criteria for identification of transfer claimed by Jarvis (ibid.) are: i) intra-group homogeneity, ii) inter-group heterogeneity and iii) similarities between the native language and interlanguage performance. Jarvis (ibid) argues that at least two, and preferably all three of these types of evidence are needed to make a reliable claim about transfer.
Of particular interest in relation to the present study are the studies in Ringbom (1992), Jarvis (2000a) and Jarvis and Odlin (2000). All these studies concern Finnish-speaking learners’ and Swedish-speaking learners’ learning of English and the results showed that Swedish-speaking learners had an advantage in learning English over Finnish-speaking learners, presumably owing to cross-linguistic similarity between English and Swedish.

3.5. Implications for this study

Above, we have seen that interlanguage is subject to be affected (or formed) by cross-linguistic influence, which can be measured by, for instance, studying negative transfer and positive transfer from previously known languages. It can also be measured by avoidance and overuse of the TL. The subjects in this study, Finnish-speaking learners and Swedish-speaking learners, share some common features; they are, for example, likely to have English as their L2 and Japanese as their L3 or later language. They may also have studied other languages, but we may safely say that English is part of their language background studied prior to Japanese.

Thus the question whether English has an influential role regardless of the learners’ NL in their learning of Japanese and in the use of deictic demonstratives can be asked from the point of view of the recency view (Hammarberg 2001). Or could it rather be the learners’ NL that influences their learning and their use of deictic demonstratives? It may also be a typological similarity/distance (cf. Cenoz 2001; De Angelis & Selinker 2001; Hammarberg 2001; Jarvis 2000; Jarvis and Odlin 2000; Ringbom 1992; 2001), or psychotypological similarity/distance (cf. Hammarberg 2001; 2009; Kelleman 1983; Ó Laoire and Singleton 2009; Ringbom 2001), or any language perceived to be foreign rather than the NL (De Angelis and Selinker 2001 56) that matters. The learners’ native languages, Finnish and Swedish, belong to different language families; hence there is a question whether they have different impacts on the learning of Japanese in general and the use of deictic demonstratives in particular.

In this study the impact of the learners’ NL in terms of the typological similarity/distance will be focused on in particular. Besides, since previous studies have shown that the way grammar is taught has influence on learning, I take any possible differences in teaching approaches between institutions into consideration: FKF and SU on the one hand and AU on the other, because FKF and SU follow the same syllabus while AU has its own.
4. Previous studies

Since this dissertation deals with learning L2 Japanese from a typological point of view, previous studies from three related areas are reviewed in this chapter. These three areas are i) contrastive studies on semantics of spatial deictic demonstratives in Japanese and other languages, ii) studies on acquisition and the actual use of Japanese demonstratives as native language and iii) studies on the acquisition of Japanese demonstratives as second language. In the contrastive study section (Section 4.1), contrastive analyses with four different languages are reviewed in order to give a picture of typological distance/similarity between these languages and Japanese, since typological distance/similarity is considered to be a constraint on cross-linguistic influence. Section 4.2 presents studies on acquisition and the actual use of Japanese demonstratives as native language. In this section empirical studies that dealt with a) the developmental process of children’s use of demonstratives and b) the actual use of spatial deictic demonstratives by adult native speakers are reviewed. Section 4.3 presents empirical studies dealing with adults’ acquisition of Japanese (spatial deictic) demonstratives as L2.

4.1. Contrastive studies of demonstratives in Japanese and other languages

4.1.1. English and Japanese

Demonstratives in English have two forms, proximal ‘this’ and distal ‘that.’ The fact that English demonstratives have a two-way contrast (proximal-distal), while Japanese demonstratives have a three-way contrast (proximal ‘ko,’ medial ‘so,’ distal ‘a’) and further that the so-series indicates proximity to the addressee, makes contrastive studies rather complicated.

Furthermore, studies of the actual use of spatial deictic demonstratives in English showed that distal ‘that’ could be used for the referent located physically close to the speaker (while Japanese normally permits the use of the proximal ko-series only for the same referent).

Sawada (2010), for example, quoting Ando (2005, 448), reported a case in which a speaker exclaims ‘What’s that?!’ at the moment he puts something that tastes bad in his mouth. Sawada (ibid.) further stated that when
'that' is used where 'this' is normally used, it can indicate the speaker’s psychological distance (for instance, disgust) towards the referent.

Niimura (2006, 36) reported similar yet different cases in which English *that* might be used about a referent located close to the speaker without adding a sense of distance-taking attitude, for instance to indicate an interesting book she has just read. According to Niimura, the Japanese distal *a*-series cannot be used when the referent is located physically close to the speaker. Niimura speculated that there might be psychological differences between English-speakers and Japanese-speakers in the way they perceive a referent (Niimura 2006, 42). Sawada (2010) suggested that psychological distance and temporal distance might be the decisive factors in choosing deictic demonstratives in English, while it is basically physical distance alone that is the decisive factor in Japanese. Sawada (ibid.) also pointed out that both *this* and *that* might be used in copula sentences to point out a person in a photograph that she is holding. For the same situation, only proximal *ko* can be used in Japanese.

### 4.1.2. Chinese and Japanese

Like English demonstratives, Chinese demonstratives have two forms that indicate two-way contrast: proximal *zhe* and distal *na*. These forms are used both adnominally and pronominally.\(^\text{61}\)

As was the case with contrastive studies between Japanese and English, comparing two languages with different deictic contrast systems (three-way or two-way) is not an easy task. For example, Shan (2011) found cases in which both Chinese proximal *zhe* and distal *na* corresponded to the Japanese medial (proximal to addressee) *so*-series. She also found that the Chinese proximal *zhe* could correspond to the Japanese distal *a*-series. Referring to the similar cases found in English, Shan reasoned that the use of *a*-series would be preferred in Japanese for a referent located physically distanced from the speaker, since physical distance plays a decisive role in Japanese, but this is not always the case in Chinese. In Chinese, although physical distance could influence the choice of demonstratives, it would not be a decisive factor. Shan (ibid) states that it is rather the speaker’s interest in the referent, and the speaker’s wish to call the addressee’s attention that would influence the choice. For example, the speaker’s strong interest in the referent may be reflected in the use of proximal *zhe*, even if the referent is distanced from the speaker. A speaker may also use proximal *zhe* of a distanced referent if he wishes to call the addressee’s attention to it. Another difference that Shan notes is that while the addressee’s location in relation to the referent and her relation to the referent is a decisive factor for the speaker of Japanese when choosing the demonstrative *so*-series, in Chinese, the address-
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\(^\text{61}\) The Chinese transcription is based on Shan (2011).
ee’s location or her relation to the referent seems not to matter. This means that both proximal *zhe* and distal *na* can be used to refer to a referent located in the addressee’s sphere. This is quite interesting since in English, which also has a two-way contrast, distal ‘that/there’ often indicates the addressee’s sphere.

4.1.3. Turkish and Japanese

In Özyürek and Kita (2002), quoted in Levinson (2004), “real usage conditions” of Turkish and Japanese deictic (spatial) demonstratives were sought. An analogy between Turkish and Japanese demonstratives has often been drawn since Turkish demonstratives have three forms: *bu*, *şu* and *o*. *Bu*, *şu* and *o* are traditionally explained as: proximal to speaker, medial to speaker or proximal to addressee and non-proximal to either speaker or addressee respectively (cf. Balpinar 2012, 90; Diessel 1999, 59; Levinson 2004, 110; Yoshida 1980, 872). According to Özyürek and Kita’s (2002) study, even though the Turkish demonstrative *şu* has traditionally been considered to indicate proximal addressee, it is actually used to draw the attention of the addressee to a referent in a situation where there is a lack of joint attention. Özyürek and Kita found a similarity between Turkish medial *şu* and Japanese medial *so* in that both have two functions: one to indicate that the referent is close to the addressee and the other to draw the addressee’s attention to a new referent.

Balpinar (2010, 2012), on the other hand, in his study, presented a quite different view on *bu*, *şu* and *o*. According to his elaborated opinion (Balpinar 2012), the semantics of Turkish demonstratives can be basically explained by a notion of *shared* or *not-shared space*: in other words, the contrast between whether i) the referent is located in *shared* space (of the speech participants), or ii) the referent is located in *not-shared space* (of the speech participants), rather than the relative distance of a referent. Balpinar’s (ibid.) notion of shared space (of the speech participants) may be comparable to Diessel’s (2012) *common domain* of speaker and addressee. According to Balpinar, *bu* and *şu* refer to a referent located in the shared sphere of the speech participants while *o* refers to a referent located in the not-shared sphere. Further, in his opinion, the difference between *bu* and *şu* is whether the speaker judges that the addressee recognizes the referent or not: if the speaker judges that the addressee will recognize the referent, it will be referred to by *bu*; if not, it will be referred to by *şu*. That *şu* refers to a referent in the shared space of the speech participants means that the use of *şu* requires an addressee, so *şu* can hardly be used in monologue (cf. Balpinar
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62 Including “potentially shared” (Balpinar 2012, 94).
63 Balpinar (2010) describes it with the word *recognition*; i.e., he calls it “recognition by the hearer.”
Balpinar (ibid.) considered that this is characteristic of şu and is comparable with the Japanese so-series. As evidence that the use of Turkish demonstratives does not depend on the relative distance from the speaker (deictic center) to the referent, Balpinar (2010, 194; 2012, 93) gives examples in which şu is used to refer to (introduce) new referents that are located at two different distances; in one case, the referent was located close to both the speaker and the addressee and in the other, the referent was located far away from both. Balpinar (2010, 194) equates şu in the former case to Japanese proximal ko(no) and şu in the latter case to Japanese distal a(no).

According to Balpinar (2012, 95), if a speaker judges that the referent is not located in shared space, for example in a situation when a speaker makes a comment on something (the referent) that the addressee possesses, the referent will be referred to by o. Further, Balpinar (2012) states that the notion of “controllable domain,” that is, if a speaker judges that the referent is located in the domain/sphere which he has control over or not, can explain the semantics and use of Turkish demonstratives.

As seen, the basic semantics of Turkish demonstratives is explained by a psychological factor. Balpinar (2010, 185) states that while the use of Turkish demonstratives depends on a psychological factor, the use of Japanese demonstratives depends on physical distance.

4.1.4. Thai and Japanese

Demonstratives in Thai are divided into four groups. They are: proximal nîi/nîi, medial nân/nân, distal nôon/nôon and emphatic distal núun/nûun (Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom 2005, Ch. 6). In addition, demonstrative determiners are noted in high tone and demonstrative pronouns in falling tone (ibid.). The emphatic distal demonstrative núun/nûun is often regarded as a part of distal demonstratives; Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom consider proximal nîi/nîi, medial nân/nân, distal nôon/nôon to be the basic demonstratives in Thai (ibid., 83). Kongjit (2004a; b) examined the actual use of demonstratives by native speakers of Thai and Japanese when they had to point out the referents located at different distances from the speaker. Her finding was that the use of nîi/nîi (proximal), nân/nân (medial) and nôon/nôon (distal) is based on the distance between the speaker and the referent; in other words, the location of the referent in relation to the speaker (the speaker’s location) is the only decisive factor in Thai. Regarding the use of Japanese demonstratives, on the other hand, she found that use of the ko-series (proximal) and the a-series (distal) was based on the distance between the speaker and the referent, but the use of the so-series (medial) was based on the distance between the addressee and the referent. Thus in the use of Japanese demonstratives, not only the location of the referent in relation to the speaker (the

---

64 The transcription is based on Iwasaki and Ingkaphirom (2005).
speaker’s location) but also the location of the referent in relation to the addressee (the addressee’s location) play an important role. Kongjit (ibid.) further states that the spatial relation between the speaker and the addressee affected the use of Japanese demonstratives.

As seen, the nature of Thai demonstratives can be described as egocentric and their use is based on the physical distance only from the speaker to the referent. The use of Japanese demonstrative is based on the physical distance both from the speaker to the referent and from the addressee to the referent. We find here that even though both น่าน/น่าน (Thai) and the so-series (Japanese) are described as medial, their basic semantics are different.

4.2. Native speakers’ use of Japanese demonstratives

This section reviews empirical studies that deal with the developmental process of children’s use of demonstratives (Section 4.2.1) and the actual use of spatial deictic demonstratives by adult native speakers (Section 4.2.2).

4.2.1. Acquisition of demonstratives as native language

As Endo (1988a) and Ono (2008) mention, there are not many studies that deal with the acquisition of demonstratives in Japanese as a native language. However, the studies carried out up to date have explored various areas. For example, there are studies regarding the time/period and order of emergence, that is, at what age children start to use ko/so/a- expressions and which expressions (forms) they start to use first and what comes next and so on (Iwabuchi et. al. 1968; Okubo 1968, cited in Endo 1988b; Kuji and Saito 1982; Ono 2008). Further, the acquisition of semantic features, that is, at what age children start to understand deictic contrasts between ko-, so- and a- and how their understanding develops, and the acquisition of other pragmatic uses, for instance how they develop their understanding and use of anaphoric use, has also been studied (e.g. Ito et al 1987; Ito et al 2004; Saito et al 1981; Kuji and Saito 1985; Terazu and Uyeno 1983).

Most of these studies mentioned above touched upon both comprehension and production of demonstratives, but some of them dealt with only one of these areas.

The types of data used in these studies varied but can be divided into two groups: one is data collected longitudinally, using recorded naturally occurring material (e.g. Iwabuchi et al 1968, quoted in Endo 1988b; Okubo 1968, quoted in Endo 1988b; Ono 2008), and another is data elicited cross-sectionally, using controlled experiments (e.g. Endo 1988a; Ito et al 2004; Saito et al 1981; Kuji and Saito 1985; Ito et al 2004).
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Regarding the order and the time of emergence, Okubo (1968) and Iwabuchi et al. (1968), reported that the ko- and a-series emerge prior to the so-series at the age of 1 year 6 months, which is also confirmed by Ono’s (2005) data.

Regarding the time of emergence of the so-series, a study by Kuji and Saito (1982) showed that it emerges “about a half year up to one year after” the emergence of the ko- and a-series (Endo 1998b). This is also confirmed by Ono (2005), but in Ono’s data, the number of so-series demonstratives employed by the informant was very limited. Ono (2008) counted the number of ko-, so- and a-expressions used by the informant (a female child) on the data-collecting occasions during two periods: when she was i) between 1 year 6 months and 1 year 11 months old and ii) between 2 years old and 2 years 5 months old, and then compared the results with adult data. (The adult was the person who was interacting with the informant at the time of data-collection. The adult’s utterances were considered to function as language input). The results of the comparison showed that during the first period, the informant’s usage rate of the so-series was less than 1% of the total occurrence, compared to the 21% usage rate of the so-series in the adult data. The result showed also that the informant’s usage rate of the a-series was 53%, but the adult’s use of the a-series was only 12%.

Table 4-1 Use of the ko-so-a series by the informant and the adult during the period 1 (1.6)–(1.11), and period 2 (2.0)–(2.5), based on Ono (2008, 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Informant (child, female)</th>
<th>ko-series</th>
<th>so-series</th>
<th>a-series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46% (450)</td>
<td>&lt;1% (8)</td>
<td>53% (511)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67% (2007)</td>
<td>21% (632)</td>
<td>12% (366)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>Informant (child, female)</td>
<td>93% (2018)</td>
<td>&lt;1% (13)</td>
<td>6% (138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% (1611)</td>
<td>24% (552)</td>
<td>6% (132)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The number of occurrences is shown in parenthesis.

According to Ono (2005, 2008), the use of the so-series is frequent among adults because the deictic center is often not shared between the speaker and the addressee in normal conversation (Ono 2008, 42), and the adults know (or have learned) that the referent located proximal to the addressee should be indicated by the so-series in that case. According to Ono, the child did not use the so-series because she had not yet learned its semantics.

It has often been speculated that the late acquisition of the so-series might be due to the children’s strong egocentricity, but Endo (1988b) has objected to this view, referring to the studies of Bruner (1986) and Shatz (1983) in which small children had proved not necessarily to be egocentric when they communicated with others.

An interesting observation made in Kuji and Saito (1982) and Saito and Kuji’s two studies (Saito and Kuji 1983; 1985), both quoted in Endo (1988b),
was that even though children might start to use the ko- and a-series demonstratives at the age of 1.5–1.9, they might use them as pronouns (mere substitutes for the other nouns or noun phrases) without being aware of their deictic contrasts and semantic features. Ito et al. (2004) made a similar observation in children under the age of 4 years. As for the acquisition of semantic features, it is suggested that children at the age of 4 or 5 start to utilize deictic contrast between the ko-series and a-series, as well as deictic contrast between the ko- and so-series (Saito and Kuji 1983, 1985). Endo (1988b) also confirmed that deictic contrast was learned/acquired much later than the first emergence of ko-so-a expressions (which is at about 1.5 years old). Regarding the order of the acquisition of demonstratives’ pragmatic functions, according to the studies reported in Endo (ibid.), the demonstratives’ deictic use was acquired prior to their anaphoric use. Endo (ibid.) concludes that so-series demonstratives seem to be difficult to acquire.

Above, we have seen that children seem to acquire/learn the deictic use of demonstratives by the ko- and a-series prior to their anaphoric use by the so-series. The emergence of the use of demonstratives can be as early as the age of 1.6, but this does not necessarily mean that the children are aware of deictic contrast.

4.2.2. Use of spatial deictic demonstratives by native speakers of Japanese

The semantic features and pragmatic features of Japanese demonstratives have been discussed by a number of researchers (Horiguchi 1992; Kinsui & Takubo (1992); Kuno (1992); Mikami 1970; Shōho 1981; Tanaka 1981; Yoshimoto (1992) by presenting rather anecdotal examples. Studies of spatial deictic demonstratives have dealt mainly with deictic contrasts and sought answers to what the ko-, so- and a-series can refer to. These studies are also often based on private experiences and/or examples occasionally found in discourses (e.g. Moriya 1992). Empirical studies that studied the actual use of spatial deictic demonstratives by adult native speakers are rather few if we do not include studies that are part of acquisition studies (e.g. Ito et al 2004).

Imai (1978) studied the distribution of spatial deictic ko-so-a demonstratives produced by 80 native speaker informants (university students), using miniature settings with dolls and a can. The dolls represented the speaker and the addressee, and the miniature settings represented the different environments (conditions) in which the doll (the speaker) would use spatial deictic ko-so-a demonstratives. Regarding the position of the dolls (the speaker and the addressee), two conditions were set: i) the speaker and the addressee are positioned face to face (opposite sides), and ii) the speaker and the addressee are positioned side by side (same side). Three different distances
between the dolls (the speaker and the addressee) were used for these conditions. The findings were: i) the domain which ko- and so- refer to would increase as the distance between the dolls (the speaker and the addressee) increased and ii) the domain (forms and sizes) that ko- and so- refer to might change depending on how the speaker and the addressee are positioned and iii) despite ii), there were, generally speaking, two distribution types of ko-so-a demonstratives. Imai described these two distribution types as a) monopolar and b) bipolar. In the monopolar type, the speaker is in the middle and surrounded by three domains; the closest domain is indicated by a ko-demonstrative, the furthest domain is indicated by an a-demonstrative and the in between domain is indicated by a so-demonstrative. The addressee is positioned in the so-domain and since the in between so-domain surrounds the whole ko-domain, the a-domain has no connection with the ko-domain in this view. In the bipolar type, the speaker is surrounded by the domain indicated by a ko-demonstrative (ko-domain), and the addressee is surrounded by the domain indicated by a so-demonstrative (so-domain). Both the ko-domain and the so-domain are surrounded by the domain indicated by an a-demonstrative (a-domain), and unlike the monopolar type, the a-domain has a connection with the ko-domain in this view. Imai found that the monopolar-type distribution was more frequent than the bipolar type among his informants.

Higashiyama and Ono (1988) conducted experiments similar to Imai (1978) on 32 native speaker informants (university students) in real world settings (not with a miniature using dolls). This study was also a comparative study between Japanese and English, comparing the Japanese informants’ data with the data elicited from native speakers of English. In the Japanese data, Higashiyama and Ono confirmed Imai’s findings (ibid), that is, the distribution of the monopolar type was more frequent than the distribution of the bipolar type. They also found that when the distance between the speaker and the addressee increased, the sphere of so-demonstratives (the area indicated by soko) increased, while no particular change was found regarding the sphere of ko-demonstratives (koko). Further, they reported that the sphere indicated by English here is around the speaker and the here sphere is surrounded by the there sphere, and that the here sphere increases as the distance between the speaker and the addressee increases.

Endo (1988a) sought factors that determine the choice between ko-, so-, a-demonstratives and hypothesized that operability and dehumanization of the addressee could influence the use of demonstratives. Operability was defined as a possibility which a speaker possesses to make the addressee understand what the referent is by using various measures such as pointing.

Imai (1978) differentiated these types by calling them type (a) and (b), but I use the terms monopolar and bipolar following Higashiyama and Ono (1988), even though the term monopolar actually has another dictionary meaning than stated here.
or using a pointer. Dehumanization of the addressee can be seen as a psychological process in which the speaker does not see the addressee as addressee in the ongoing discourse. Endo (1988a) conducted a survey consisting of production tasks on 30 native speaker informants (university students). The main findings were: i) as the speaker’s operability increased, the domain indicated by ko-demonstratives also increased, and when the speaker’s operability decreased, the domain indicated by ko-demonstratives decreased, ii) the speaker used fewer so-demonstratives about the referent located close to the addressee when the addressee was dehumanized, that is, the addressee was not assumed to be the addressee in the speech context. The results also suggested that there seemed to be two types of so-uses. In one use, the condition for the so-use is that there is (at least) one speech participant who is assigned the role of addressee and that the spatial relation between the referent and the addressee is close. In the other use, the existence of the addressee, and therefore the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee, is not a crucial factor or condition.

In Ito et al (2004), a survey/experiment was conducted to examine how native speakers comprehend demonstratives used for direction: kocchi ‘this (way)’, socchi ‘that (way)’, acchi ‘that (way) over there.’ The survey was a part of the acquisition study, which consists of similar surveys conducted on five different age groups of children. The informants in the survey presented here were 23 university students.

In the experiment, two conditions were set according to the speaker’s and the addressee’s position; in one condition (i), the speaker and the addressee were located side by side (they were on the same side), that is, both the speaker and the addressee were included in the deictic center, and in another condition (ii), the speaker and the addressee were located face to face (they were on opposite sides), that is, the speaker was the only deictic center. The informants were instructed to move to the place indicated by the experimenter, using ko- (kocchi), so- (socchi) and a- (acchi). The results were compared with Shōho’s (1981) account of the basic semantics of demonstratives. According to Shōho’s (1981) account, in a “side-by-side” condition, the distance from the deictic center (i.e., proximal-medial-distal from both speaker and addressee) regulates the domains of ko-so-a. In his opinion, in a “face-to-face” condition, the distance (proximal) from the speaker regulates the domain indicated by ko- demonstratives, the distance (proximal) from the addressee regulates the domain indicated by so-demonstratives and the distance from both speaker and addressee regulates the domain indicated by a- demonstratives.

The results showed that the informant’s comprehension/perception of ko-demonstrative (kocchi) in situation (condition) (i), in which the speaker and the addressee were located side by side, was in accordance with Shoho’s account of ko-demonstratives, but the comprehension of other demonstra-
tives in situation (condition) (ii) was not. That is, the informants’ comprehension/perception of so-demonstrative (socchi) and a-demonstrative (acchi) in the situation (condition) in which the speaker and the addressee were located on opposite sides (face to face) did not always follow Shōho’s account of demonstratives. Ito et al (2004) analyzed that the informants seemed not to assume an addressees’ domain/sphere when they were to use (i.e., comprehend and use) a spatial deictic so-demonstrative; they seemed to utilize a ko-so-a distinction based only on the distance from the speaker.

In another recent study by Okazaki (2010), a study originally conducted by Takahashi and Suzuki (1982), which had been repeated by other researchers such as Takahashi and Nakamura (1992) and Abe (2008), was conducted again. The informants in these studies were a group of young people (age around 20, the number of informants varying between 20–37). In Takahashi and Nakamura’s (1992) study, there was a group of informants whose age was between 30–40 years old. The gist of the findings in the original Takahashi and Suzuki (1982) study was twofold. One was that when the speaker and the addressee were located close to each other, the use of demonstratives (all ko-so-a demonstratives) was conditioned by the proximity (distance) of the referent to the speaker and the addressee. The other was that when there was a certain distance between the speaker and the addressee (i.e., the speaker is the only deictic center), the use of demonstratives was conditioned by both i) the proximity (distance) of the referent to the speaker (regarding all ko-so-a series), and ii) the proximity of the referent to the addressee (regarding so-demonstratives). As for the above-mentioned case in which there was a certain distance between the speaker and the addressee, Takahashi and Nakamura’s (1992) study showed further that when the distance between the speaker and the addressee exceeded more than 5-6 meters, the use of so-demonstratives decreased as the use of the a-series emerged among the young informants but not among the middle-aged informants. In Abe’s (2008) study, the noteworthy finding was that the use of a-demonstratives was observed where the use of so-demonstratives was expected according to the previous studies. The follow-up interview showed that a-demonstratives might have been used instead of so-demonstratives because the speaker had no particular relation to the addressee, and therefore had no reason to relate the referent to the addressee.

In Okazaki (2010), the informants were all university students living in the Chūgoku-Shikoku region (Western Japan). The data showed that fewer so-demonstratives were used to refer to the referent located close to the addressee compared to the results in Abe (2008), while a-demonstratives tended to be used for the same referent. Okazaki’s (2010) data also showed that a-demonstratives were used to refer to the sphere located between the speaker and the addressee when the speaker and the addressee were positioned face to face, a position which, according to Okazaki, is normally not referred
to by *a*-demonstratives.Okazaki (ibid.) commented that it was rather odd to find that *a*-demonstratives were used to refer to the addressee’s sphere. She commented also that the use of *a*-demonstratives could have been dialectal and concluded that further investigations were needed. Otherwise, *ko*-demonstratives were used to refer to the speaker’s sphere in this Okazaki’s study, as shown in the other studies.

The results of the experimental studies above showed that *ko*-demonstratives were all used to refer to the referent (including the sphere) located close to the speaker (the speaker’s sphere). How *so*- and *a*-demonstratives were used, on the other hand, varied. As for the use of *so*-demonstratives, Imai (1979), Higashiyama and Ono (1988) and Endo (1998a) showed that it could be characterized in two ways: i) to indicate proximity to the addressee (the addressee’s sphere) and ii) to indicate outside of, but close to the speaker’s sphere indicated by *ko*-demonstratives. The use of *so*-demonstratives is related to the addressee, especially the relative location of the addressee (Imai 1979, Higashiyama and Ono 1988, Endo 1988a), but the addressee’s location alone cannot explain the use of *so*-demonstratives (Endo 1988a). Endo (ibid.) suggested, for example, the speaker’s operability over the referent and the dehumanization of the addressee as the factors that can influence the use of *so*-demonstratives (and other demonstratives). Quite recent studies by Ito et al (2004), Abe (2008) and Okazaki (2010) showed that *a*-demonstratives were often used where the use of *so*-demonstratives was expected. As the follow-up interview in Abe (2008) suggested, the non-use of *so*-demonstratives in the situation where the use of *so*-demonstratives was expected might be caused by the speaker’s conscious or unconscious exclusion of the addressee from the discourse context (Abe 2008, 110), or the use may be dialectal (Okazaki 2010, 38). However, to date it is still rather unclear why the informants used *a*-demonstratives instead of *so*-demonstratives.

4.3. Acquisition of Japanese demonstratives as L2

As mentioned briefly in Section 1.1, demonstratives are in general said to be difficult for non-native speakers of Japanese to learn, and among the various uses other than the deictic use, especially the anaphoric use has been reported to be difficult (Morizuka 2003, 62; Niimura 1992, 36). To date, a number of studies have been conducted to examine the acquisition of Japanese demonstratives as L2. These studies often focus either on deictic uses or anaphoric uses of demonstratives, but sometimes on both. The methods applied to elicit data vary among studies, but cross-sectional studies in the form of cloze tests and multiple-choice tasks predominate. Using these tasks, the learners’ declarative knowledge, for instance knowledge about semantic
and pragmatic properties of *ko-so-a* demonstratives, was measured, often in terms of *correct* and/or *incorrect* use of them (cf. Morizuka ibid.). Contrastive analyses between Japanese and the learners’ native language were often made prior to the discussion of the results, to see whether they have any relation to the errors that the learners made.

The learners’ native language included in the studies varies; there are, for example, studies made on Chinese (Sun 2008; Shan 2011), English (Niimura 1992; Niimura & Hayashi 1996), Korean (An 1996), Thai (Waasanaa 1995). There are also studies that dealt with two or more learner groups with different native languages, such as studies by An (1999; 2000), Moriya (1992), Sakai (1987) and Sakoda (1993; 1994; 1997a; b; 2001). An’s study and Sakai’s study dealt with Chinese speakers and Korean speakers, Moriya’s study dealt with German speakers, English speakers, Chinese speakers and Korean speakers. As mentioned, Sakoda has conducted various studies which have dealt with different learner groups with different native languages. Sakoda, who was interested in discovering how learners’ interlanguage was formed, used various methods to elicit data in order to approach related issues such as cross-linguistic influences; she utilized both longitudinal and cross-sectional studies. Her acquisition studies concern both deictically used demonstratives and anaphorically used demonstratives.

A common finding in these demonstrative acquisition studies (dealing with both deictically used and anaphorically used demonstratives) is that the learners made more errors in the use of anaphoric demonstratives than of deictic demonstratives, and that there seemed to be a confusion between the use of the *so-* series and the *a-* series. Thus it has been assumed that the anaphoric *so-* and *a-*series are difficult to learn irrespective of the learners’ native language. However, this does not mean that deictic demonstratives are easy to learn; Niimura (1992), Niimura & Hayashi (1996) and An (1999) observed that errors in deictic demonstratives were persistent – they were still observed among advanced learners. The causes of the errors, influence from the native language (a part of cross-linguistic influence) and lack of proper explanation (educational matter), have been pointed out. Thus this study investigates the learners’ interlanguage by identifying any possible cross-linguistic influence and influence from education.

---

66 However, the learners’ native languages were not specifically given in some studies. For example, Sakoda (1993) divided the learners into two language groups according to the number of deictic contrasts: language groups with two-way deictic contrast and language groups with three-way deictic contrast, but she did not state which languages they were.
5. Studying the use of spatial demonstratives

This chapter is an introduction to the following two chapters which present the studies conducted to investigate the actual use of demonstratives by native speakers and learners. The present chapter describes the data and informants (Section 5.1), the rationale behind the choice of instrument used for the data collection (Section 5.2) and the detailed description of the methods used for data collection (Section 5.3).

5.1. The data and the informants

The aim of this study is to investigate the actual, native use of spatial-deictic demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and to investigate the use of Japanese spatial-deictic demonstratives by Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners in the light of their respective native counterparts’ use and the Japanese native speakers’ use. The data used in this study consist of short sentences and expressions in written form produced by the native speakers and the learners, both elicited by a method called discourse completion task(s) (DCT). The learner data, the use of Japanese demonstratives by the learners, were then analyzed and compared with the native speaker data, that is, the use of Japanese demonstratives by the native speakers of Japanese and the use of demonstratives by the native speakers of the respective languages.

Elicitation of the native speaker data which serve as the baseline for the examination of L2 data has been an important part of this study. As pointed out in Ellis (2008, 353), similarities or differences between interlanguage performance and native performance are often determined only by reference to some published description such as a reference grammar book, which may not always reflect actual usage. Comparisons of L2 data and TL data (Japanese native data) and comparisons of L2 data and learners’ corresponding L1 data are also an important part of this study. While the native speakers’ use of demonstratives may reflect only their perception of the referents in relation to the addressee (for example, how the distance to the referent in

---

67 One of the few studies comparing actual usage by native speakers and learner-performance dealt with gesture, conducted by Yoshioka (2005).
relation to the addressee is represented in their minds\textsuperscript{68}, the learners’ production may also be affected by other factors such as the learners’ linguistic knowledge about the use of demonstratives in the target language, their processing system that controls the actual performance and last but not least, influence from their L1.

Thus the data used in this study were collected from three language groups. The native speaker data (native data, or L1 data) was collected from three groups: Japanese-speaking informants, Finnish-speaking informants and Swedish-speaking informants. The number of informants in each group was 100. The learner data (learner data, or L2\textsuperscript{69} data) was collected from two groups: Finnish-speaking learners of Japanese and Swedish-speaking learners of Japanese. The number of Finnish-speaking learners was 62 and the number of Swedish-speaking learner informants was 67. Finnish-speaking learner informants were further divided into two groups depending on the institutions where the informants were studying Japanese. Table 5-1 shows the number of native speaker participants and their gender distribution per language, and Table 5-2 shows the number of learner informants participating in Study 2 and their gender distribution per learners’ home institution. The age of L1 informants varied between 18 and 75 years and for L2 informants, it varied between 18 and 60 years. Thus all the informants were adults.\textsuperscript{70} Since the language situations, including language education issues, in Finland and Sweden differ considerably, they are described prior to the detailed description of the informants below. The description of the language situation in Japan and of Japanese-speaking informants is also briefly discussed.

Table 5-1 Number of native informants participating in Study 1 per language and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JP (n = 100)</th>
<th>FI (n = 100)</th>
<th>SW (n = 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
JP = Japanese-speaking informants
FI = Finnish-speaking informants
SW = Swedish-speaking informants

\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Takahashi and Suzuki’s (1982) reasoning about the use of their method.

\textsuperscript{69} The term second language (L2) is used as a general term for other language(s) than one’s L1 here.

\textsuperscript{70} Selinker 1972, referring to Lenneberg (1967), defines adult as a person who is over the age of 12.
### Table 5-2 Number of learner informants participating in Study 2 per institution and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Finnish-speaking informants</th>
<th>Swedish-speaking informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU (n = 33)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKF (n = 29)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU (n = 67)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: AU = Aalto University, FKF = Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan, SU = Stockholm University

5.1.1. The language situation in Finland and the Finnish-speaking informants

Finland has two official languages, Finnish and Swedish. There are also formally recognized minority languages: three Sami languages, Romani, Finnish Sign Language and Karelian. The 1992 Language Act guarantees equal status of Finnish and Swedish, both of which are called *national languages* and which are obligatory subjects during the compulsory education. For those who have Finnish as their mother tongue (the informants in this study), Finnish is strictly speaking their “first national language,” and Swedish “the second national language.” The term “the second national language(s)” is often used in the context of school language education, contrasted with “foreign language education,” when *foreign language* refers in most cases to English, German, Spanish, French and Russian.

Nowadays, pupils in Finland in general start to study other languages than “the first national language” such as “the second national language” or “the first foreign language” in 3rd grade, and even though many Finnish-speaking pupils choose to study English, by the time they have finished the compulsory education, they have also studied Swedish as the second national language.

The self-reports on language background showed that the Finnish-speaking informants in this study (both the native informants and the learner informants) have studied Swedish and at least one additional language, often English. Thus for our learner informants, the target language, Japanese, could be an L3 or a later language. It should also be noted that Finland is officially a bilingual country and the Swedish language can be dominant in society in certain areas of Finland, simply because the proportion of the Swedish-speaking population (Finnish people who have Swedish as L1, i.e., Swedish-speaking Finns) is higher than the Finnish-speaking population (Finnish-speaking Finns). Finnish-speaking Finns living in such areas, for

http://www.oph.fi/lagesoversikt, accessed 20140726. Also, according to Höglín (2002, 24), practically speaking all Finnish pupils have studied English as their *first foreign language* since the 1970s.
instance Åland,\textsuperscript{72} may have more chances to interact with the Swedish language than those who live in areas where the Swedish-speaking population is in a minority. In the capital area (Helsinki, Espoo, Vantaa, Kauniainen), where one of the learner informant-groups was recruited, the Swedish-speaking population is about 6%. In the Vaasa region, where the other learner informant-group was recruited, the Swedish-speaking population is about 22.6%.\textsuperscript{73} In the whole of Finland, the Swedish-speaking population is about 6%.

Again, in this study, the data from the informants who have Finnish as L1 (i.e. Finnish-speaking Finns’ data) were analyzed. The Finnish-speaking informants who participated in the study to collect L1 data are referred to as Finnish native informants and the Finish-speaking informants who participated in the study to collect L2 data are referred to as Finnish learner informants.

**Finnish native informants (FI informants)**

The data collected from 100 Finnish native informants were analyzed in this study and all of them resided in Finland at the time of the survey. They were recruited through e-mail correspondence and via Facebook.\textsuperscript{74} Their ages ranged from 18 to 75 years old and all of them had at least completed upper secondary education. As stated, they had Finnish as their L1, and all of them had studied English as a foreign language. They had also studied Swedish as the second national language. As already mentioned, there are some Swedish-speaking areas in Finland and depending on the informants’ residence area, some informants might have more contact with Swedish than others. Since there was no question about the informants’ proficiency in Swedish included in the questionnaire, the informants’ knowledge of Swedish could not be assessed. Thus some of the informants could have been multi-lingual speakers of Finnish and Swedish, even though they regarded Finnish as their mother tongue. Besides Swedish and English, most of them had studied one or two other foreign languages such as German, French and Russian. There were 82 female and 18 male participants.

**Finnish learner informants (AU- and FKF informants)**

The total number of informants was 62, 33 of whom were students at Aalto University (AU) located in the Helsinki region and 29 students at Fria Kris-

\textsuperscript{72} In Åland, 89.4% of the population have Swedish as L1 and in Ingå municipality (located 50 km west of Helsinki), 55.4% of the population have Swedish as L1. (http://www.kommunerna.net/sv/kommuner/svensk-tvasprakiga/Sidor/default.aspx, accessed 20140726)


\textsuperscript{74} I would like to express my gratitude to Jouni Elomaa and Tomoko Watanabe at Fria Kristliga Folkhogskolan for their cooperation in collecting L1 data in Finland.
tliga Folkhögskolan (FKF) located in Vaasa, on the west coast of Finland. All of them resided in Finland at the time of the data collection. They were recruited through the teachers at their respective schools. Their ages range from 18 till 60 and all of the participants have Finnish as their L1. The self-reports on their language background showed that all but one had studied at least Swedish and English, and they may have studied one or two additional foreign languages prior to the study of Japanese at university level. There were totally 35 female and 37 male participants, 19 females and 24 males from AU and 16 females and 13 males from FKF. Their proficiency level of Japanese was between beginner and intermediate according to the school terms in which they were studying at the time of the data collection. However, the previously mentioned self-reports on their language background revealed that some informants had studied Japanese prior to studying at university level, and this means that even if a learner reported that he belonged to the beginner level class, for instance term 1, his actual proficiency level could be higher. It should also be noted that Vaasa is known as a bilingual municipality in which 22.6% of the whole population have Swedish as their mother tongue and 70.6% have Finnish as their mother tongue. It should also be noted that Japanese language courses at FKF follow the syllabus used at Stockholm University and Swedish is also complementarily used in the teaching. Hence, the FKF informants (learners) have more contact with Swedish than the AU informants (learners). The AU learners use Elävää japania I (2011) as the textbook and the FKF learners use Shokyū nihongo genki I (2011).

5.1.2. The language situation in Sweden and the Swedish-speaking informants

In Sweden, the official language is Swedish. There are also five formally recognized minority languages, including Finnish. The other recognized minority languages are Meänkieli, the Sami languages, Romani and Yiddish. Even though there are some municipalities such as Nykvarn, Södertälje and Oxelösund where more than 8% of the population have Finnish as L1 (Parkvall 2009, 66), those who have Swedish as L1 (for convenience sake, I call them Swedes) do not usually interact with Finnish.
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75 I would like to express my gratitude to Jun’ichiro Okura and Virpi Serita at Aalto University, and Jouni Elomaa and Tomoko Watanabe at Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan for their cooperation in collecting L2 data in Finland.
76 One student at FKF reported that he had studied Swedish, German and French.
78 Textbooks are presented by the books’ name, not by the authors’ name.
79 Note that 8% is the rate at which a municipality in Finland is recognized as a bilingual municipality.
Nowadays, Swedes normally start to study English as L2 (the first foreign language) in 3rd grade and they start to study another foreign language as L3 (the second foreign language) in 6th grade. Many schools offer German, French and Spanish. The self-reports on the language background showed that all the Swedish-speaking informants in this study had studied English and at least one additional language. In this study, the data were analyzed from informants who considered Swedish to be their L1. The Swedish-speaking informants who participated in the study to collect L1 data are referred to as Swedish native informants, and the Swedish-speaking informants who participated in the study to collect L2 data are referred to as Swedish learner informants.

**Swedish native informants (SW informants)**

The number of informants was 100 and all of them resided in Sweden at the time of the data collection. They were recruited through e-mail correspondence. Their ages ranged from 18 to 75 years old and all of them had completed at least upper secondary education. As for their language background, all of them considered that they had Swedish as their L1 and they had also studied at least one foreign language, English. Further, most of them had studied one or two additional foreign languages such as German, Spanish and French. There were 47 male and 53 female participants.

**Swedish learner informants (SU informants)**

The number of informants was 67 and all of them were students at Stockholm University, resident in Sweden at the time of the data collection. They were recruited by personal contacts. Their ages ranged from 18 till 42 at the time of the data collection. All the informants considered that they had Swedish as their mother tongue. According to the self-reports on their background languages, they had studied at least one foreign language (English) and one or two additional foreign languages prior to Japanese. Japanese could be thus the learners’ L3 or a later language. As for the gender of the participants, the number of females/males was not evenly distributed; there were 41 female and 26 male participants. Their proficiency level of Japanese was between beginner and intermediate according to the term in which they were studying at the time of the survey. As was the case with the Finnish learner informants, the self-reports on the language background revealed that some informants had studied Japanese prior to studying at university level,
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80 Some schools introduce English as L2 in 1st grade.
81 I would like to express my gratitude to my colleagues at my home institution (the Department of Asian, Middle Eastern, and Turkish Studies [former Department of Oriental Languages]), the Department of Culture and Aesthetics, the Department of Language Education, the Department of Linguistics, the Institute for Interpreting and Translation Studies, and the Department of Psychology at Stockholm University and the Faculty of Languages at Dalarna University for their cooperation.
and this means that even if a learner reported that he belonged to the beginner level class, his actual proficiency level could be higher. As mentioned, the SU informants and the FKF informants follow the same syllabus, and they use the same textbook, *Shokyū nihongo genki I* (2011).

5.1.3. The language situation in Japan and the Japanese-speaking informants

In Japan, the official language is Japanese. There are four major regional dialect groups, but standard Japanese is the language used in language education and mass-communication and is understood throughout the country (Iwasaki 2006).

English had been an obligatory subject in the lower secondary school since 1947. The self-reports on their language background showed that the Japanese-speaking informants in this study had studied English as a foreign language (L2).

The Japanese native informants who participated in the study have Japanese as their mother tongue (L1), and they are referred to as Japanese native informants. The number of informants was 100. Of 100 informants, 80 resided in Japan and the rest (20) in Sweden at the time of the data collection. Those who resided in Sweden were exchange students who had not lived in Sweden longer than one month at the time of data collection and they were recruited through personal contacts. They took a Swedish language course for beginners but the language used in their daily communication was English, and I consider therefore that their use of Japanese in general was not affected by Swedish during their stay in Sweden. The informants who resided in Japan were recruited through e-mail correspondence via acquaintances. The informants’ ages ranged from 18 to 72 years and all of them had completed at least upper secondary education. As mentioned, all the informants had studied at least one foreign language, English. Further, many of them had studied one or two additional foreign languages, such as German, Spanish, French, Chinese or Korean. As for the gender of the participants, the numbers were not evenly distributed: there were 63 female and 37 male participants.

---

82 The standard or common variety of Japanese was formed in the early 20th century, based on a variety of the Tokyo dialect (Iwasaki 2006, 93).

83 In the Course of Study, regulated in 1947, the word *foreign language* is used, but only English was given as the example (cf. https://www.nier.go.jp/guideline/h19/chap2-9.htm). In 2011, the Course of Study for elementary schools was revised and a foreign language (English) became an obligatory subject in elementary school in 5th and 6th grade.

84 I would like to express my gratitude to Kenji Suzuki at Meiji University, Jens Forsberg, Miyoko Inoue, Makiko Kanematsu, Luisa Yamada and my colleagues at my home institution for their cooperation in collecting L1 data in Japan.
5.1.4. The Japanese language learning environment for Finnish-speaking learners and Swedish-speaking learners

As already mentioned, the learner informants in this study were studying Japanese at institutions of higher education in their respective countries at the time of the investigation. Their general language background is as described above. Regarding their learning environment, I may describe it as “a foreign language learning environment” in which learning takes place basically only through formal instruction and exercises in the classrooms led by teachers. Compared to the English or French-learning environment in the immersion program in Canada and the English-learning environment in Eng­lish as a second language program (ESL program) intended for immigrants in the USA, where the learners have to use their respective target languages (TLs) in their everyday life even outside of language classes, the occasions when the learners in this study interact with the TL (Japanese) may be very limited. However, a recent big leap in the development of information and communication technology (ICT) has made it much easier for the learners (both Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking) to communicate with speakers of the TL (Japanese) on a daily basis. Thus it may be possible that some learners have more natural exposure to Japanese and that the learning takes place in more or less natural settings for them. At the same time, the development of ICT means increased variation in the ways of learning outside of the classrooms. This diversity makes it difficult to measure or estimate the learners’ everyday exposure (frequency, duration, degree etc.) to Japanese.

In this study, the facts about the learners’ learning environment and their use of Japanese language (contact with Japanese) outside of the classroom are therefore only referred to in the qualitative analysis; I do not intend to conduct a quantitative analysis of it. Further, the learners’ proficiency level mentioned in this study is based on the school terms in which they were studying the language in the respective institutions; the learners’ actual contact with Japanese and Japanese people is not taken into account. The number of terms and the corresponding proficiency level are: 1st and 2nd term = beginners’ level, 3rd and 4th term = intermediate level and 5th term and later = advanced level.

5.2. The rationale behind the choice of instrument

The data analyzed in this study deal with the use and non-use of demonstratives for certain referents in given situations, and the choice (types) of demonstratives if they are used. The data are elicited by discourse completion tasks (DCTs). DCTs, together with role-play, represent one of the fre-
quently used instruments for data collection, especially within speech act research (Mackey and Gass 2005, 89; Félix-Brasdefer 2010, 42; Roever 2011, 466). DCTs are usually carried out in written form, providing the informants with a description of a situation in which the speech act occurs. In L2 acquisition studies, the tasks are known to measure the informants’ offline pragmatic or socio-pragmatic knowledge,\(^6\) such as how to apologize, invite and/or refuse in a non-interactive format (Félix-Brasdefer 2010, 43–45).

In the studies of Japanese native speakers’ use of spatial demonstratives, experimental tasks that can be described as something in between role-play and DCT have been used. For instance, in the tasks used in Takahashi and Suzuki’s study (Takahashi and Suzuki 1982), the informants were instructed to use suitable demonstratives by considering the addressee’s positions, to refer to a specific person (i.e., the referent) located in various positions in the classroom environment. This study was repeated with some modifications by Takahashi & Nakamura (1992), Abe (2008) and Okazaki (2010). In another study in which native speakers’ development/progress in understanding of ko/so/a-series was examined, the informants of various ages were instructed to go towards the locations referred to by the spatial demonstratives (Ito et al 2004).

I found DCT would be a suitable instrument for the data collection in my study because 1) it provides controlled situations in order to capture types of demonstratives occurring under certain circumstances, 2) at the same time, it can give participants opportunities to answer freely and, above all, 3) it was the most convenient way to collect Finnish data and Japanese data from Sweden. The use of naturally occurring speech is perhaps more desirable in studying interlanguage pragmatics, but that was rather unrealistic in my study due to the difficulty of assembling a sufficient corpus of data within the limited time (cf. Ellis 2008, 165). The use of discourse completion tasks may be less naturalistic, but the instruments can still be useful and the validity of the results can be made higher by providing detailed contextual information about the situation (cf. Félix-Brasdefer 2010, 52). I found the discourse completion tasks were useful, since the instructions could be formulated simply as “use expressions appropriate to the given situations,” not necessarily asking the participants to use or choose specific demonstrative expression(s) for the referents; and contextual information about the situation could be enriched by both texts (descriptions and instructions of the tasks) and pictures/images.

As mentioned, the data collection instrument employed in this study is designed to elicit informants’ production of demonstratives. It should be

\(^6\) Knowledge, also referred to as competence, can be seen as the way in which the language system is represented in the mind of a person (in my case, a learner), which can be distinguished from control or performance, the processing system for controlling knowledge during actual performance (cf. Bialystok and Sharwood Smith 1985, 104).
pointed out that the DCT employed was not a proficiency-oriented test; the focus of interest is to investigate use and non-use (occurrence and non-occurrence) of deictic demonstratives, and types of demonstratives if they are used.

5.3. Discourse completion tasks used in the present study

The tasks were conducted in the form of a survey, and two sets of tasks were prepared for the surveys. One set was used in Study 1 to elicit the native speakers’ data (L1 data) of Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and another set was used in Study 2 to elicit the learners’ data (L2 data) from Swedish-speaking and Finnish-speaking learners of Japanese. The data from native speaker groups (L1 data) served as a reference for learners’ data (L2 data). The present section describes the DCT used in both Study 1 and Study 2. It also describes the mode, medium and procedure used in each study.

5.3.1. DCT used for the collection of L1 data (Study 1) and L2 data (Study 2)

The DCT used in Study 1 to elicit the native speakers’ data contained 20 tasks (including an exercise and fillers) to prompt the informants to produce various expressions, especially deictically-used spatial demonstratives for the intended referents. The number of tasks used in the DCT for Study 2 was seven (including an exercise and a filler) and they were selected from the DCT used in Study 1. In both studies, the set of tasks was preceded by a general questionnaire in which the informants’ background such as gender, age and their language background was asked for. The tasks used to elicit deictic demonstratives were designed based on the semantics of Japanese demonstratives discussed in Section 2.4.1, that is, based on the basic deictic features characterized in terms of spatial terms in relation to the deictic center. Here, ko indicates proximal to the speaker, who serves as the only deictic center, and so indicates proximal to the addressee, taking the speaker as the only deictic center. However, it also indicates medial to both the speaker and the addressee, assigning the addressee also as the deictic center. Further, a indicates non-proximal (distal) to the speaker who serves as the only deictic center. These semantics are often used in the descriptions of demonstratives in textbooks of Japanese as a foreign language and a native language. Table 5-3 shows the overview of 20 tasks/situations used in Study 1, including the seven tasks/situations used in Study 2. The Table also shows the tasks/situations included and not included in the analyses.
Table 5-3 Description of the tasks used in Study 1 (S1) and Study 2 (S2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended referent</th>
<th>Given instruction</th>
<th>Analyzed in S1</th>
<th>Analyzed in S2 (Used in S2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clothes/dress</td>
<td>You are the man in the picture. Your girl friend is pointing out a dress and says she wants to buy it, but you want to stop her buying it. What do you say/how do you express it?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>– (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lecturer</td>
<td>You are the woman in the middle of the picture and you think the lecturer looks like the actor Tom Cruise. How do you express your thought?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ring</td>
<td>You are the man in the picture. Promise your wife (besides you) that you will buy the ring that you two are looking at.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Patient’s wrist/hand/arm</td>
<td>You are the nurse in the picture. Ask the patient whether the wrist you are holding hurts.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Kanji/math</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (sitting beside you) if she knows the reading of the kanji alternatively answer to the math problem.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Location where the speaker is receiving massage</td>
<td>You are receiving massage. Tell the masseuse that the part she is pressing hurts.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dog’s name</td>
<td>Ask the name of the dog beside which the addressee (the person in the picture) is standing. <em>(The addressee’s dog)</em></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spanish course/class</td>
<td>You are the man in the picture. Your friend (female, shown in the picture) told you that the class of Spanish language was very good and you started to consider taking that course. Tell your friend about it.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gizmo/dog</td>
<td>You are the veterinarian in the picture. Tell the (imaginary) audience that the dog you are holding is called Gizmo.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Test</td>
<td>You are the woman on the right (in the picture). Your friend (on the left) asked you whether you knew there would be a test tomorrow, but you did not know about it. Tell your friend that you did not know.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Song/music</td>
<td>You are listening to a new song and you think it is fantastic. Comment on the song.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Monkey</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Comment that an monkey on the TV is funny.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 The location where the addressee is situated</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (on the right) whether the water where she is swimming now is deep.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dish</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) the name of the dish shown on the TV.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Cake</td>
<td>You are the boy in the picture. You want to buy one of the cakes that the man is holding. How do you express this?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Meeting</td>
<td>You are the man in the picture. Your colleague (on the right) wanted to confirm that the meeting is scheduled for June 12th, 1pm, but you have never heard about the meeting. How do you express that you did not know?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>– (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cookies</td>
<td>Comment on the woman (in the picture) that the cookies on the pan that she is holding, looks delicious.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 TV program</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) what he is watching on the TV.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Article</td>
<td>You are the man on the right. Your colleague sent you an article and now asked you if you have seen/read it before. This is the first time you have seen it. How do you say (express) it to your colleague?</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jungfrau-joch</td>
<td>You are the woman on the right. You and your friend (on the left) are watching a picture of Jungfrau-joch shown on the TV. Tell your friend that you have been to the observatory shown in the picture by train.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The tasks used in Study 2 are stated in parenthesis. The tasks included and not included in the analyses are marked + and – respectively.
Of 20 tasks, one task (No.1 in Table 5-3) was meant to be an exercise and four tasks (Nos. 8, 10, 16, and 19) were fillers. Five of the tasks (Nos. 6, 7, 13, 15, 17) had situations in which the use of the *so*-series was expected, and four of the tasks (Nos. 4, 5, 9, 11) had situations in which the use of the *ko*-series was expected. One task (No. 2) had a situation in which the *ko*-series or *a*-series was expected to be used. For the situations presented in the remaining five tasks (Nos. 3, 12, 14, 18, 20) the use of DEM was expected but no particular prediction was made regarding the type of DEM to be used since the perception of the proximity/distance to the referent from the deictic center was deemed to be varied. The choice of situations used to elicit the deictically used DEM was based on the descriptions and the situations given for the *ko*-series and *so*-series in Sakata (1992) and textbooks of Japanese as a foreign language such as *Minna no Nihongo Shokyū I honsatsu* (1998) and *Shokyū Nihongo Genki* (2011). The situations in the tasks were also prepared with reference to CASTEL/J pictures, available on The Japan Foundation’s website for Japanese language teaching, which were presented with key sentences that contain deictically used Japanese DEM. The situations given in tasks Nos. 3, 12, 14, 18 and 20 may not have appeared in the Japanese textbooks, but they can occur in daily life. However, there was always a possibility that the informants (both the learners and native speakers) might not use referring expressions in the given situations, and even if they used them, they were not necessarily demonstratives.

The tasks used for the collection of the native data of Finnish and Swedish contained the same situations/scenarios except for No. 5. In situation No. 5, the intended referent was originally a reading of a *kanji*, a Chinese character used in Japanese. Since Finnish native speakers and Swedish native speakers might not be familiar with *kanji*, the intended referent was replaced by an answer to a math task. Otherwise each task in the DCT contained an instruction, a description and a picture to prompt the informants to use expressions appropriate for the given situations in their respective native

---

87 The situation where the referent is located slightly away from the speaker and/or near to the addressee, thus the use of the medial *so* series is expected.
88 In the given situations the intended referents were located close to the speaker and thus the use of the proximal *ko*-series was expected.
89 In the given situation, the intended referent was located slightly away from the speaker. Since the speaker was talking to herself (without an obvious addressee), the use of the proximal *ko*-series or distal *a*-series was expected.
90 In the given situations, the referents were located at the same distance from both speaker and the addressee, but the perception of proximity/distance to the referent might differ among the informants.
language. Pictures were used to facilitate the informants’ understanding of the situations; they were either photographs or illustrations.92

In Study 2, seven tasks including one exercise and one filler (Nos. 1, 7, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18 in Table 5-3) from Study 1 were used. The five tasks (Nos. 7, 12, 14, 15, 18) to elicit the learners’ use of Japanese DEM were selected basically based on the result of Study 1. It was also planned to include situations in which perception of proximity/distance would vary individually. Each task used in the DCT for the learners also had an instruction and a description in their respective languages attached to the picture, in order to prompt the informants to use expressions appropriate for the given situations. The learners, however, were instructed to use Japanese (in Japanese characters/letters or the Latin alphabet) in their responses.

5.3.2. Medium, mode and procedure used in Study 1 and Study 2

Study 1

The surveys took place on different occasions during the period 2011–2013. Tasks printed on paper and internet-based tasks were used for the survey. For the former, answers were given in handwriting, and for the latter, by using a computer. The paper-based tasks were used to collect part of the Japanese L1 data and part of the Swedish L1 data collected at Stockholm University. The internet-based tasks were used for data collection for the sake of efficiency. The contents of the paper-based tasks and the internet-based tasks were the same. Participation in the survey was voluntary and the surveys were conducted anonymously. The informants received no reward. They were all approached in accordance with the ethical guidelines for arts and social science research recommended by The Swedish Research Council. The informants were informed that the purpose of the survey was to study expressions used in certain situations, but they were not informed that the survey was to examine their use of demonstratives and there was therefore a possibility that the informants might not use demonstratives or any referring expressions at all.

The paper versions of the tasks were distributed at Stockholm University in connection with student meetings/gatherings. The participants were instructed to answer the general questions about their age, gender and language background first and then to do the tasks. In the tasks, the participants were instructed to produce suitable expressions in the given situations in writing. The informants were instructed always to act as the speaker, not the addressee. It took max. 20 minutes for the informants to complete the tasks.

92 The photographs and illustrations are taken from Microsoft ClipArt. Parts of the photographs and illustrations are slightly modified, adapted to the intended situations.
including the fillers and the general questions about the participants’ background, regardless of the language. For the internet-based version of the tasks, (i) Google Docs, a freeware web-based office suite together with separate picture files, and (ii) SurveyMonkey®, a web survey service were used. The web addresses to these survey sites and the picture files (in the case of (i)) were distributed by e-mail. Apart from this, the conditions were the same as for the paper version. As stated before, there was no time limit set for the surveys, but the logging data recorded on SurveyMonkey® showed that it took approximately 15 to 20 minutes to complete the internet-based tasks, including the filler tasks and general questions about the participants’ background, regardless of language.

Study 2

The surveys were conducted on different occasions during the period 2012–2013. Paper-based tasks and internet-based tasks were used for the survey. For the former, answers were given in handwriting, and for the latter, by computer. The paper-based tasks were used to collect Finnish-speaking learners’ data at Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan and Swedish-speaking learners’ data at Stockholm University. The internet-based tasks were used for the data collection at Aalto University. The contents of the tasks were identical. At the time of the survey, the participants were informed that the survey was to investigate the production of Japanese expressions and the use of Japanese grammar, but they were not informed specifically that the actual purpose was to investigate their use of Japanese demonstratives. The internet-based survey used for the learners at Aalto University had a column to fill in the participants’ name, but it was not compulsory to do so and all surveys were handled anonymously. The informants were all approached in accordance with the ethical guidelines for arts and social science research recommended by The Swedish Research Council.

The paper versions of the tasks were distributed to the informants at FKF in connection with lectures or meetings/gatherings. No time limit was set for response and the informants were instructed to produce expressions appropriate to the given situations. For the internet-based version of the tasks, SurveyMonkey® was used. The web address to the survey site was distributed by e-mail. Descriptions and instructions for the tasks were given in the learners’ languages, but the informants’ answers were written in Japanese.

As mentioned before, there was no time limit set for the surveys. However, the logging data recorded on SurveyMonkey® showed that it took 10–30 minutes to complete the tasks, including the exercise, the filler task and the general background questions, regardless of language. The time to complete the tasks in paper form was also approximately 10–30 minutes.

93 By using Japanese letters/characters or the Latin alphabet.
As was the case with the survey for native speakers, the informants were instructed to produce expressions appropriate for the given situations in writing. In the tasks, the informants were always asked to act as the speaker, not the addressee.
6. Study 1: Native speakers’ use of spatial demonstratives

This chapter seeks the answer to Research Question 1: What similarities or differences can be found between the native informant groups regarding the use of spatial demonstratives? The hypothesis was that the Japanese native informants (JP informants) and the Finnish native informants (FI informants) might show some kind of similarity in their usage patterns because Japanese and Finnish share typological similarities regarding the number of deictic contrasts expressed by the demonstratives, namely, three-way deictic contrast. The Swedish native speaker informants (SW informants), on the other hand, might show their own particular pattern because the Swedish demonstrative system has two-way deictic contrast. That Swedish has definite articles which, together with nouns, can function as deictically used expressions, and that Japanese and Finnish do not have such articles, might result in the usage rate of DEMs in Swedish being lower than in Japanese and Finnish. The chapter starts with a description of the data used in Study 1 and how it was analyzed (Sections 6.1 and 6.2). The result is presented in Section 6.3.

6.1. The data analyzed in Study 1

Of 20 tasks mentioned in Section 5.3, the results from 12 tasks (Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 in Table 5-3) were analyzed. Of the remaining eight tasks, five included an exercise or were used as fillers. The results from the other three tasks could have been a part of the data, but they had to be excluded from the analysis because it was deemed that they might not give reliable data.\(^\text{94}\)

The situations given in the 12 tasks can be divided into three categories according to the semantic contrast of Japanese demonstratives based on both the distance-oriented and the person-oriented view, and there were four tasks per category. These categories are: A) the situation where speaker is the

\(^{94}\) The preliminary analysis of the results from Japanese (L1) showed that there were seven (7) answers missing in one of the tasks and one of the tasks did not generate enough use of DEMs for the intended referents. Further, it showed that in one task, there was inconsistency in the instructions given to the informants of each language.
deictic center and since the intended referent is located close to the speaker, the use of proximal *ko* series is expected; B) the situation where the deictic center is equated to both the location of the speaker and/or the addressee, that is, the referent is located slightly away from the speaker and/or near to the addressee, hence the use of the so-called medial *so* series is expected; and C) the situation where the referent is located at the same distance from both the speaker and the addressee, and as the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location, and therefore the perception of proximity/distance to the referent may differ among the informants (no prediction was made for this category). Below, the situations used for the collection of data are presented by category. The descriptions stated under *Given Situation/instruction* are the approximate translations of the situations and instructions provided to the informants. Note, however, that the descriptions *intended referent* stated in the parentheses are not provided to the informants. In the survey the tasks were presented in a different order.

**Table 6-1 The twelve tasks included in the analysis and the expected use of DEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Given situation/instruction (intended referent)</th>
<th>Expected use of Japanese DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Patient’s hand</td>
<td>You are the nurse in the picture. Ask the patient whether the wrist you are holding hurts. <em>The speaker’s action toward the addressee is also included.</em></td>
<td>ko-series/proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Kanji/math</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (sitting beside you) if she knows the reading of the kanji/answer to the math problem. <em>(Kanji, including its reading or math, including the answer)</em></td>
<td>ko-series/proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Gizmo</td>
<td>You are the veterinarian in the picture. Tell the (imaginary) audience that the dog you are holding is called Gizmo. <em>(The dog the speaker is holding)</em></td>
<td>ko-series/proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>You are listening to a new song and you think it is fantastic. Comment on the song. <em>(The music/song the speaker is listening to)</em></td>
<td>ko-series/proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Massage</td>
<td>You are receiving massage. Tell the masseuse that the part she is pressing hurts. <em>(The body part being massaged. The addressee’s action toward the speaker’s body part is also included)</em></td>
<td>so-series/non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Dog’s name</td>
<td>Ask the name of the dog beside which the addressee (the person in the picture) is standing. <em>(The addressee’s dog)</em></td>
<td>so-series/non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (on the right) whether the water where she is swimming now is deep. <em>(The location where the addressee is situated)</em></td>
<td>so-series/non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>A cake</td>
<td>You are the boy in the picture. You want to buy one of the cakes that the man is holding. How do you express this? <em>(The cake that the addressee is holding)</em></td>
<td>so-series/non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Monkey</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Comment that an monkey on the TV is funny. <em>(The monkey on the TV, including the monkey’s action)</em></td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) the name of the dish shown on the TV. <em>(The dish shown on the TV, including its name)</em></td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>TV program</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) what he is watching on the TV. <em>(The TV program that the addressee is watching)</em></td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>You are the man in the picture. Promise your wife (besides you) that you will buy the ring that you two are looking at. <em>(The ring that the both speaker and addressee are looking at)</em></td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though these tasks were designed to prompt informants to use demonstratives in order to refer to the referent, there was a possibility that they
might not refer to the referent at all, or even if they did use a referring expressions, they might not necessarily use a demonstrative.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the same situations were used in the tasks for the native speakers, except for one situation (A2) in which the intended referent “a reading of kanji (Chinese character)” was considered to be unfamiliar to the native speakers of Swedish and Finnish and was therefore replaced by a more familiar “an answer to a math task” situation. The instructions and the descriptions of each situation were given in the informants’ native languages.

6.2. Analysis of the L1 data

6.2.1. Procedure

In the analysis of the native informants’ data (L1 data), types of expressions other than demonstratives, used for the referents were analyzed prior to conducting Study 2 for collecting L2 data.

As stated, the data analyzed in Study 1 was elicited from 12 of the 20 tasks. In the examination of L1 data, the informants’ use and non-use of spatial-deictic demonstratives (DEMs) to mention the intended referents was analyzed to begin with. When a DEM was used, it was treated as use of DEM and expressions in use were demonstrative (+DEM). If demonstratives were not used, it was treated as non-use of DEM and expressions in use were labeled non-DEM (−DEM). If a non-DEM was used, its type, in terms of its semantic properties, was examined and classified. If the informants did not follow the instructions, their answers were excluded from the analysis. For instance, in Example 6-1 below, “You are Gizmo,” the name Gizmo was addressed to Gizmo (the dog) itself, and this was excluded from the analysis because the instruction given was that the dog’s name Gizmo should be addressed to the imaginary audience (= the addressee). Example 6-2, on the other hand, was included in the analysis since this utterance was deemed to be addressed to the imaginary audience (i.e., the addressee).

---

95 A situation “to ask your friend the meaning of kanji (Chinese characters/ideographs used in Japan)” used in the Japanese version was replaced by a situation “to ask your friend the answer to the math task.”
If the expressions the informants used were appropriate within the given discourse context but did not refer to any particular referent, they were included in the analysis but regarded as a non-use of DEM. For instance, the expression “ouch” employed in Situation/task B1 was classified as an exclamation suitable in the given situation, but it does not refer to any referent and was therefore regarded as a non-use of DEM and the expression in use “ouch” was non-DEM. In these cases, the kinds of expressions employed were examined and classified. If DEMs were used but with no connection to the intended referent, they were included in the analysis, but they were also regarded as a non-use of DEM. The informants’ answers with any orthographical errors were all included in the analysis unless there was any uncertainty as to their classification as DEM. If one and the same kind of DEM was employed several times to refer to the same referent by an informant, it was counted as one occurrence. The cases where several different DEMs were employed by an informant will be discussed separately.

The results of the examination of the L1 data in the respective languages, regarding the informants’ use and non-use of DEM for the intended referents, were contrasted with each other (especially Swedish and Finnish vis-à-vis Japanese) in order to determine whether or not there were typological similarities and/or differences between them. Both similarities and differences between languages may be possible constraints on cross-linguistic influence (cf. Ellis 2008, 390).

6.2.2. Spatial-deictic DEM

As discussed in Chapter 2, deixis is defined as the encoding of the context of utterance by linguistic expressions, where its interpretation and understanding are heavily dependent on the context of utterance at the time of the speech event. Any linguistic expressions used for such encodings can be called a deictic expression (or simply deictics), and demonstratives are con-
sidered to be typical examples. Categories that are normally distinguished within deixis are person, time and space, and in this study, I focus on space. It is thus demonstratives used for spatial-deictic references that are dealt with here. It is important to note that the notion of space in spatial references concerns not only space in a literal and/or physical sense but also metaphorical, extended uses. For instance, the basic semantics of “proximity to speaker” in spatial reference may be extended to other domains such as action as in Swedish (på) detta sätt ‘(in) this way’ and Finnish tămä painallus ‘this push/press’ (cf. Anderson and Keenan 1985, 278). The notion of space may also be interpreted in a psychological sense, that is, as psychological proximity/distance, which is often conceived of as being temporally close to the mind of the speaker (ibid.). For instance, one may use this Tuesday as in I was sick this Tuesday during the following weekend to indicate that the intended Tuesday is an occasion in the immediate past in her mind.

Demonstratives of the languages included in the analyses and the criteria for the classification are described as follows. When the informants used spatial-deictic demonstratives for the intended referents, this has been marked with +DEM (use of DEM). When they used other expressions than spatial-deictic demonstratives, this is marked with –DEM (non-use of DEM or non-DEM) and if the informants used spatial-deictic demonstratives, but not for the intended referents, this has been also treated as non-use of DEM (–DEM) and noted as such.

Japanese
So-called ko/so/a-words (i.e., expressions with the demonstrative morphemes ko-, so- and a-), including independently used demonstrative pronouns, adnominally used demonstrative adjectives and determiners, as well as demonstrative adverbs, are regarded as demonstratives in this study. All such ko/so/a-words used spatial-deictically, to refer to the intended referent in the given discourse contexts, have been counted and included in the analysis. Example 6-3–Example 6-9 show cases included in the analysis as +DEM. See also Table 2-2 and Table 2-3 for the list of demonstratives which are also included in the analysis. In the examples, demonstratives in the original text are given in italics.

Example 6-3 JP01
ねえ、これ 読める？
nē kore yomeru?
INTJ kore can.read

‘Hey, can you read this?’
Example 6-4 JP71
この わんちゃん お名前は？
kono wan-chan onamae wa?
kono bowwow-DIM name:HON TOP

‘A name of this doggy? (What is the name of this doggy?)’

Example 6-5 JP87
そこ 深い？
soko fukai?
soko deep

‘Is it deep there?’

Example 6-6 JP83
そっち 深い？
socchi fukai?
socchi deep

‘Is it deep there?’

Example 6-7 JP39
はは、 こいつ おもしろ！
haha koitsu omoshiro!
haha (laugh) koitsu funny

‘Haha, this guy is funny!’

Example 6-8 JP91
なんで こんな いい 曲 今まで 開かなかったんだろう。
nande konna i kyoku ima made kikanakatta-n-darō.
why konna good music now ALL listen:NEG:PST-NR-AUX

‘Why haven’t I heard such good music before?’

Example 6-9 JP66
これは 痛いですか？
kore wa itai-desu-ka?
kore TOP painful-POL-Q

‘Is this aching?/Does this hurt?’

Finnish
Expressions with demonstrative stems tā- and tuo- that appeared as demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative determiners and their inflected forms,
including pronominal adjectives and adverbs, are regarded as demonstratives in this study. All the demonstratives used spatial-deictically to refer to the intended referent in the given discourse contexts were counted and included in the analysis. As for *se-* , this is very problematic since the status of *se* has often been considered different from the other two demonstratives, *tämä* and *tuo*, and it is often given a different pragmatic function, namely, an anaphoric function (Laury 1997, 55; 2005, 59; Karlsson 1999). *Se* can also be interpreted as both demonstrative pronoun and the third-person inanimate personal pronoun (cf. Juvonen 2000, 36) and there is no clear-cut borderline between *se* as a demonstrative and *se* as a third-person personal pronoun. However, independently or adnominally used *se* with a locative meaning, that is *se* in local cases used to point to the location of the addressee or to the referents which the speaker considers to be in the addressee’s sphere, are quite obviously spatial-deictically used demonstratives and they are included in the analysis. Finnish *se* as a pronominal adverb (*siellä, sieltä, and sinne*) used to point to the location of the addressee or for the referents which the speaker considers to be in the addressee’s sphere, were also regarded as spatial deictic demonstratives. See Table 2-4 and Table 2-5 for the demonstratives which have been counted and included in the analysis. Example 6-10–Example 6-14 show cases included in the analysis as +DEM. In the examples, demonstratives in the original text are given in italics.

Example 6-10 FI01
*Tämä on hyvä.*
*tämä COP3 good*

‘This is good.’

Example 6-11 FI37
*Sattuu=ko tä-stä?*
*hurt3=Q tä-ELAT*

‘Does it hurt (out of) here?’

Example 6-12 FI15
*Mitä sieltä tulee?*
*what se:ADVL:ABL come3*

‘What’s on the TV?’ (What comes from there?)
Example 6-13 FI16
_Tuo-ssa on kauhean kipeä kohta._
tuo-INESS COP3 unpleasant:GEN sore spot

‘(In) there is a terribly sore spot.’
(It’s a terribly sore spot there.)

Example 6-14 FI43
_Au, tuo vähän sattui_  
ouch tuo a.little hurt:PST3

‘Ouch, that hurt a bit.’

**Swedish**

Independently and attributively used *den här/där* and *denna*, and their inflected forms, as well as attributively (adnominally) used *den* with a definite noun and their inflected forms are regarded as demonstratives in this study. All such demonstratives used spatial-deictically to refer to the intended referent in the given discourse contexts have been counted and included in the analysis. Independently used *den/det* are not regarded as demonstratives. See Table 2-6 for the demonstratives analyzed in the study. Example 6-15–Example 6-18 show cases included in the analysis as +DEM. In the examples, independently used demonstratives in the original text are given in italics. As for adnominally used *den* and *den här/där* including their inflected forms, are in italics but not the head noun.

Example 6-15 SW02
_Vilket program är detta_  
which program COP detta

‘Which program is this?’

Example 6-16 SW15
_Gör det ont här?_  
do it pain här

‘Does it hurt here?’

---

96 However, *den N-def* used as a so-called determinative pronoun (determinativa pronomen) is not included.
97 However, *där* used as a relative adverb is not included.
6.2.3. Description and classification of demonstratives according to distance-oriented and person-oriented views

For a representation of the semantic properties of demonstratives (DEM*) used in the L1 data I have followed Anderson and Keenan (1985, 284) and Diessel (1999, 50), categorizing the occurrences based both on i) the distance-oriented view and ii) the person-oriented view on DEMs’ semantics. According to the distance-oriented view, the use of DEM is based on the location of the speaker, that is, the proximity/distance from the speaker, including a variety of metaphorical extensions. According to the person-oriented view, the use of DEM is based on the discourse participants’ interactional role, either as the speaker or as the addressee (or a non-participant). Hence, based on the distance-oriented view, we have categories proximal to the speaker and non-proximal to the speaker. This category may be distinguished further between medial and distal to the speaker. According to the person-oriented view, we have categories proximal to the speaker, proximal to the addressee and non-proximal (distal) to both the speaker and the addressee. In this study, proximal to the speaker is labeled as +PROX, proximal to the addressee and medial to the speaker is labeled as ±PROX and non-proximal (distal) to both the speaker and the addressee is labeled as –PROX.

As seen in Section 2.4, in Japanese, we have the ko-, so-, a-series as DEMs and they can be described as follows. The ko-series has a form [+PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the speaker (+PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal (+PROX). The so-series has a form ±PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the addressee and/or non-proximal to the speaker (±PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee is proximal and/or the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is non-proximal (±PROX). The a-series

---

*The term demonstrative(s) (= DEM) are used henceforth with a restricted meaning, “spatial-deictically used demonstrative(s)” or “spatial-deictic demonstratives” unless otherwise stated.
has a form [–PROX] and a basic semantics of distal to the speaker (–PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is distal (–PROX).

As for Finnish, we have the tä-, se, tuo-series, which can be described as follows. The tä-series has a form [+PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the speaker (+PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal (+PROX). The se-series has a form [±PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the addressee and/or non-proximal to the speaker (±PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee is proximal and/or the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is non-proximal (±PROX). The tuo-series has a form [–PROX] and a basic semantics of distal to the speaker (–PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is distal (–PROX).

As for Swedish, we have här, den här, denna, där, den där and den N-def, which can be described as follows. Her and den här have a form [+PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the speaker (+PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal (+PROX). Denna has a form [+PROX] and a basic semantics of proximal to the speaker (+PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal (+PROX), just like här and den här. The difference between här/den här and denna is that the former här/den här is used mostly in colloquial Swedish while the latter denna is used mostly in formal written Swedish. Där and den där have a form [–PROX] and a basic semantics of distal to the speaker (–PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is distal (–PROX). Note that a basic semantics of proximity to the addressee is not given explicitly in grammars such as SAG (1999). However, we find ample examples of där and den där used to imply proximity to the addressee in actual uses. Regarding den N-def, like där and den där, this has a form [–PROX] and a basic semantics of distal to the speaker (–PROX), used when the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is distal (–PROX). However, unlike där and den där, a semantics of den N-def is not restricted to distance but is also related to contrast; Swedish den N-def can be used to indicate a contrast, irrespective of distance/proximity.

The forms and semantics of the spatial-deictic DEM occurring in the L1 data of Japanese, Swedish and Finnish were classified accordingly, as shown in the following tables.

99 Nominal demonstratives are stated in singular and in common gender.
### Table 6-2 Semantic classification of DEM: Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Categories according to distance-oriented view</th>
<th>Categories according to person-oriented view</th>
<th>represented in the analysis as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko-series</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>+PROX or proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so-series</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the addressee</td>
<td>±PROX or medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[±PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-series</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>non-proximal to both speaker and the addressee</td>
<td>±PROX or distal (non-proximal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-3 Semantic classification of DEM: Finnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Categories according to distance-oriented view</th>
<th>Categories according to person-oriented view</th>
<th>represented in the analysis as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tä-series</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>+PROX or proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se-series</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the addressee</td>
<td>±PROX or medial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[±PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuo-series</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>non-proximal to both speaker and the addressee</td>
<td>±PROX or distal (non-proximal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6-4 Semantic classification of DEM: Swedish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Categories according to distance-oriented view</th>
<th>Categories according to person-oriented view</th>
<th>represented in the analysis as</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>den här, här and the variations</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>+PROX or proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denna and the variations</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>+PROX or proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den där, där and the variations</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker (distal)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>−PROX, or distal (non-proximal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den N-def and the variations</td>
<td>non-proximal to the speaker (distal)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>−PROX, or distal (non-proximal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accordingly, we may postulate that the Japanese ko-series corresponds to the Finnish tä-series and Swedish den här, här, denna (and their variants). The Japanese so-series may correspond to the Finnish se-series. The Japanese a-series may correspond to the Finnish tuo-series and Swedish den där, där and den N-def.

#### 6.2.4. Classification of non-DEM

If the expressions used by the informants were relevant to the given situation (discourse context) but did not refer to the intended referents, or if the intended referent was referred to by means of expressions other than spatial deictic demonstratives, they were all treated as non-DEM. All cases of non-DEM have been classified in specific categories. The parameters used for the classifications are empirically grounded and collected from the present data.
6.3. Results

The following presents the quantitative and qualitative analysis of Study 1. To begin with, an overall description of how spatial deictic demonstratives were used and/or not used for the intended referent in each language and situation is given (Section 6.3.1). After that comes a classification and descriptions of expressions other than demonstratives used in the given situations, that is, use of non-DEMs. Section 6.3.2, presents qualitative analyses of the demonstratives used in each Situation, A1–C4.

6.3.1. Use of DEM and non-DEM in each situation

Usage rate

Table 6-5 shows the number of cases included in the analysis (n), whether demonstratives have been used (+DEM) or not used (–DEM) by the native informants, and the rate of the demonstratives used. The usage rates for each situation and language are also presented in a line graph in Figure 6-1.

Table 6-5 Number of use and non-use of DEM by the native informants in each situation and language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>JP DEM</th>
<th>FI DEM</th>
<th>SW DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>Used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The usage rates of DEM in Table 6-5 and Figure 6-1 show that even though Situations A1–C4 were designed to prompt the use of DEM, they were not always used in Japanese. The figure shows that in the Categories A–C, the situations in which the highest usage rate was found were basically the same in all three languages. That is, for Category A, all three languages marked the highest usage rate in Situation A2. For Category B, it was Situation B3 and for Category C, it was Situation C2. The situations in which the lowest usage rate was attested varied, except for Category B, in which all three languages scored the lowest usage rate in Situation B2. This result indicates that there were certain situations common to all three languages where the informants tended to use DEM. However, the usage rates also differed considerably between the languages in certain situations, such as B2, B4 and C1. To see whether DEMs are more likely to be used (or less likely to be used) in a certain language compared to other languages, the χ2 tests were performed.

The results showed that there were significant differences between the languages groups regarding the use of DEM (used/not used) as a whole (χ² = 114.181, df = 2, p < 0.001). The residual analysis showed that the JP informants in general tended to use more DEMs, and the SW informants, less.

Thus we have seen above that the JP informants in general tended to use DEMs and the usage rates were high, and that the SW informants tended not to use DEMs and the usage rates were low. We find here that the FI informants group can be placed in the middle in terms of tendency to use DEMs or not and also the usage rates. As seen in the figure, exceptions were Situations A1, A3, B1 and C4. In A1 the highest usage rate was scored by SW
informants, and in A3 and C4 the highest usage rate was scored by FI informants.

Although the JP informants tended to use DEMs instead of other expressions for the given situations, there were some exceptions, which suggested that the actual uses of DEMs (regarding when DEMs are used) were not always in accordance with the explanations given in grammars and textbooks. The Finnish language, like Japanese, does not have definite articles, and it was thought that it would use DEMs as deictic expressions as frequently as Japanese. However, the results showed that the FI informants’ usage of DEMs was not as frequent as that of the JP informants. The Swedish language can utilize definite articles together with nouns as deictic expressions, and the SW informants indeed used fewer DEMs than the other languages.

From the above, we get a picture of how the speakers of each language tended to use demonstratives in the given situations.

**Types of non-DEM**

As stated, expressions used by the informants may not always refer to the intended referent even though the use of the expressions was appropriate in the given discourse contexts (situations). The intended referents may not necessarily be referred to by means of spatial deictic demonstratives either. All such instances were treated as non-use of demonstratives (the expressions in use were called non-DEM, marked with –DEM) in this study, and they are placed in certain categories. In the L1 data of the languages, the following categories are identified which can basically be divided into three different kinds of linguistic forms: zero, NP with or without determiners and complements (NP) and pronominal.

**Japanese**

1) Zero (∅): the intended referent is not directly referred to. Examples are the use of the exclamation 痛っ itatt! ‘ouch!’ instead of referring to the spot that aches and the use of sentences such as 買ってあげるよ katte ageru-yo ‘(I’m) gonna buy (it) for you’ used without referring to the intended referent, a ring.

2) NP: the intended referent is referred to by means of a bare noun, or a noun with determiners and complement. Examples are わんちゃん wan-chan ‘doggy/little doggy’ おじさんの持ってるやつ ojisan no motteru yatsu ‘the one uncle (= you) is holding.’

3) Interrogative pronoun: An example is nani ‘what’ as in ねえ、何見てるの Nē, nani miteruno ‘Hey.. what are you watching?’
1) Zero (∅): the intended referent is not directly referred to. An example is the use of the interjection Autos ‘ouch’ instead of referring to the spot that aches.

2) NP with or without determiners and complement: Examples are Mikä koiran nimi on? ‘What is the dog’s name?’ and Onpa hassu apina. ‘Isn’t it a funny monkey?’

3) Personal pronoun, animate or inanimate; other than DEM in the case of se, including a formal subject: Examples are: Mikä sen nimi on? ‘What is his/her/its name?’ Mikä hänen nimi on? ‘What is his/her/its name?’ Onpa se veikeä apina. ‘Isn’t it a funny monkey?’

4) Interrogative pronoun: An example is mitä ‘what’ as in Mitä katsot? ‘What are you watching?’

**Swedish**

1) Zero (∅): the intended referent is not directly referred to. Examples are the use of the interjection Aj ‘ouch!’ which is used instead of referring to the spot that aches, and the use of the sentence Vi får väl se... ‘we’ll see.’

2) NP with or without determiners and complement: Examples are en kaka ‘a cake,’ grym låt ‘awesome tune/song,’ vovven ‘doggy,’ programmet ‘the program,’ din hund ‘your dog.’

3) Indefinite pronoun: an example is (en) sådan/sån ‘such’ as in (en) sån ‘such a.’

4) NP with interrogative pronoun, with or without determiner, used for interjection: An example is the use of vilken ‘which/what’ as in vilken rolig apa ‘What a funny monkey!’

5) Personal pronoun: An example is den ‘it’ as in Vad heter den? ‘What is its name of?/What is it called?’, when the intended referent was a dog hund (common in gender); i.e., especially when it takes the same grammatical gender as the referent.

6) Personal pronoun, neuter ‘det,’ used in the position for the subject (formal subject) or complement: An example is det ‘it/the’ in Vad är det för maträtt de lagar? ‘What is it/the dish they’re cooking?’

7) Interrogative pronoun: An example is vad ‘what’ as in Vad tittar du på? ‘What are you watching?’

8) Relative adverb: Är det djupt där du är? ‘Is it deep where you are?’

### 6.3.2. Qualitative analyses

In this section, the demonstratives used in the 12 situations (A1–C4) are discussed per category, situation and language. Table 6-6 shows which DEMs in each language were used for the intended referents, and my inter-
interpretations of the data and detailed discussions will follow. The discussion starts with general remarks on the usage rates and cases with non-DEM. A short summary concludes the discussion in each situation.

In the examples, the grammatical number of Finnish and Swedish is given in the singular unless otherwise stated. Swedish nouns (N) and noun phrases (NP) are given in the indefinite and common form unless otherwise transliterated. Comparing the demonstrative systems of three different languages is not an easy task; in order to be able to discuss different DEM systems and compare them with each other, the descriptions of DEM presented in Section 6.2.3 were applied as follows: the semantics of ‘proximal to the speaker’ in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish DEM is called \textit{proximal} here and marked +PROX in the analyses.\footnote{The term and the abbreviation (marking) may be used interchangeably in order to help the reader.} The semantics of ‘non-proximal to the speaker, and proximal to the addressee’ in Japanese and Finnish DEM is called \textit{medial} and marked ±PROX, and ‘non-proximal to the speaker, or to the addressee, alternatively to both the speaker and the addressee’ in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish DEM is called \textit{distal} and marked –PROX.\footnote{The term and the abbreviation (marking) may be used interchangeably in order to help the reader.} The square brackets [ ] together with the abbreviations are used to indicate the forms, and the angle brackets \(\langle\rangle\) together with the abbreviations are used to indicate the spatial relations between the referent, the speaker and the addressee in the situations given.
Table 6-6 Number of spatial deictic demonstratives (+DEM) used and non-use of spatial deictic demonstratives (–DEM) according to their type in each situation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B3</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den här, denna</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>den där, den Nn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The ratio of the demonstrative types used is given in parentheses.

Category A

The intended referent is located in the speaker’s current sphere and close to the speaker, either visible (Situations A1, A2, A3) or invisible (Situation A4). Since the referent is located close to the speaker (+PROX), a proximal demonstrative, that is, the ko-series, was expected in Japanese. The Finnish proximal tâ-series and the Swedish proximal den här, här and denna (and their variants) are also described to indicate a referent located in the speaker’s current sphere (close to the speaker); these DEMs were expected to be used for the situations dealt with in this category.

Situation A1

General

In this situation, the speaker was asked to play the role of a nurse (female) and to ask the addressee (patient, female) if the spot she was holding hurts. Even though the intended referent was the addressee’s body part (the wrist),
the speaker was *holding* the body part in question, and as it is close to the speaker, the use of proximal DEM was expected. The usage rate of DEM scored by the Finnish and Swedish informants in this situation turned out to be quite high (88% and 92% respectively). However, the usage rate scored by the Japanese informants turned out to be not so high, only 61%. It was rather surprising that the usage rate scored by the Japanese informants turned out to be lower than that of the informants of the other languages in this situation. The results showed that 29 of 38 Japanese informants who did not employ DEM chose to ask a question without referring to a specific referent such as, *痛みはありませんか／痛みはどうですか* *itami wa arimasuka/itami wa dō desuka* ‘Do you have a pain?/How is the pain?’ It seemed that the speaker’s action of *holding* replaced the use of DEM for its pointing function. Seven of 12 Finnish informants who did not employ DEM here chose also to ask a question without referring to a specific referent such as *Tuntuuko kiipua?* ‘Do you feel a pain?’ Five of eight Swedish informants who did not employ DEM used *där* as a relative adverb, as in Example 6-19.

Example 6-19 SW09

Gör det ont *där* jag håller?
do it pain where I hold

‘Does it hurt where I’m holding?’

**Japanese**

Only the [+PROX] *ko*-series was used in this situation, and among the *ko*-series, it was DEM for location *koko* ‘here’ that was mostly used to refer to the addressee’s wrist (Example 6-20). Adnominal *kono* together with a head noun, typically *bubun* ‘part’ (*kono bubun* ‘this part’) and *atari* ‘around’ (*kono atari* ‘around this spot’) were used to refer to the addressee’s body part (Example 6-21). Further, adverbial DEM for manner *kō* ‘in this way’ was used to refer to the action, the way the speaker touches the addressee’s wrist. The use of the *ko*-series in this situation was based on the actual (physical) proximity to the referent (the addressee’s body part) as the addressee’s wrist (the referent) was close to the speaker as she was touching it at the time of speech. The *ko*-series was also used to refer to the speakers’ own action, the touching (Example 6-22).
Example 6-20 JP46 and others
ここ、痛みますか？
koko itamimasu-ka?
koko hurt:POL-Q

‘Does (it) hurt here?’

Example 6-21 JP20
この部分に痛みはありませんか？
kono bubun ni itami wa arimasu-ka?
kono spot LOC pain TOP exist:POL-Q

‘Do you have a pain at this spot?’
lit. Is there pain at this spot?

Example 6-22 JP71
こうすると痛いですか？
kō suru to itaiidesu-ka?
kō do then painful:POL-Q

‘Does (it) hurt when I do like this?’

Finnish
Only the [+PROX] tā-series was used in this situation. Most of the uses were in internal locative cases of DEM pronouns, that is, the elative case tāsta (29 cases), the inessive case tāssä (16 cases) and the illative case tähän (13 cases). The use of the nominative case tämä (26 cases) was also found. See Example 6-23–Example 6-26.

Locative cases of proximal DEM pronouns were used both pronominally and adnominally (the illative case tähän was mostly used pronominally) to refer to the addressee’s wrist that the speaker was touching. The nominative case tämä was also used both pronominally and adnominally, and when it was used pronominally, it referred to the action of the speaker, touching. When used adnominally, it referred to the wrist, the location/spot where the speaker was touching. The Finnish tā-series in locative cases (tästä, tähän, tāssä) are all often translated into English as ‘here.’ However, the different case endings indicate different directions of the action of the verb. The verbs used frequently in this situation were ‘hurts/aches’ (sattua and koskea), and ‘feels’ (tuntua). The elative case tästä was used to indicate that the act of the verb was occurring ‘from’ the spot on the body and the inessive case tāssä, ‘in(side)’ the spot. The illative case tähän was used to indicate ‘hurting towards’ the spot. Note that the inessive case tāssä was used only with the verb ‘feel’ tuntua in my data.
It was basically only proximal DEM pronouns in internal locative cases, and adnominally used nominative case tämä together with a head noun, typically kohta ‘spot,’ that were used to refer to the location in my data. Proximal DEM adverbs for place (täällä ‘here,’ täältä ‘from here,’ tänne ‘to here’) were not used for this situation.

According to Laury (1997, 56), DEM pronouns in internal locative cases characterize their denotata as points or units rather than regions. According to her, DEM adverbs (locative adverbs in Laury’s term), on the other hand, characterize their denotata as regions. Further, she states that the referents expressed by the internal locative case forms of DEM pronouns (i.e. inessive, elative and illative) tend to be “relatively more foregrounded, more referential, smaller, geometrically simpler (point-like), more salient, anticipated, and proximal” (ibid, 139). My interpretation of the use of tästä, tässä and tähän in this situation was that it was necessary for the speaker to pinpoint
the pain within the location that she had close contact with (i.e. touching). The use of proximal DEM was thus based on the actual physical contact with and, thus proximity to the referent.

**Swedish**

The use of the proximal DEM adverbial for location *här* was frequent for this situation, and the use of pronominal *det här* ‘this, neuter’ and *detta* ‘this, neuter’ were also found. Pronominally used DEM *det här* ‘this, neuter’ was judged to refer either to the addressee’s wrist or to the speaker’s action, that is, how the speaker was touching the addressee’s wrist. Another pronominally used DEM *detta* ‘this, neuter’ was judged to refer to the action. In Example 6-28, the DEM adverbial for location *här* was used to refer to the location of the addressee’s body part. In Example 6-29, the use of pronominal *det här* (neuter) can be interpreted to refer either to the speaker’s action or to the location. As the use of proximal DEM (*här, den här, denna* and their variants) refer to the wrist which the speaker is touching or the speaker’s action, the use was based on the actual proximity to the referent. (Note that *denna/detta*, often described as formal written language, were also used here.)

Example 6-28 SW12 and others

Gör *det* ont *här*?

‘Does it hurt here?’

Example 6-29 SW30 and other

Hur *känn-s* *det här*?

‘How does this feel?/How does it feel here?’

There was one case in which the distal DEM adverb for place *där* was used. The DEM adverb for place [−PROX] *där* was used to refer to the location of the addressee’s body, the wrist, which the speaker was touching (Example 6-30). The use of [−PROX] *där* in this situation cannot be explained in terms of distance, since the referent was located physically close to the speaker. However, as shown in 2.4.3, the use of *där* is not restricted by the physical and absolute distance, and in my opinion, the use of *där* can be better explained in terms of exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere; the speaker normally has control over whatever happens in his current sphere, and the use of *där* here seemed to convey the speaker’s spontaneous thought of ‘not having control of the referent’. Further, in my opinion,
the exclusion of the referent was determined for the purpose of communication and we may call it a social-interaction factor.

Example 6-30 SW49
Gör det ont där?
does it pain där
‘Does it hurt there?’

The use of proximal DEM (här, den här, denna and their variants) was dominant for this situation (91 cases), which may indicate that the proximal DEMs are the typical choice for referring to the location which belongs to the addressee if the location (the referent) is close enough for the speaker when she is touching.

Summary
The results showed that the usage rate of DEM scored by the JP informants turned out to be much lower than that scored by the FI and SW informants, but it was basically only [+PROX] DEMs that were used when DEMs were used to refer to the intended referent (the addressee’s body part, wrist) in all three languages. An exception was one case found in SW data, in which the [−PROX] där was used. The use of där cannot be explained in terms of distance, but it has been suggested that it may be explained in terms of ‘exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere.’ The choice of proximal DEM can be explained by the speakers’ spatial proximity to the referent.

Situation A2

General
In the given situation, the speaker (female) was showing a kanji (in the case of Japanese) or a math task (in the case of Finnish and Swedish) to her friend (the addressee, female) to ask her if she knew the reading of the kanji or the answer to the math task. In Situation A2, the usage rate of DEM scored by the informants turned out to be the highest in the whole Category A, regardless of language. All the JP informants used DEM. The FI informants who did not use DEM used just the NP vastaus ‘answer’ in the inflected case, often in the accusative case. The SW informants who did not use DEM often used the pronoun det ‘it, neuter’ and/or the NP svar ‘answer’ in the definite form svaret ‘answer-def, neuter.’

Japanese
Only the [+PROX] ko-series was used and it was pronominal kore or adnominal kono together with a head noun, typically kanji ‘kanji character’
(Example 6-31 and Example 6-32). There were also some cases in which adnominal *kono* was used associative deictically together with the head noun *yomikata* ‘reading’ (Example 6-33).

Example 6-31 JP11 and others

これ、読める？
*kore yomeru?*

‘Can (you) read this?’

Example 6-32 JP25

この漢字は何て読むの?
*kono kanji wa nan te yomu-no?*

‘How do you read this *kanji*?’

Example 6-33 JP05 and others

この読み方が分かる?
*kono yomikata wakaru?*

‘(Do you) know this reading?’

As the referent was located close to the speaker, the use of the *ko*-series was based on the actual distance (proximity) of the referent.

*Finnish*

In general, the [+PROX] *tä*-series was used in this situation. The exception was one case with the [–PROX] *tuo*-series and one case with the [±PROX] *se*-series found in this situation. When the *tä*-series was used, it was often in the accusative case *tämä*, used pronominally or adnominally, to refer to the math task. The *tä*-series in the nominative case (*tämä*), illative case (*tähän*), partitive case (*tätä*) and inessive case (*tässä*) was also found. They were all used either pronominally or adnominally to refer to the math task (Example 6-34–Example 6-38).

Example 6-34 FI03

Osaat=ko ratkaista *tämä*-n?

‘Do you know how to solve this?’
As shown in Example 6-38, there was one case in which both tässä (inessive case) and tämä (nominative case) were used. In this example, tässä referred to the location in which the math task was perceived to be located. The math task in question was then referred to by adnominal DEM with the head noun tehtävä ‘task.’ As the referent was located close to the speaker, the use of proximal DEM was based on the actual distance to the referent.

As mentioned, there was also one case in which the [-PROX] tuo-series was used, and one case in which the [+PROX] se-series was used. Both were in the elative case, tosta and siitä respectively, and they were used pronominally to refer to the task. According to Laury (1997), the use of the tuo-series signals that the speaker excludes the referent from her current sphere and it implies at the same time that the referent is available to someone else. According to Laury (ibid.) and VISK (2008), the use of the se-series signals that the speaker considers the referent to be in the addressee’s sphere. The referent in the given situation was the task that the speaker had been engaged in, and that was located physically close to the speaker (〈+PROX〉). The use of distal or medial DEM in this situation can hardly be explained in terms of spatial distance, so the use of the tuo- and se-series needs a different inter-
In Section 2.4.2, it was shown that a speaker can use all three DEM tämä, se, and tuo to refer to an object (the referent) while the distance between the speaker and the referent remains the same, namely, proximal (cf. Etelämäki 2009; Laury 1997; VISK 2008, §722). Thus the use of the tuo- and se-series in this situation may rather be described in terms of a psychological factor. The physical distance (proximity/distance) between the speaker and the referent did not seem to matter here. This result may be comparable to the case shown in Situation A1 by a SW informant, in which där [−PROX] was used. In Situation A1, the use of där was analyzed to indicate the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere, and the use of the se- and tuo-series in Situation A2 can also be explained as the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere, indicating that she has handed over control of the task to the addressee (se) or disclaims both her own and the addressees control of, and perhaps also the responsibility of solving the task (tuo). The exclusion seems to be deliberate and as discussed in a previous example, a social-interactional factor seems to be related to the exclusion.

Example 6-39 FI88
Mitä sä sai
to-sta.
what you get:PST2 tuo-ELAT

‘What did you get from that?’

Example 6-40 FI97
Mitä sä sii-tä sai.
what you se-ELAT get:PST2

‘What did you get from it?’

Swedish

It was mostly [+PROX] här and den här that were used in this situation. The use of [+PROX] denna was also observed. There was also one case in which [−PROX] den NP-def was used. The proximal DEMs used were pronominal det här (neuter), adnominal det här (neuter), and adnominal den här (common). When they were used adnominally, they were typically with the head noun talat ‘number/counting-task-def, neuter’ and/or frågan ‘question-def, common’ as in det här talat ‘this calculation task’ and den här frågan ‘this question’ respectively. When denna (and its variants) was used, it was in pronominal detta (neuter) and/or in adnominal denna (common) together with a head noun, typically uppgift ‘task,’ and they were all used to refer to the task. As seen, all the proximal DEM forms in Swedish were used to refer
to the math task. As was the case in Situation A1, *detta/denna*, which are often described as belonging to formal written language, was also used here. As was the case with Japanese and Finnish, the use of *den här, här, denna* and their variations here is based on the spatial proximity of the referent, since the math task was presented in front of the speaker.

Example 6-41 SW16
Har du svarat på *den här fråga-n*?

‘Have you answered this question?’

As stated, there was one case in which a distal DEM was used for this situation. It was an adnominal *den* (common), together with a head noun *frågan* ‘question-def, common’ as in *den frågan* ‘the/that question’ (Example 6-42). The use of the distal DEM cannot be explained in terms of distance-based semantics. However, as SAG (1999, 2:323) explains, the use of [*–PROX*] *den N*’def indicates that a certain referent is pointed out among a number of similar referents given in the speech situation. Thus the use of *den frågan* in this situation can be explained by the exclusion of the referent, a certain math task, from the speaker’s sphere and the speaker’s intention to point it out among the other tasks, without reflecting on the distance between the speaker and the referent; the distance seemed to be irrelevant here.

Example 6-42 SW81
Vet du svar-et på *den fråga-n*?

‘Do you know the answer to that/the/this question?’

In my data, there was also one case with adnominally used proximal DEM *det här* (neuter), which was used together with a head noun *svaret* ‘answer-def, neuter.’ Since the head noun *svaret* ‘answer-def, neuter’ was first mentioned and the referent could only be understood via what was physically presented for the addressee in the speech context (the math task/problem), *det här svaret* in this situation was judged to be in associative deictic use. Note that associative variations of DEM uses are usually not discussed in the literature.
Example 6-43 SW20
Kan du det här svar-et?
can you det här answer-DEF

‘Can you this answer?’
(‘Do you know this answer?’)

Summary
The results showed that the usage rate of DEM scored by the informants for this situation turned out to be the highest among the whole of Category A, regardless of the languages, and JP informants used only [+PROX] DEMs for the intended referent. As for the FI informants, the use of [+PROX] DEM and [–PROX] DEM, and in the case of the SW informants, the use of [–PROX] DEM was also observed. In all three languages, the use of proximal DEM seemed to be based on the spatial distance (i.e. proximity) of the referent to the speaker. On the other hand, the use of [+PROX] DEM in Finnish and/or [–PROX] DEM in Finnish and Swedish indicated that their use were not solely regulated by the physical distance of the referent. In these languages, [+PROX] DEM (Finnish) and [–PROX] DEM (both Finnish and Swedish) seemed to be used for deliberate exclusion of the referent, depending on the speech participants’ ongoing social interaction.

Situation A3

General
In the given situation, the speaker was presenting a dog for the audience (the addressee) by saying its name, Gizmo. The distance between the speaker and the addressee was not clear in the picture used in the DCT, but the distance between the speaker and the referent was close; the speaker was holding the dog.

The usage rate of DEM turned out to be quite high (over 80%) in all the languages. The JP informants who did not use DEM for this situation often used just a name, Gizmo, as the predicative: Gizumo-kun desu ‘(It is) Mr. Gizmo.’ Some (not all) also used the interjection hāi ‘Yeah/yes, well’ preceding the introduction of the name, seemingly to catch the attention of the addressee. The FI informants who did not use DEM often used the personal pronoun hän ‘he/she’ to refer to the dog. The SW informants who did not use DEM also used the personal pronouns hen ‘he/she’ and han ‘he.’ Some also used the noun hunden ‘dog-def,’ in the definite form.

Japanese
It was only the [+PROX] ko-series that was used in this situation. In my data, the ko-series used were all adnominal kono; pronominal kore was not used.
Adnominal *kono* was used together with a head noun, typically *ko* ‘little one’ (Example 6-44), *inu* ‘dog’ (Example 6-45) and *wan-chan* ‘doggy’ to refer to the dog. As the referent is presented just in front of the speaker, the use of the *ko*-series is based on the spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker. The choice of the head noun also seems to add a gradation of the speaker’s feelings of intimacy towards the dog. For example, the head noun *wan-chan* ‘doggy’ conveys a diminutive sense and the use of this noun together with *kono* shows the speaker’s intimacy toward the dog. Further, the noun *ko* ‘little one’ means literally ‘little person, child’ and we found that by using *kono ko* ‘this little one,’ the dog was treated as if it was a little human being. Again, a sense of intimacy is suggested here. In this respect, it is interesting to find that only adnominal *kono* was used for this situation and not pronominal *kore*. As seen in Table 2-3 in Section 2.4.1, the denotatum type of *kore* is prototypically *thing*, and *kore* is basically used only to refer to *inanimate things* (cf. Murata 2007, 44; *Gendai Nihongo Bunpō* 2009:7, 22). The exception, however, is that *kore* might be used for the person shown in the picture (photo), or for the speaker’s family member when the speaker is going to introduce the person in question to the addressee (ibid.).

Example 6-44 JP03 and others

```
この 子は ギズモです。
kono ko wa Gizumo desu.
kono little.one TOP Gizmo COP:POL
```

‘This little one is Gizmo.’

Example 6-45 JP02 and others

```
この 犬の 名は、 ギズモです。
kono inu no namae wa Gizumo desu.
kono dog GEN name TOP Gizmo COP:POL
```

‘This dog’s name is Gizmo.’

**Finnish**

It was mostly the [+PROX] *tä*-series that was used, mainly in the nominal case *tämä*, genitive case *tämän* and inessive case *tässä* (Example 6-46–Example 6-48). *Tämä* and *tämän* were used pronominally or adnominally and they referred to the dog, Gizmo. When the *tä*-series in locative cases were used, they referred to the location of Gizmo. In some cases, both the nominal case *tämä* and the inessive case *tässä* were used in one sentence as seen in Example 6-49. Here, *tämä* (nominative case) referred to Gizmo and *tässä* (inessive case) referred to the location of Gizmo. As the referent is presented just in front of the speaker, the use of the *tä*-series was basically
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based on the actual distance (proximity) to the referent. As shown in the JP data, the use of a noun with a positive sense (komeuden ‘handsome one’ in Example 6-47), together with adnominal DEM, may also indicate a sense of intimacy and closeness to the referent.

Example 6-46 FI55 and others
Tämä on Gizmo.
tämä COP3 Gizmo

‘This is Gizmo.’

Example 6-47 FI56
Tämän komeude-n nimi on Gizmo.
tä-GEN handsome.one-GEN name COP3 Gizmo.

‘The name of this handsome one is Gizmo.’

Example 6-48 FI60 and others
Tä-ssä on Gizmo.
tä-INESS COP3 Gizmo

‘Here is Gizmo.’

Example 6-49 FI13 and others
Tämä tä-ssä on Gizmo.
tämä tä-INESS COP3 Gizmo

‘This (one) here is Gizmo.’

There were two uses of the se-series in this situation, but there was only one case in which se was deemed to be spatial-deictically used ([±PROX]). It was siinä in Example 6-50 and the other se was judged to be a personal pronoun. As seen in Example 6-50 the first se functioned as a personal pronoun and the second siinä (inessive case) was used to refer to the location of Gizmo. According to the grammar, the use of siinä signals that the speaker regarded the referent to be in the addressee’s sphere and the use of siinä for this situation cannot be explained in terms of the spatial distance of the referent to the speaker. In the Example 6-50, even though an existence of an audience as the addressee was presupposed, the use of the se-series (siinä) together with enclitic -han has the effect of shifting the role of addressee from the imaginary audience to Gizmo. That is, as the use of the se-series was explained in terms of exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere (see the previous Situation A2), and as siinä here refers to the sphere where Gizmo is located, the reading in this situation is that the speaker stepped aside from
the current sphere where the audience and Gizmo were both included. By
doing so, the speaker lets Gizmo be her addressee, yet the audience still re-
 mains as the addressee.

Example 6-50 FI88
Kas Gizmo-han se sii-nā
INTJ Gizmo-ENCL se se-INESS

‘Oh look, Gizmo he, there.’
‘Oh look, Gizmo, isn’t it you?’

Swedish
It was only proximal DEM (den här, här, denna and their variants) that were
used in this situation. They were used pronominally det här (neuter) and
adnominally den här (common) together with a head noun, typically hunden
‘dog-def, common’, to refer to the dog, Gizmo (Example 6-51 and Example
6-52). The proximal DEM detta (neuter) was used pronominally to refer to
Gizmo (Example 6-53). The use of proximal DEM is based on the spatial
proximity of the referent to the speaker. As was the case with the adnominal
DEM used by JP informants, adnominal DEM den här in the SW data often
accompanied a head noun, which gives a sense of intimacy, such as vovven
‘doggy-def, common’ and sōmosen ‘sweetie-def, common.’ As mentioned,
the use of proximal DEM is based on the spatial proximity of the dog, and
with the choice of a certain head noun, a sense of intimacy also seems to be
triggered. At this point, it may be worth mentioning that den här hunden
‘this dog’ is often accompanied by an attribute with a positive se-
nce, such as fina ‘fine-def.’ This might have the effect of increasing the feel-
ing of intimacy towards the dog. In Example 6-54, both adverbial of loca-
tion, [+PROX] här ‘here’ and adnominally used [+PROX] den här with a head noun, den här
fina hunden ‘this fine dog’ were used. Further, a number of examples with
proximal DEM contained an exclamation mark ‘!’, indicating that the read-
ing of the proximal DEM was to emphasize, besides proximity and intimacy
to the dog, the speaker’s intention to attract the attention of the addressee.

Example 6-51 SW01 and others
Det här är Gizmo!
det här COP Gizmo

‘This is Gizmo!’
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Summary

In Situation A3, the usage rate of DEM was quite high (over 80%) in all the languages. The high usage rate of DEM in this situation seems to indicate that the use of DEM was preferred here; this might be because the use of DEM can call the addressee’s (in this case the audience’s) attention to the referent, the dog (i.e. to establish joint attention, see page 19). Calling on the addressee’s attention to the referent may have a special significance here because the speaker wants to introduce something new (the dog, the referent) to the addressee(s).

Regarding the type of DEM used for the referent, it was almost exclusively [+PROX] DEM that was used for this situation in all three languages, except for one case in Finnish in which the [+±PROX] serie series was used. The use of [+PROX] DEM seems to be based on the actual proximity of the referent to the speaker. Adnominally used [+PROX] DEM was found in all three languages. Together with a head noun with a diminutive sense, or together with an attribute with a positive sense, they seemed to indicate closeness to or intimacy with the referent, in addition to spatial proximity.

Regarding the case of the Finnish [+±PROX] serie serie used for this situation, as seen in Situation A2, the use seemed to imply an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere. In Situation A3, the use of siinä marked the change of addressee from the intended audience to the intended referent,
dog, to speak to directly. Hence, the choice of *se* marks the interactional status of the participants.

**Situation A4**

**General**

In this situation, the speaker (gender unknown) was to comment if the piece of music (a song she was listening to), was good/great. Unlike Situations A1–A3 in which the referent could be perceived visually, the referent in Situation A4 was music; it was audible, but not visible. In addition, while the existence of the addressee was quite obvious in Situations A1–A3, the existence of an addressee was not so clear in Situation A4, because the speaker herself was the addressee in this situation. Within the whole Category A, the FI and SW informants scored the lowest usage rate of DEM for this situation and JP informants scored the second lowest usage rate of DEM for this situation. It turned out that the informants, regardless of their language, used adjectives, with or without interjections, such as お、いいねえ *O, ō ne ne* ‘Ah, nice’ (JP), *Hieno* ‘fine’ (FI), *Najs*! ‘nice!’ (SW), and/or NPs with adjectives 良い曲 *yoi kyoku* ‘nice/good music’ (JP), *Hieno piisi* ‘fine piece (of music)’ and *Bra låt* ‘good song/tune’ (SW).

**Japanese**

Only the [+PROX] *ko*-series was used for this situation, in the form of pronominal *kore*, or adnominal *kono* (Example 6-55 and Example 6-57). All but one of the *ko*-series used referred to the intended referent, that is, the piece of music (song). There was one case in which adnominal *kono* was used together with a head noun *ātisuto no CD* ‘artist’s CD’ (Example 6-57). In this example, *kono N* was used to refer to the artist who produced or played the music. The artist to whom the speaker was referring was not present in the speech context at the time of the utterance, and the referent was referred to via the music that the speaker was listening to. This *kono NP* was in associative deictic use.

The use of the [+PROX] *ko*-series in this situation is judged to be based on the spatial proximity of the referent in terms of how close the sound source was (in this case, the headphones that the speaker was wearing) but also in terms of immediacy and temporal proximity added to the spatial proximity, provided that the music was being played at the time of the utterance.
Example 6-55 JP42 and others
この曲、いいな。
kono kyoku 1-na.
kono music good-PTCL

‘This music is good.’

Example 6-56 JP27 and others
これいいな。
kore 1-na.
kore good-PTCL

‘This is good.’

Example 6-57 JP99
このアーティストのCDを集めよう！！
kono atisuto no CD o atsumeyō!
kono artist GEN CD ACC collect:VOL

‘I’ll collect this artist’s CD!!’

Finnish
The use of the [+PROX] tää-series was predominant in this situation. One case with the [-PROX] tuo-series was found, but no [+PROX] se-series was used.

Regarding the [+PROX] tää-series in use, the nominative case tämä (including colloquial tää), elative case tästä and inessive case tässä were found (Example 6-58 for the use of tämä and Example 6-59 for the use of tästä). The tää-series were mostly used pronominally, but adnominally used tää-series were also found. They were all used to refer to the music (song) that the speaker heard/was listening to; thus the use was judged to be based on the spatial proximity of the referent (the closeness of the sound source and the immediacy). One case of the [-PROX] tuo-series was in the accusative case, tuo, and it was used pronominally (Example 6-60).

Example 6-58 FI01 and others
Tämä/tää on hyvä.
tämä COP3 good

‘This is good.’
Example 6-59 FI06 and others

Example 6-60 FI90

Regarding the use of the \([-\text{PROX}]\) tuo-series, the grammar explains that it indicates that the speaker has excluded the referent from his current sphere. This exclusion can be associated with spatial distance but cannot be explained in terms of the physical, spatial distance of the referent. However, we have seen cases where tuo was used to refer to a physically proximal referent. The reading of tuo here is rather multifarious; my analysis is that it was an exclusion of the referent in terms of accessibility, for example, regarding time. That is, presupposing that the utterance was made when the song/music in question has just stopped playing, the song/music is no longer available and is distal in terms of time. Another possible reading is that it is ‘reminiscent’ of the song/music in question, once (well-) known to the speaker but not in the speaker’s immediate sphere, but she was thinking about it. In this reading, the tuo-series in the recognitional use.

**Swedish**

It was only proximal DEMs that were used in this situation, mostly adnominal *den här* (common) together with a head noun, typically *musiken* ‘music-def’ (Example 6-61). The use of pronominal *det här* ‘this, neuter’ and adnominal *denna* (common) was also found. There was one case of adnominal *denna* (common) and *denna* was used together with a head noun *låt* ‘song.’

As was the case with Japanese and Finnish, the use of proximal DEMs was judged to be based on the spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker. This use, as discussed in the Japanese and the Finnish data, was based on both the spatial factor and the temporal factor. An interesting observation, however, is that some Swedish proximal DEMs found in this situation were used with the verbs in the preterit tense. Compare Example 6-61 and Example 6-62.
In everyday conversation, Swedish-speaking people’s use of the preterit has been observed in situations when they are experiencing or have just experienced something. For instance, it has been observed that Swedes say *Det var gott* ‘lit. it was good’ to comment on the food at the dinner table while they are still tasting it.

**Summary**

The usage rate of DEMs turned out to be quite low in all the languages; this was due to the use of adjectives (such as ‘good!’) to comment on the referent. The quite low-usage rate in Situation A4 can be compared with Situation A2 in which the informants generally scored a high DEM usage rate. The difference between Situations A2 and A4 was that, while Situation A2 concerned asking a question about the referent and the existence of an addressee was obvious, Situation A4 concerned giving a comment and the existence of an addressee was not so obvious since the speaker herself was the addressee. Consequently, while the speaker in Situation A2 needed to direct the addressee’s attention to the intended referent, it was not necessary for the speaker in Situation A4 to do so.

Regarding the type of DEM used for this situation, we find that the use of [+PROX] DEM was predominant in all three languages. The one exception, the use of the [–PROX] *tuo*-series found in the Finnish data, seemed to be explained in terms of temporal distance and unaccessibility to the referent, indicating that the speaker perceived the music to have just stopped playing at the time of utterance.

**Category B**

The intended referent is located slightly away from the speaker, and/or, within the addressee’s current sphere, so the use of DEM with basic semantic ‘non-proximal to the speaker’ and ‘proximal to the addressee,’ the so-series (±PROX, medial) was expected in Japanese. Since the Finnish *se-*
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series is also described as indicating the referent located in the addressee’s sphere, the use of the *se*-series was expected in Finnish. As for Swedish, even though it is not explicitly suggested in the literature (SAG 1999) but is found in everyday conversation, the use of *den där* was expected.

**Situation B1**

**General**

In the given situation, the speaker (a male) was receiving massage and was to tell the masseuse (the addressee) that the spot where he was receiving massage hurt. In Japanese, the use of the [*±PROX* *so*-series was expected since the speaker was to refer to the referent (the speaker’s body part) that was under the control of the addressee, that is, within the addressee’s sphere.

The DEM usage rate turned out to be quite low in Situation B1 for all the languages (53% in JP, 45% in FI and 50% in SW). The informants who did not use DEM here used exclamations such as 痛っ！*Itatt!* (JP), *Auts!* (FI) and *Aj!* (SW), which all mean ‘Ouch.’ The use of a declarative statement without referring to the intended referent (the speaker’s body part) was especially frequent among the Japanese informants and the Finnish informants, as in ちょっと痛いです *chotto itai-desu* ‘(It) hurts a bit’ (JP) and *Tekee kipeää* ‘It hurts’ (FI). Among the Swedish informants, the use of the request form (imperative) without referring to the referent such as *Ta det lite varligt* ‘Take it easy/be careful’ was also frequent.

**Japanese**

As expected, only the [*±PROX* *so*-series was used when DEMs were used in this situation. All but one uses of the *so*-series were *soko* ‘there’ to refer to the spot in question, the part of the speaker’s body (Example 6-63). There was one case in which an adverbial DEM of manner, *sō*, was used to refer to the action performed by the addressee (Example 6-64). The use of the *so*-series to refer to the speaker’s own body part can be explained in terms of the location of the referent in relation to the addressee, that is, person-oriented semantics of DEM. The use of the *so*-series indicates that the speaker regarded the referent to be within the addressee’s sphere. The use of *sō* indicates that the action modified by this adverb belongs to the masseuse.

Example 6-63 JP80

ちょっと もこ 痛いです。

chotto soko itai-desu.

a.bit soko painful-POL

‘It hurts there a bit.’
Example 6-64 JP71
そう すると 少し 痛いです。
sō susru to sukoshi itai-desu.
‘When/If you do like that, it hurts a little.’

Finnish
Both the [±PROX] se- and the [–PROX] tuo-series were used for this situation. The majority of the se-series used were demonstrative pronouns in the inessive case siinä and/or in the elative case siitätä (Example 6-65–Example 6-68). Some uses of the adverb of manner and degree niin were also found. According to Laury (1997, 56), DEM pronouns in internal locative cases characterize their denotata as points or units, rather than regions, and the use of the inessive and/or elative case here indicated that it was a specific spot that the speaker was referring to.

When the se-series was pronominal or adnominal demonstrative pronouns, they referred to the spot on the speaker’s body part. The use of an adverb of manner and degree referred to the way the masseuse was massaging. As was the case with Japanese, the use of the [±PROX] se-series for this situation can be explained in terms of the person-oriented semantics of DEM, whose spatial relation of the referent is defined in relation to the addressee, that is, proximal to the addressee.

Example 6-65 FI05
Siinä on vähän aristaava kohta...
se-INESS COP3 little sensitive spot
‘There/it is a bit sensitive spot...’

Example 6-66 FI68
Auts. Siinä kohta-a tuntuu kipua.
INTJ se-INESS spot-PRTV feel3 pain-PRTV
‘Ouch, there (lit. in the spot/in that spot), it feels painful.’

Example 6-67 FI01
Sii-tä kohta-a tekee kyllä kipeä-ä.
se-ELAT spot-PRTV make3 ADV.EMPHEMP soire-PRTV
‘In that area, it does hurt.’
When the [-PROX] tuo-series was used, they were mostly in the nominative case tuo, used pronominally and/or adnominally. Occasionally, tuossa (inessive case), tuohon (illative case), tosta (elative case) and the adverb of manner noin were also used. Tuossa (inessive case) was used pronominally. Tuohon (illative case) and tosta (elative case) were used adnominally.

When the tuo-series was used adnominally, it referred to the addressee’s action, massaging (Example 6-69). When the tuo-series was used adnominally, the referent was what the head noun referred to, which was typically kohta ‘the spot/area,’ that is, the spot where the speaker was receiving massage (Example 6-70). Example 6-71 and Example 6-72 show the tuo-series with different case endings (inessive and illative respectively). They were used pronominally to refer to the specific spot where the speaker was receiving massage.
While the use of the se-series in this situation was expected, the use of the tuo-series was not. The number of tuo-series used for this situation indicates that it was not exceptional to use them in this situation. When interpreted as a spatial demonstrative, the use of the tuo-series indicates remoteness of the referent to the speaker and that the referent is excluded from the speaker’s sphere. Obviously, then, the tuo-series cannot be used spatially: the spot where the speaker was receiving massage, alternatively, the way that the speaker was receiving massage was very present and topical in the given speech situation, not only close to but in contact with the speaker.

Use of the [-PROX] tuo-series to refer to a referent in situations where the [+PROX] se-series is otherwise used, is, however, reported in Saari (2000, 111). According to Laury (1997, 73-74), use of the tuo-series signals the exclusion of an object (referent) from the speaker’s own sphere, but physical distance between the speaker and the referent is not a condition for its use. According to her observations of the tuo-series, this exclusion also implies that the object (referent) is available to someone else, especially to the addressee, while the use of the se-series indicates that the referent is in the addressee’s current sphere (ibid., 77). Accordingly, my analysis here is that the use of the tuo-series in this situation implies the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere because he did not have control of it. This exclusion of the referent seems to be deliberate. At the same time as this use implies a ‘pointing out’ of the referent, no matter where the referent is located in relation to the speaker and the addressee. I thus agree with Laury’s analysis that physical/actual distance from the speaker to the referent is not a condition for the use of the tuo-series. Thus the reading of the tuo in Situation B1 is that the speaker was only telling the addressee the type of action that hurt him (caused a pain), or the location of the pain, which he had no control over, without relating to the addressee.

Swedish

Mostly distal DEMs were used in this situation, mainly the adverbial for location där and a pronominal det där (neuter). The number of uses was limited, but the use of proximal DEM was also observed. Proximal DEM was the adverbial for location här and/or adnominal det här (neuter) together with a head noun stället ‘spot-def, neuter.’
As for distal DEM, the locational adverbial *där* was used to refer to the speaker’s body part where the addressee (masseuse) was massaging (Example 6-73), and pronominal *det där* (neuter) was used to refer to the action of the masseuse (Example 6-74). There was also one case with adnominal *det där* (neuter) with a head NP, *stället* ‘spot-def, neuter,’ which was used to refer to the speaker’s body part. Interpreted as the spatial demonstrative, the use of [–PROX] *där* and *den där* (and their variants) indicates remoteness of the referent to the speaker. In the given situation, the referent is the speaker’s body part and proximal, and the use of [–PROX] DEM cannot therefore be motivated. However, with an interpretation based on an exclusion of the referent from the speaker, the use of [–PROX] DEM may indicate that the referent is within the addressee’s sphere; in other words, by excluding the referent from his own sphere, the speaker is giving the addressee (masseuse) control over both his body and the act of massaging. Even though the literature on the Swedish grammar consulted (SAG 1999) does not mention the use of distal *där* and/or *den där* and their variants indicating the addressee’s sphere, it is quite obvious that they do refer to the addressee’s sphere here.

Example 6-73 SW01 and others

`Det gör lite ont där.`

‘It hurts a little bit there.’

Example 6-74 SW19 and others

`Det där gör ont!`

‘That hurts!’

As mentioned, proximal DEM was also used in this situation. This can be explained in terms of actual distance (proximity) to the referent (Example 6-75).

Example 6-75 SW74

`Kan du trycka lite löser just här?`

‘Can you press a little more loosely right here?’
As shown in the example, [+PROX] här was used by the speaker to show how he wished his body part to be treated. The use of här implies that the speaker had command (or wanted to show that he had command) of his own body. Thus the use of proximal DEM seemed to be based on the speaker’s intention to show that the referent was within his sphere.

Summary
The results showed that the DEM usage rate was not very high in all three languages. The use of exclamations was quite frequent instead. The results also showed that when DEMs were used, only the [+PROX] so-series were used by the JP informants, and that all but one used the so-series referring to the speaker’s body part. The use of the so-series was analyzed to be based on the speaker regarding the referent as being in the addressee’s sphere, and this use can be explained in terms of the actual location of the referent in relation to the addressee, that is, the person-oriented semantics of DEM. Among the FI informants, it was the [+PROX] se-series that were mostly used, but the [-PROX] tuo-series were also frequently used. The use of the se-series and tuo-series in my data referred basically to the spot on the speaker’s body, but some of them were used to refer to the action of the addressee. As was the case with the use of the Japanese so-series, the use of the se-series in Finnish was based on a basic spatial interpretation of the DEM whereby the speaker placed the referent in the addressee’s sphere.

The use of the tuo-series can hardly be motivated in terms of physical distance of the referent to the speaker, but it can be explained in terms of the exclusion of the referent (the speaker’s body part) from the speaker’s sphere, outside the speaker’s control. As seen, in Finnish it was not necessary to refer to the referent by having a point of reference anchored to the addressee for this situation; this may be due to a socio-interactional factor that is related to the use.

Among the SW informants, the use of [-PROX] där and den där and their variants, was predominant (94%), but the use of [+PROX] här and den här and their variants was also observed (6%). The use of [-PROX] där and den där indicated that the speaker regarded the referent as being in the addressee’s sphere, based on the person-oriented semantics of DEM. The use of [+PROX] här and den här seemed to be explained by the actual distance to the referent from the speaker, but it was also analyzed to be based on the speaker’s intention to place the referent within his own sphere.

Situation B2

General
In this situation, the speaker (gender unknown) was to ask the addressee (gender unknown) the name of the dog that accompanied her. In order to ask
the name, it was expected that the informants would refer to the dog and since the dog is located proximal to the addressee, the use of the [±PROX] so-series was expected in Japanese.

The DEM usage rate turned out to be the lowest in all the languages for this situation. The results showed that the use of interrogative 名前は何ですか Namae wa nan-desuka? ‘What is the name?’ without mentioning the referent was frequent among the Japanese informants. However, there were also cases where this question was preceded by a comment such as かわいい犬です Kawaii inu desu ‘What a cute dog (isn’t it?)’ in which the referent is mentioned to start a conversation. In Finnish, the use of a possessive construction such as koirasi and sun koiran (both mean ‘your dog’) together with the adjective niminen ‘named’ or copula on ‘is’ was frequent. The use of a NP with or without a determiner and complement, for instance koira ‘dog’ and the personal pronoun hän ‘he/she’ (normally used only for human beings) to refer to the dog, was also observed.

In Swedish, the use of the possessive construction din hund ‘your dog’ with the verb heter ‘be called/named’ was frequent. The use of a NP with the definite article, hunden ‘the dog,’ to refer to the dog was also frequent.

The overall low DEM usage rate by the JP informants (45%), the FI informants (15%) and the SW informants (4%) indicates that Situation B2 is not a typical situation where demonstratives are used.

**Japanese**

As expected, the speakers of Japanese used the [±PROX] so-series to refer to the dog for this situation. However, the [+PROX] ko-series was used even more frequently. The distal a-series [−PROX] was not used.

When the so-series was used, the expression was often an adnominal sono together with a head noun, typically inu ‘dog’ and wan-chan ‘doggy.’ The pronominal sore was also found. They were all used to refer to the dog. The use of the so-series is motivated by the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee, which indicates that the speaker regarded the dog to be in the addressee’s sphere.

The use of adnominal sono is exemplified in Example 6-76 and Example 6-77. As the English translation suggests, the noun inu ‘dog’ conveys a neutral sense, while the noun wan-chan ‘doggy’ conveys a diminutive sense, ‘little,’ and thereby affection. Thus the use of sono with wan-chan ‘doggy’ conveys a sense of psychological proximity (intimacy) to the dog compared with the use of sono inu.

As for the use of pronominal sore, considering that pronominal sore normally refers to inanimate things, its use in this situation to refer to the dog may be regarded as impolite to the addressee. However, it is possible to use
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sore to refer to animate referents provided that the discourse is taking place in an exceedingly informal context. There were two cases in which pronominal sore was used (see Example 6-78, for one case) and the reading was that the expression might be used between very close friends. In the example given, sore could be used when the speaker found that her close friend (the addressee) was accompanying a dog which she had not seen before.

Example 6-76 JP31
sono inu namae wa nan to iu-no?

‘What is the dog’s name?’

Example 6-77 JP18
sono wan-chan nan te namae desu-ka?

‘What is the doggy’s name?’

Example 6-78 JP37
sore nan te iu namae?

‘What is that one called?’

Regarding the use of the [+PROX] ko-series, they were used adnominally, often with a head NP ko ‘little one,’ or wan-chan ‘doggy,’ to refer to the dog. See Example 6-79 and Example 6-80. The use of the proximal ko-series indicates that the speaker regarded the referent as being in his current sphere and located close to him. As the referent was located close to the addressee, the use of the ko-series for this situation cannot be explained in terms of the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker. Considering that the majority of the adnominal kono cases used (23 of 27) had the head NP, which conveys a diminutive sense (ko ‘little’ or wan-chan ‘doggy’), while less than half of the adnominal sono cases (6 of 18) had such a head NP, we may consider that the ko-series was associated with intimacy and closeness.

Considering that the distance between the speaker and the referent was relatively determined in the given situation, the use of the ko-series in this situation was not restricted by the actual (physical) spatial distance/proximity between the speaker and the referent. The use of the ko-
series here seemed to be based on psychological distance/proximity to the referent, as perceived by the speaker.

Example 6-79 JP82 and others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>ko no</td>
<td>nan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>little one GEN</td>
<td>name TOP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘What is this little one’s name?’

Example 6-80 JP30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>What</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>wan-chan</td>
<td>nan te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>bowwow-DIM</td>
<td>what QUOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘What is the name of this doggy?’

FINNISH

All three Finnish demonstrative series were used in this situation. The Finnish speakers chose most frequently [±PROX] se, as in Mikä sen nimi on? ‘What is its name?’ However, some cases of sen (se in the genitive case) attested in this situation were difficult to classify, as they might as well have been instances of a personal pronoun (animate or inanimate) and not a demonstrative. Further, se in my data was also used anaphorically. There were four cases of se which were considered to be spatial DEM in my data, all in the inessive case, siinä. All of the attested siinä referred to the place where the dog was located (Example 6-81). As seen, the dog was first referred to by an indefinite NP (marked 1 in the example), which was later referred to by another se (marked 2 in the example) used anaphorically. The use of the se-series is motivated by the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee, as the referent was located close to the addressee, indicating that the speaker regarded the dog to be located in the addressee’s sphere. However, the number of se-series that were judged to be obvious cases of DEMs was very small.

The proximal [+PROX] tä-series and [−PROX] tuo-series were also used in this situation (Example 6-82 and Example 6-84). The number of cases was also quite low: six cases of tä-series and five cases of tuo-series; they were used both adnominally and pronominally to refer to the dog. As was the case with adnominally used DEMs in Japanese, some adnominally used tämä had a head noun with a diminutive meaning, such as soppolainen ‘cutie’ and pikkuruttuturpa ‘little wrinkle-muzzled.’

The use of the tä-series indicates that the speaker regarded the referent to be within his current sphere. As was the case in Japanese, considering that
the distance between the speaker and the referent was relatively determined in the given situation, this use can be explained in terms of psychological proximity rather than the actual distance. The psychological proximity of the dog was further enhanced by the use of a lexical head noun that conveyed a sense of intimacy or affection.

An interpretation of the use of the *tuo*-series, based on physical distance, excludes the dog from the speaker’s current sphere and places the referent away from the speaker, possibly even from the addressee. Interestingly enough, some adnominally used *tuo*-series in my data accompanied a head noun that implied intimacy, that is, closeness to the dog. Example 6-85 and Example 6-86 show, for example, that even if the use of the *tuo*-series may indicate the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, it is not necessarily linked to distance-taking, that is, a negative attitude, from the referent. Thus the positive meaning of the head noun seems to override the basic meaning of the demonstrative in these adnominal constructions.

Example 6-81 FI96

| On=pas | sii-nä | kiva-n | nääköinen | koira | ? |
| COP3=EMPH | se-INESS | nice-GEN | looking | dog |

Mikä | se-n² | nimi | on? |
what | se-GEN | name | COP3 |

‘That’s (There’s) a nice-looking dog (There, isn’t it a nice-looking dog!). What’s its name?’

Example 6-82 FI24

Mikä | tämä-n | koria-n | nimi | on? |
what | tä-GEN | dog-GEN | name | COP3 |

‘What is the name of this dog?’

Example 6-83 FI11

Minä | nimensä | toi | on? |
what | named | tuo | COP3 |

‘What is the name of that one?’

Example 6-84 FI88

Mikä | to-n | nimi | on? |
what | tuo-GEN | name | COP3 |

‘What is the name of that one?’
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Example 6-85 F78
Voi, mikä to-n sörpäläi-sen nimi on?
INTJ what tuo-GEN cutie-GEN name COP3

‘Oh, what is the name of that cutie?’

Example 6-86 FI51
Mikä tuo-n kaunistustukse-n nimi on?
what tuo-GEN decoration-GEN name COP3

‘What is that decoration’s name?’

Swedish

Only a small number of DEMs were used for this situation; there were two proximal and two distal DEMs found in the Swedish data. The proximal DEM was the adverbial DEM for location här, used in these two cases to refer to the dog’s location. The distal DEM was den där, which was used adnominally in the two cases. As shown in Japanese and Swedish, the use of proximal DEM [+PROX] and distal DEM [−PROX] cannot be explained in terms of spatial relations of the referent to the speaker. An interpretation of proximal DEM and distal DEM according to the physical distance is proximity and remoteness of the referent to the speaker (eventually to both the speaker and the addressee in the case of distal DEM).

Regarding the use of proximal DEM [+PROX], the use based on proximity in terms of the inclusion of the referent to the speaker’s sphere seems to be possible as the sense of inclusion is quite distinct in Example 6-87. In this example, the inclusion covers not only the dog but also the addressee because the dog itself was referred to as din kompis ‘your mate.’ The adverbial of location här can be read as ‘here, the place you and I (= we) are located at.’ As was the case with Japanese and Finnish proximal DEM, the use of proximal här seemed to be based on relative proximity or psychological proximity to the referent from the speaker, as perceived by the speaker.

Example 6-87 SW59
Och vad heter din kompis här då?
and what call you:POSS mate här then

‘And, what is your mate here called?’

The two cases with distal DEM den där were used adnominally, together with the head nouns snyggingen ‘good-looker/handsome one’ and gynnarn104

104 Gynnarn is the colloquial form of gynnaren.
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‘sly dog, clown, scamp, joker’ respectively (Example 6-88 and Example 6-89). The use of [−PROX] den där is said to indicate the distance. SAG 2 (1999, 320) explains that it also indicates the speaker’s distance-taking attitude. However, the use of adnominal den där in this situation seemed to indicate only the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, without adding any particular negative connotations. One of the head nouns in fact has a clearly positive connotation (den där snyggingen ‘good-looker’), and the reading of the noun gynnarn on the other hand was rather mixed; it can be read with both a positive and a negative (pejorative) meaning. These NPs could have been used ironically, but my analysis is that the use of both den där snyggingen and den där gynnarn give an impression that the speaker’s turn was meant to be jocular, without any negative connotations. As shown by adnominally used Finnish tuo, the positive meaning of the head noun of the NP here seems to override the basic meaning of the demonstrative in these adnominal constructions.

Example 6-88 SW63
Vad heter den där snygging-en då?
what call den där good-looker/handsome.one-DEF then

‘What is that good-looker called, then?’

Example 6-89 SW07
Vad heter den där gynnarn?
what call den där rascal-DEF

‘What is the name of that rascal?’

Summary
The results showed that even though the expected [±PROX] so-series was used, the use of the [+PROX] ko-series was more frequent in Japanese. In Finnish, all three DEMs, [+PROX] tä-, [±PROX] se- and [−PROX] tuo-series, were used. The use of se was frequent, but most of them were judged to be non-DEM, mainly personal pronouns. In Swedish, both [+PROX] här, den här and [−PROX] där, den där were used, even though the number of cases was small. Thus the results showed that [+PROX] DEM could be used in all three languages to refer to a referent located in the addressee’s sphere, and the use was analyzed to be based on psychological proximity towards the referent.

That the use of the [−PROX] DEM Finnish tuo-series was found but not the Japanese [−PROX] a-series for this situation may suggest that the use of Finnish [−PROX] DEM is not necessarily based on the physical distance “dis-
tal” between the referent and the speaker, while the use of the Japanese [–PROX] a-series is conditioned by the spatial distance. Further, the adnominally used Finnish distal DEM showed that the positive meaning of the head noun of the NP seems to override the basic meaning of the demonstrative, that is, distance, including distance-taking attitude.

As regards Swedish, according to SAG (1999 2: 320), [–PROX] den där can be used to show the speaker’s physical and/or psychological distance towards a referent, even to express the speaker’s disdain/contempt for the referent, especially if it is a person. Swedish does not have [±PROX] DEM to indicate proximity to the addressee, but the use of [–PROX] den där seems to serve to cover the semantics by excluding the referent from the speaker’s sphere. As was the case with adnominally used Finnish distal DEM, adnominally used Swedish distal DEM showed that the positive connotation conveyed by the head noun seems to override the basic semantics of distal DEM, distance (Example 6-88 and Example 6-89).

**Situation B3**

**General**

In Situation B3 the speaker (female) and the addressee (female) were bathing/swimming. The addressee’s location was a bit away from the speaker. The speaker was then to ask the addressee whether the place where she was bathing/swimming was deep. To refer to the spot where the addressee was located, use of the [±PROX] so-series in Japanese was expected.

The DEM usage rate was highest for this situation within Category B. When we compare the DEM usage rate among the languages, we find that it is lowest in Swedish (72 cases, 72%). Of 28 cases in the SW data in which DEMs were not used, the number of expressions which did not refer to any specific location (i.e., the addressee’s location) was in fact only six; in these six cases, the depth was asked by using the question År det djupt? ‘Is it deep?’, or Bottnar du? ‘Do you reach the bottom?’, without referring to any particular spot. As for the other 22 expressions, the location was referred to by other means; 19 of them included the adverb där ‘there’ which was used as a relative adverb as in År det djupt där du är? ‘Is it deep where you are?’. The other three expressions included the adverb borta ‘out there’ together with the prepositional phrase vid dig ‘by your side.’

As for Japanese and Finnish, when DEMs were not used, the depth of the water was often asked for by an adjective such as fukai (JP) and syvä (FI) ‘deep,’ without referring to any specific location. The depth of the water was also established by asking if the addressee could reach the bottom.
Japanese

The DEM usage rate was very high among the JP informants and they basically used only the [±PROX] so-series, as expected. There was also one case in which the [+PROX] ko-series was used. The so-series were used both pronominally (soko ‘there’, socchi ‘that direction’) and adnominally (sono, together with a head noun, typically hen and atari, which both mean ‘around/spot’) and they referred to the location of the addressee (Example 6-90 for the use of soko). The use of the so-series can be explained in terms of the spatial relation of the referent (the place in question) to the addressee.

Example 6-90 JP27 and others

sono shita?
sono chita

‘Is it deep here?’

The one example of the [+PROX] ko-series used for this situation is an adnominal kono together with a head noun hen/ atari ‘around/spot’ (Example 6-91). The use of the ko-series for this situation according to the physical distance indicated proximity of the referent to the speaker. This use can be better explained in terms of the speaker’s inclusion of the area/spot where the addressee was located in her sphere. As Diessel (2012b, 2410) states, the deictic center and the speech situation are conceptual units and the distance does not deal with the absolute sense of distance; an area where the speaker is included (i.e., deictic center) can vary in size from the speaker herself to the room where she is located (see page 19). The number of cases used tells us, however, that it might not be standard use for this situation.

Example 6-91 JP59

kono shita?
kono chita?

Finnish

Only the [±PROX] se-series, siellä (demonstrative adverb for location) and siinä (pronoun se in inessive case), was used (Example 6-92 and Example 6-93); the [+PROX] täs- series and [−PROX] tuo-series were not used. This

105 The character 辺 can be read as both hen and atari but the meaning is the same, ‘around/spot’.
result was in accordance with Laury’s statements about her data (Laury 1997, 77), in which the most clearly deictic uses of se were in the local cases of se (se in locative cases). In my data, siinä was often used pronominally, but adnominally used siinä was also used. All these uses referred to the location of the addressee.

Example 6-92 FI03 and others
On=ko siinä syvä-ä?
COP3=Q se-INESS deep-PRTV

‘Is it deep right there?’

Example 6-93 FI15 and others
Hei, on=ko siellä syvä-ä?
INTJ COP3=Q se-SUPESS deep-PRTV (ADV)

‘Hey, is it deep there?’

The result that only the se-series was used for this situation can be compared with the result from Situation B1 (massage) in which the referent was also a location, but the types of DEM used turned out to be quite different. In Situation B1, the intended referent was the speaker’s body part (i.e., location), but under the addressee’s control at the time of utterance. We found that in Situation B1, both the se- and the tuo-series were used, while in Situation B3, the tuo-series was not used. In Situation B1, the se-series in inner locative cases, namely siinä (inessive case, pronominal or adnominal) and siitä (elative case, pronominal or adnominal) were used to refer to the place in question, but in Situation B3, only siinä (inessive case) was used. Further, as mentioned, in Situation B3, the use of a DEM adverb in the se-series, such as siellä, was frequent, but a DEM adverb of location was not used at all in Situation B1.

According to Laury’s observation (Laury 1997, 56), the use of a DEM adverb indicates that the referent is region rather than specific spot. This seems to explain why a DEM adverb could be used in Situation B3 but not in Situation B1. In Situation B3, the addressee’s location was either regarded as an abstract, unspecified area or region (in the case where the se-series was an adverb) or a definable area (in the case where the se-series was in the locative case). In Situation B1, only the latter was used, hence the location on the addressee’s body was conceived of as a specific spot.

Further, considering that only the se-series was used in Situation B3, but not the tuo-series, the location in Situation B3 was treated by these informants from the addressee as the point of reference (indexical ground). On the
other hand, the location in Situation B1 could be viewed from different points of reference.

Swedish

Only the distal adverbial DEM där [–PROX] was used in this situation and it was often accompanied by other adverbs for location such as borta ‘away’ (Example 6-94). The DEM usage rate was 72% in this situation, which was rather low compared to the DEM usage rate scored by the JP informants and the FI informants. As mentioned, there were actually 19 more cases in which där was used, but they were used as a relative pronoun, not a DEM (Example 6-95).

The basic semantics of [–PROX] där is explained as distal feature (remoteness) of the referent to the speaker and an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere. Although in the literature such as SAG (1999), där is not explicitly explained to indicate the addressee’s sphere, as seen in Situation B2, the semantics of the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere is extended to cover the semantics of the addressee’s sphere. The use of där was therefore interpreted as referring to the spot where the addressee was located. That the speaker regarded the location to which she was referring as outside the speaker’s sphere is sometimes strengthened by the adverbs borta ‘away’ and ut ‘out there.’

Example 6-94 SW94

Är det djupt där borta?
COP it deep där away

‘Is it deep over there?’

Example 6-95 SW71

Är det djupt där du är?
COP it deep där you COP

‘Is it deep there, where you are?’

Summary

The DEM usage rate scored by the informants was highest for this situation in Category B. The type of DEM used to refer to the referent was [±PROX] (Japanese so-series and Finnish se-series) and [–PROX] (Swedish där). The use of the Japanese so-series and the Finnish se-series indicated that the location the speaker referred to was considered to be in the addressee’s sphere (or the location was the addressee’s sphere) and this use can be based on the spatial relation between the referent and the addressee. The use of
Swedish där in this situation indicated that the referent was excluded from the speaker’s sphere and therefore distal from her. It was further analyzed that the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere was extended to indicate that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere.

Regarding the use of the Japanese [+PROX] ko-series, this can be based on the speaker’s inclusion of the referent in his current sphere. As Diessel (2012) states, the location where the speaker includes herself as the deictic center can vary in size.

The high DEM usage rate and the (almost) exclusive use of [+PROX] DEM (so-series in Japanese and se-series in Finnish) and [−PROX] DEM (där in Swedish) for this situation may confirm that this situation is a typical situation where the so-series is used and that the conditions for the use of the se-series (Finnish) and där (Swedish) may be similar.

Situation B4

General
In Situation B4, the speaker (male) was to point out a (cup)cake, which he was considering buying. The cake was on the tray, which a shopkeeper (the addressee, male) was holding. In Japanese, the use of the medial so-series was expected to refer to the cake, since the cake was considered to belong to the addressee and was thus clearly located within the addressee’s sphere. This kind of shopping situation is often given as a typical example of the use of demonstratives in Japanese textbooks. The DEM usage rate in Situation B4 varied among the languages. In Japanese, it was, as expected, high (91%), in Swedish quite low (47%) and in Finnish, somewhere in-between (64%).

When DEMs were not used, the use of numerals without specifying a particular cake was frequent in JP data. An example is the use of hitotsu ‘one’ as in hitotsu kudasai ‘give me one (please).’ In Finnish, the use of a NP with numerals was also frequent, and as in Japanese, the cake was not specified, as in Saisinko yhden muffinsin ‘May I have one muffin?’ The use of the numeral yksi ‘one’ alone, as in Saanko yhden? ‘May I have one?’ was also observed. In Swedish, the use of a NP with a comparative pronoun en sådan (kaka) ‘one such (cake)’ was frequent instead of a DEM. There were also constructions with determiners (definite articles) together with numerals, such as en av kakorna ‘one of the cakes.’

Japanese
The medial so-series [+PROX], as expected, was mostly used for this situation, but the [−PROX] a-series and [+PROX] ko-series were also found. They were used both pronominally (sore) and adnominally (sono) together with a

---

106 For example in Nihongo Shokyu Genki I (2011).
head such as kēki ‘cake,’ to refer to the cake that the speaker was considering buying. The use of the so-series can be explained in terms of the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee, indicating that the speaker regarded the cake as being located in the addressee’s sphere. The distal a-series was used both pronominally (are) and adnominally (ano) together with a head noun, typically kēki ‘cake,’ to refer to the cake. When interpreted as the spatial DEM, the use of the a-series indicates that the referent was considered to be located away not only from the speaker’s sphere but also from the addressee’s sphere. Since the referent is located in the addressee’s sphere, the a-series cannot be explained in terms of the spatial relation of the referent. A closer analysis showed that the use of the a-series in this situation seemed to be caused by the informants’ misinterpretation of the intended addressee. That is, as Example 6-96 shows, the speaker regarded another person than the shopkeeper as the addressee when he used ano kēki ‘that cake.’ In this example, when the speaker used ano kēki ‘that cake,’ the addressee was his mother. When the speaker’s utterance was addressed to the shopkeeper, the cake (the referent) was referred to by pronominal sore.

Example 6-96 JP29

お母さん あの ケーキ 買っていい(sic)? それ ください。

okāsan  ano  kēki  katte-iii (sic)?  sore  kudasai.

mother  ano  cake  buy:GER-good  sore  give.me:IMP:POL

‘Mom, may I buy that cake? Please give me that (one).’

As for the use of the [+PROX] ko-series, it was used both pronominally (kore) and/or adnominally (kono) together with kēki ‘cake’ to refer to the cake. When interpreted as the spatial DEM, the use of the ko-series indicates proximity of the referent. Since the referent is located close to the addressee, the use of the ko-series cannot be explained in terms of actual, spatial distance of the referent. As was the case with the a-series shown in Example 6-96, some ko-series were used to refer to the cake when the speaker regarded another person than the shopkeeper (for example, his mother) as the addressee. In Example 6-97, the speaker used an interjection/exclamation ねー ねー nēnē, ‘hey/hallo’ to his mother to attract her attention. Proximal kore was used then to address the mother in order to refer to the cake.

Example 6-97 JP23

ねーねー 今日 ちゃんと 勉強するから これ 買って!

nēnē  kyō  chanto  benkyō-suru kara  kore  katte!

INTJ  today  well  study-do therefore  kore  buy:GER

‘Please, I will study very well, so buy this!’
There were, however, also cases in which the *ko*-series was used to refer to the cake and to address the shopkeeper (Example 6-98) and the use of the *ko*-series here seems to be explained better in terms of inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere. The Japanese proximal *ko*-series seems to be used to include the referent in the speaker’s current sphere, regardless of the actual (physical) distance. This inclusion could be related to a psychological proximity towards the referent.

**Finnish**

The distal *tuo*-series [−PROX] and the medial *se*-series [±PROX] were used for this situation but not the proximal *ko*-series [+PROX]. The use of the *tuo*-series was more frequent than the use of the *se*-series.

The *tuo*-series used were often in the elative case, plural pronominal *noista*, and/or the demonstrative adjective *tuollainen/tommonen*. When *noista* was used, it did not refer directly to the intended referent, a certain cake, but a number of cakes that the intended referent was amongst (Example 6-99). Example 6-100 and Example 6-101 show a pronominally used *tuo*. Interpreted as the spatial DEM, the use of the *tuo*-series indicates distal feature of the referent, excluded from the speaker’s sphere and even from the addressee’s. The use of the *tuo*-series cannot be motivated as long as it excludes the referent from the addressee’s sphere.

Example 6-99 FI70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>want: COND1</th>
<th>one-ACC</th>
<th><em>tuo</em>:PL-ELAT</th>
<th>thank,you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haluaisin</td>
<td><em>yhde</em>-n</td>
<td><em>noi-sta</em>,</td>
<td><em>kiitos</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘I would like to have one of those, thank you’

Example 6-100 FI29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>get: COND1=Q</th>
<th><em>tuo</em>-ACC</th>
<th><em>muffin</em>-ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saisin=ko</td>
<td><em>tuo</em>-n</td>
<td><em>muffinsi</em>-n?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Can I have that muffin?’
‘How much does that chocolate-frosted one cost?’

The number of clearly spatial deictic DEM se-series ([±PROX]) was eleven out of 66. When the se-series were used in locative cases, as was the case with noista (tuo in the elative case, plural) mentioned earlier, they did not directly refer to a specific referent (cake), but rather the location of a group of cakes that the referent was included in. Interpreted as the spatial DEM, the use of se in locative cases indicates proximity of the referent to the addressee, placing the referent in the addressee’s sphere and the use was thus motivated by the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee.

Example 6-102 F134
Saisin=ko mäh-nyhde-n niistä muffinsei-sta?  
get: COND1=Q I one-ACC se:PL-ELAT muffin:PL-ELAT

‘May I have one of these/those/the muffins?’

While the use of the [±PROX] se-series can be explained in terms of the spatial relation between the referent and the addressee, the use of the [-PROX] tuo-series cannot. The use of the tuo-series for the situations where the use of the se-series is expected was also observed in Situation B1, and as discussed, such cases are also reported in Saari (2001, 111). As discussed in Situation B1, the use of the tuo-series seems to be explained in terms of the speaker’s intention to exclude the referent from his current sphere. As Laury (1997, 74) states, the use of the tuo-series signals the exclusion of an object (referent) from the speaker’s own sphere, at the same time implying that the object is available to someone else, namely the addressee. Note that the point of reference is still the speaker. My data seems to confirm Laury’s statement; that is, by using the tuo-series, the speaker in Situation B4 seems to be saying that the intended cake is not in his sphere but available for the addressee (the shopkeeper), as in Haluaisin yhden noista, kiitos. ‘I would like have one of those.’ By using the se-series in the same situation, on the other hand, the speaker was indicating that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere, controlled by the addressee, as in Saanko yhden niistä muffinsei-sta? ‘Can I have one of those muffins?’ We find here that when the se-series are used, the referent is referred to with the addressee as the point of reference.

That the tuo-series was used more than the se-series in this situation indicates that the addressee’s location was not so important as the point of reference (the point of reference was not necessarily anchored to the addressee),
even though the referent was located close to the addressee. My personal opinion is that use of the tuo-series seems to imply the speaker’s intention to make his own utterance rather impersonal, by avoiding a reference anchored in any person, especially the addressee.

Swedish

Only distal DEMs were used in this situation. The distal adnominal den där (common) together with a head noun was most common (Example 6-104), but pronominal den där (common) and an adverb for location, där were also found. The adnominally used den där was often in the plural as in de där kakorna ‘those cakes’ (Example 6-103), but also in the singular den där kakan ‘that cake’ (Example 6-104). The singular den där kakan ‘that cake’ was used to refer to the cake that the speaker was considering buying, and de där kakorna ‘those cakes’ was used to refer to a number of cake which included the cake that the speaker was considering buying. The pronominal forms were used in a similar fashion (Example 6-105). The adverb for location där ‘there’ was often used with the indefinite pronoun så(da)n as in en sådan där ‘one such there’ to refer to the type of cake that the speaker was considering buying (Example 6-106).

Example 6-103 SW05
Jag skulle vilja ha en av de där kakorna.
‘I would like to have one of those cakes.’

Example 6-104 SW09
Jag tar den där kakan.
‘I’ll take that cake.’

Example 6-105 SW24
Kan jag få köpa en av de där kakorna?
‘Can I buy one of those?’
Example 6-106 SW18
Jag tar en sån där.
I take one such där

‘I’ll take one of those’

Example 6-107 SW38
Kan jag köpa den kaka-n?
can I buy-INF den cake-DEF

‘Can I buy that cake?’

Further, there were some cases in which [–PROX] den N-n (plural de N:PL-n), den together with a head noun was used. The head noun was typically kakan ‘cake-def’ as in den kakan ‘that cake’ or kakorna ‘cake:PL-def’ as in de kakorna ‘those cakes’ (Example 6-107 for the use of den kakan). Den kakan ‘that cake’ was used to refer to the cake the speaker intended to buy and de kakorna ‘those cakes’ were used to refer to the group of cakes that included the intended cake. Interpreted as spatial DEM, the use of distal DEM for this situation indicates remoteness of the referent to the speaker, excluded from her sphere. The use of där, den där (and their variations) and den N-def itself did not signal that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere. However, as stated in Situation B2, the exclusion of the referent indicated by där, den där seems to be extended to indicate that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere and the possibility to interpret this use to indicate the addressee’s sphere was not excluded. Further, the reading of distal DEM den NP-def was that the speaker pointed out the cake(s) regardless of distance. As was the case for FI informants, proximal DEMs were not used here.

Summary
Situation B4 deals with a shopping situation often given in Japanese textbooks when introducing the use of demonstratives, either in explanations or in exercises.

In Situation B4, the expected Japanese [±PROX] so-series but also the [–PROX] a-series were used. A closer examination showed that among the 17 cases in which the a-series were used, 16 were judged to be cases where the informants had treated another person than the intended person as the addressee. The results indicated therefore that the a-series was hardly used here when the shopkeeper (the intended person) was the addressee after all. This result can be compared with the results shown by the FI informants, of whom 86% (55 out of 66 cases) used [–PROX] tuo-series. The use of the tuo-series suggested that in Finnish the cake did not need to be referred to in terms of the relation to the addressee. This use was analyzed to be a deliberate exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, in order to indicate
that “the referent is now available to the addressee.” In Swedish, only [–PROX] där, den där and den N-def were used for this situation. The use of där, den där indicated an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, which was further analyzed as meaning that it could be extended to indicate that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere. The [–PROX] den N-def seemed to be used to point out a certain cake (referent) and in this use, the cake was not referred to in terms of its spatial location vis-à-vis the speaker or the addressee.

In Japanese, the [+PROX] ko-series was used for this situation while no [+PROX] DEMs were used in Finnish or Swedish for this situation. Above, we have seen that the conditions for the use of the Japanese [+PROX] so-series differed from those of the Finnish [+PROX] se-series. The results also suggested that the characteristics of the Finnish [–PROX] tuo-series differ from the Japanese [–PROX] a-series, and further that the Japanese [+PROX] ko-series is used in a wider context than both the Finnish and the Swedish [+PROX] DEMs.

Category C

Category C includes situations which presuppose the use of DEMs, but no particular predictions were made beforehand regarding the choice of DEM for this category, since the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location in the given situations. Provided that the semantics of DEMs is based on relative distance between the speaker (deictic center) and the referent, the use of a DEM should reflect the way in which the speaker (i.e., the user of the DEM) perceives the relative distance to the referent in the given situation.

Even though different referents were dealt with in Situations C1–C3, the spatial relations between the speaker, the addressee and the referent remained the same; in other words, the speaker and the addressee were sitting side by side on the sofa and watching ‘something’ (the referent) shown on the TV. The referent was always in front of both the speaker and the addressee. The physical distance of the referent from the speaker and from the addressee were thus the same and was assumed to be about 2–3 meters, a distance that cannot be reached just by stretching out one’s arm, which may not always be conceived as proximal. However, as Diessel (2012b) states, the distance mentioned here is a relative distance of the referent to the deictic center and not the absolute distance; depending on how the deictic center is conceptualized, the distance can be thought of as proximal.

In Situation C4, the speaker and the addressee were standing side by side and looking at a ring (the referent) displayed in a shop window. The physical distance from the speaker and the addressee to the referent was assumed to be at most 0,5 meters, or the distance that can normally be reached by stretching out an arm. The referent was in front of both the speaker and the
addressee, but because the referent was placed in the shop window, the speaker (and addressee) could not touch it. Further, the speaker was to refer to the referent in relation to the addressee, and the use of DEMs would vary depending on how the deictic center is conceptualized.

Situation C1

General

Situation C1 deals with a situation where the speaker (male) and the addressee (female) are watching TV, and the speaker is to comment on how funny a monkey shown on the TV is. The native informants’ usage rates differed mostly in this situation (86% in the JP, 49% in the FI and 20% in the SW data). The JP informants who did not use DEM for this situation used bare nouns such as saru ‘monkey’ to refer to the monkey in question. The FI informants who did not use DEM for this situation used mostly an NP with or without determiners and complements, typically hasu apina ‘funny monkey.’ The SW informants who did not use DEM for this situation often used an NP with an interrogative pronoun, with or without an attribute, used as an interjection, such as vilken rolig apa ‘what a funny monkey,’ an NP in the definite form such as apan ‘monkey-def,’ or a personal pronoun such as den ‘that/it.’

Japanese

The proximal ko-series [+PROX] was mostly used for this situation. The distal a-series [−PROX] was also used, but no medial so-series [±PROX]. When the ko-series were used, most of them were used adnominaly (kono) together with a head noun typically, saru ‘monkey’ (Example 6-108). Demonstratives were also used pronominally as in koitsu ‘this guy/fellow’ (Example 6-109).

Example 6-108 JP18
この サル 面白い！
kono saru omoshiroi!
‘This monkey is funny!’

Example 6-109 JP39
はは、 こいつ おもしろ！
haha koitsu omoshiro!
haha koitsu funny
‘Ha ha, this fellow is funny!’
When the \( a \)-series were used, they were used mostly adnominally (\( \text{ano} \)), together with a head noun, such as \( \text{saru} \) ‘monkey’ (Example 6-110). Pronominal \( \text{are} \) ‘that’ and \( \text{aitsu} \) ‘that guy/fellow’ were also found. Pronominal \( \text{are} \) ‘that’ and \( \text{aitsu} \) ‘that guy/fellow’ were also found. Pronominal \( \text{aitsu} \) and adnominal \( \text{ano saru} \) referred to the monkey, and pronominal \( \text{are} \) referred to either the monkey or its actions.

Example 6-110 JP45

\begin{verbatim}
あの サル すごいよ。
anosaru sugoi-yo.
\end{verbatim}

‘That monkey is awesome.’

Regarding the use of \([+\text{PROX}]\) \( \text{ko} \)-series, when interpreted as spatial demonstratives, the \( \text{ko} \)-series indicates the proximity of the referent to the speaker. The distance of the referent to the speaker shown in the picture was not so close that the referent could be reached by stretching out her arm; the use of the \( \text{ko} \)-series for this situation seemed to be explained by the inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere. This inclusion may depend on the psychological closeness, proximity of the referent in terms of time or presentness extended from the basic semantics of proximity (cf. Section 2.4.1).

The distal \( a \)-series \([-\text{PROX}]\) as spatial demonstratives, on the other hand, indicate remoteness of the referent to the speaker and to the addressee, excluded from their sphere and this use indicates the exclusion of the monkey, alternatively what was going on on the TV, from both the speaker’s and the addressee’s sphere. As the distance of the referent to the speaker (and the addressee) was not very close, this use of the \( a \)-series may be reasonable. Since no particular sense of alienation or aversion was conveyed by the way the \( a \)-series was used, the sense of distance seemed to be connected only to the physical distance. This view may be supported by the informants’ frequent use of expressions that convey a positive sense, used together with the \( a \)-series. For instance, \( \text{ano saru} \) ‘that monkey’ or \( \text{aitsu} \) ‘that guy/fellow’ as subject often had a predicate with a positive sense, such as \text{omoshiroi} ‘funny’ and \text{īne} ‘good.’

That the \( s \)-series \([-\text{PROX}]\) was not used at all suggests that it was not necessary for the speaker to have a point of reference anchored to the addressee in order to refer to the monkey. My analysis is that the speaker was sitting by the side of the addressee in the given situation and that the speaker included the addressee in his own current sphere.

The results showed that both the \([+\text{PROX}]\) \( \text{ko} \)-series and the \([-\text{PROX}]\) \( a \)-series were used to refer to the same referent, monkey (alternatively what was going on on the TV). Provided that the use of the DEM reflects the speaker’s perception of the distance to the referent, the result suggests that
the use of DEM is not necessarily based on a physical (actual) distance, but rather a psychological distance. A frequent use of the proximal ko-series indicates that JP informants in my data had a tendency to include the monkey in their sphere, and this inclusion seemed to be based on psychological proximity to the monkey, or the proximity of the referent in terms of time.

Finnish

The DEM usage rate was rather low (55%) in this situation. Among the DEM used, the [-PROX] tuo-series was used most frequently. The tuo-series was often used adnominally together with the head apina ‘monkey’ to refer to the intended referent (Example 6-111 and Example 6-112). When tuo was used pronominally, it referred either to the monkey, or to what was going on on the TV, the monkey’s actions (Example 6-113).

Example 6-111 FI04

Tuo apina on todella hassu.
tuo monkey COP3 really funny

‘That monkey is really funny.’

Example 6-112 FI95

Höhöhö, kato nyt to-ta apina-a
hi hi hi look:IMP2 now tuo-PRTV monkey-PRTV

‘Hi hi hi, now look at that monkey.’

Example 6-113 FI29

Toi on tosi hassu.
tuo COP3 very funny

‘That is very funny.’

There were five cases in which the [+PROX] tä-series was used. The number of uses was small compared to the use of the tuo-series. When tämä was used pronominally, it referred either to the monkey or to what was going on on the TV or to the kind of program the informant was watching (Example 6-114–Example 6-116). When it was used adnominally, the referent was always the monkey.
‘Haha, this makes me feel good.’

‘Awesome performance! I never get tired of these.’

‘Looking at this puts me in really good mood.’
lit. ‘Nothing can put me in a good mood than looking at this.’

There were also six cases in which se was used but only two of se were judged to be in spatial-deictically used DEM [+PROX] and therefore included in the analyses. As seen, the use of the se-series was not frequent. The clear cases of spatial-deictically used DEM were in the inessive case siinä and used pronominally, which referred to the location of the monkey (Example 6-117).

‘There! Funny monkey.’

As stated, all three DEMs (tä-, se-, and tuo-series) were used for this situation. Among them, the use of the [+PROX] tuo-series was most frequent.

Interpreted as the spatial demonstratives, the [+PROX] tuo-series indicates the distal feature of the referent (remoteness), excluded from the speaker’s sphere and even from the addressee’s. As discussed in the use of [+PROX] by the JP informants, considering the actual spatial distance of the referent to the speaker, the use of the tuo-series is understandable. Further, as Laury’s (1997, 74) claims, at the same time as the tuo-series implies that the monkey
(the referent) was excluded from the speaker’s sphere, it may indicate that the monkey was now available to the addressee. In this way, the tuo-series in this situation seems to invite the addressee to pay extra attention to the referent. Thus the distal tuo-series seemed to be used for a pointing-out or focusing function, not based on the physical distance. In this respect, it may be worth mentioning that there were some cases of the tuota (tuo-series in the partitive case) used in this situation, which were used to refer to the monkey as the object of a verb (in the imperative), katso ‘look!’ (also kato in colloquial form, such as in Example 6-112). Thus tuota in my data clearly had the function of focusing the addressee’s attention on the referent.

Regarding the use of the [+PROX] tä-series as the spatial demonstratives, it indicates proximity of the referent to the speaker, included in his sphere. As discussed in the use of the [+PROX] ko-series by the JP informants, this inclusion implies a presence of the monkey in the speaker’s current sphere in terms of time, that is, temporal proximity. Unlike the tuo-series which is shown to be used to focus the addressee’s attention, the use of the tä-series was used as a comment on the monkey, not requesting the addressee to look at it. Note, however, that I am not arguing that katso tätä (apinaa) ‘look at this (monkey)’ cannot be used here.

Regarding the [±PROX] se-series as the spatial demonstratives, this use indicates that the referent is in the addressee’s sphere. The use of siinä in Example 6-117 should therefore indicate that the location where the monkey was found was conceived as being in the addressee’s sphere. Considering that the distance from the speaker to the referent and the distance from the addressee to the referent was the same in the given situation, it would be rather odd to think that the referent was located closer to the addressee in terms of physical distance. The use of the se-series can therefore be better viewed as signaling that the referent could be found in the sphere that the addressee could perceive.

The results showed that it was mostly the tuo-series that was used in this situation and this suggests that FI informants had a tendency to exclude the monkey (or its actions) from their current sphere. However, this use did not seem to be related to the physical or the perceived distance; the use of the tuo-series in this situation seemed to be related to focusing the speech participants’ attention on the monkey (the referent). That all three DEMs (tä-, se-, and tuo-series) were used in this situation may confirm that the actual (physical) distance between the speaker and the referent is not the crucial condition for the choice of DEM.

Swedish

The DEM usage rate was 20% and quite low in this situation. As was the case with Finnish, distal DEMs were mostly used and there was one case in which proximal DEM was used. Sixteen of nineteen distal DEMs in Swedish
were adnominal \textit{den där [–PROX]}, typically together with \textit{apan} ‘monkey-def’ (Example 6-118). There was also one case with an adverb of location \textit{där} ‘there’ used together with a comparative adverb \textit{så} ‘so’ which was used to refer to the action of the monkey (Example 6-119). Further there were two cases with [–PROX] \textit{den N-def}, with a head noun, \textit{apan} ‘monkey-def’ used to point out the monkey. The only case with proximal DEM was in pronominal \textit{detta} ‘this, neuter’, used to refer to what was going on on the TV (Example 6-120).

Example 6-118 SW13
\begin{center}  
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{Den där} & \textit{apa-n} & \textbf{är} & \textbf{riktigt Rolig.} \\
\textit{den där} & \textit{monkey-DEF} & \textbf{COP} & \textbf{really funny} \\
\end{tabular} 
\end{center}

‘That monkey is really funny.’

Example 6-119 SW39
\begin{center}  
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{Så där} & \textit{brukar jag också göra.} \\
\textit{so där} & \textit{use.to I also do} \\
\end{tabular} 
\end{center}

‘That way I usually do, too.’

Example 6-120 SW30
\begin{center}  
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{Asså. vad är detta?} & \textit{(skrattandes)} \\
\textit{so what COP detta} & \textit{laughing} \\
\end{tabular} 
\end{center}

‘So, what is this? (laughing)’

The use of [–PROX] \textit{där, den där} indicates the remoteness of the referent to the speaker, excluded from his sphere and their use for this situation implied that the speaker regarded the monkey and/or what was going on on the TV as outside of her current sphere, located away from her. Even though there were some cases as in Situation B3 where Swedish \textit{där} and \textit{den där} were used to refer to the addressee’s sphere, considering that the distance from the speaker to the referent and the distance from the addressee to the referent were the same in the given situation, the use of \textit{där, den där} (and its variants) did not seem to indicate that the speaker regarded the referent to be in the addressee’s sphere in terms of physical distance.

The distance that was indicated by distal DEM in this situation did not imply any negative, distance-taking attitude of the speaker to the referent as explained in SAG (1999: 2, 320). In my data, \textit{den dår apan} was often used as the subject of a sentence which has positive meanings, using adjectives such as \textit{skön} ‘pleasant’ and \textit{rolig} ‘amusing.’ Together with the use of distal \textit{den apan} the use of \textit{den dår apan} could have been used to indicate that the
speaker just wanted to point out the referent (cf. SAG 1999), which happened to be located outside the speaker’s sphere.

As mentioned, there was one case in which a proximal DEM was used; it was detta ‘this’ (neuter). Detta was used for this situation to refer to what was going on on the TV, and as a spatial demonstrative, this use indicates the proximity of the referent to the speaker. Considering the actual distance between the speaker and the referent, this use may be better interpreted as the speaker’s inclusion of the whole circumstance in his sphere.

Summary
The result showed that while the JP informants tended to use [+PROX] DEMs, the FI and the SW informants tended to use [–PROX] DEMs. The use of [+PROX] DEMs by JP informants implied an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, based on the presentness (temporal proximity) and hence psychological proximity towards the referent. The use of [+PROX] DEM implied, in all three languages, an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere and hence the presentness (temporal proximity) and psychological proximity towards the referent. The use of [–PROX] DEM by the FI and the SW informants implied an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere and this use seems to be explained in terms of their intention to point out. The use of [–PROX] DEMs in the FI data and the SW data, on the other hand, did not imply any ‘distance-taking attitude’ or negative connotation. On the contrary, because of the accompanied expressions that have a positive sense, the use of [–PROX] DEMs by the FI and the SW informants signaled the speaker’s positive attitude as familiarity towards the monkey. As seen in Situation B2, the positive sense of expressions used together with the [–PROX] DEMs of these languages seems to override the basic semantics of the [–PROX] DEMs.

The results also showed that [±PROX] DEMs were not used at all by the JP informants, while [±PROX] DEM uses were observed among the FI informants. It has thus been shown that it was possible to place the monkey in the addressee’s sphere in Finnish, but not in Japanese. The use of a Finnish [±PROX] DEM was analyzed to indicate an inclusion of the referent in the addressee’s sphere. This use seemed to be based on the speaker’s intention to guide the addressee where to find the referent, in the vicinity of the addressee.

Situation C2
General
In Situation C2, the speaker (female) was to ask the addressee (male) the name of the dish shown on the TV. The usage rate turned out to be high in all languages (97% in JP, 96% in FI and 91% in SW). The high DEM usage
rate for this situation in all three languages seems to indicate that this situation represents a quite typical case where DEMs are used. When DEMs were not used for this situation, a NP with or without determiners and complement was used irrespective of the language; for example 今テレビに映ってる料理 ima terebini utsutteru ryōri ‘dish shown on the TV now’ in Japanese, ruokalaji ‘dish’ in Finnish, and maträtten ‘the dish’ in Swedish.

Japanese
The proximal ko-series [+PROX] and distal a-series [−PROX] were used for this situation. The medial so-series [+PROX] was not used at all. The ko-series was used most, both pronominally (kore) and adnominally (kono), together with a head noun, typically ryōri ‘dish’ as in kono ryōri ‘this dish’ to refer to the dish shown on TV (Example 6-121 for the use of kore and Example 6-122 for the use of kono). The use of the ko-series as spatial demonstratives indicates the proximity of the referent. As discussed in Situation C1, considering the actual distance of the referent to the speaker, the use of the ko-series seemed to be based on an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere and hence both psychological and temporal proximity.

Example 6-121 JP05
これ 何て いう 料理 だっけ？
kore nan te iu ryōri dakke?
‘What was this dish called?’

Example 6-122 JP28
この 料理、 なん だっけ？?
kono ryōri nan dakke??
‘What was this dish??’

Situation C2 is characterized by quite a high usage rate of the [−PROX] a-series, compared to the other situations in the same Category (C). The a-series was used both pronominally (are) and adnominally (ano) together with a head noun, typically ryōri ‘dish’ to refer to the dish shown on TV (Example 6-123 for the use of are and Example 6-124 for the use of ano). The use of the a-series as spatial demonstratives indicates the remoteness of the referent to the speaker and this use implied that the speaker excluded the dish from her current sphere, regarding it as outside her sphere, remote from her.
The distance indicated by the use of the *a*-series, however, did not convey any other particular positive or negative connotation towards the referent. At this point, an interesting observation was that a verb used in this situation was often in the past tense together with the particle つけ-kke, including their variants, irrespective of whether the sentences contained the *ko*- or *a*-series (see Example 6-121–Example 6-124). The particle つけ-kke is usually used for questioning in order to confirm or to search for something, as English '(What) was/is it, again?' is used. The use of つけ-kke in this situation seemed to indicate that the name of the dish was unknown, or perhaps once known to the speaker but now forgotten, and she had no access to it, and therefore had to look for the answer from the addressee.

In this respect, the [-PROX] *a*- series could have been used for its recognitional function; the speaker might have used the *a*-series in search of the forgotten name of the dish, hoping that the addressee might know it. However, the use of the [+PROX] *ko*-series in this situation seemed also to convey similar readings when accompanied by the particle つけ-kke, as shown in Example 6-121 and Example 6-122. The difference between the use of the *ko* - and *a*-series was again (only) whether the speaker included the referent within her sphere (i.e., considered to be within her sphere in the case of the *ko*-series) or excluded the referent from her sphere (i.e., considered to be outside her sphere in the case of the *a*-series).

Hence, both the *ko*- and *a*-series were acceptable, and the inclusion or exclusion of the referent in or from the speaker’s sphere seemed to be based on the psychological factor rather than physical and actual distance since the informants were observing the same referent. The number of the *ko*-series used was higher than the *a*-series in this situation and this suggests that the JP informants tended to regard the referent as being in their near sphere. As was the case with the previous Situation C1, the *so*-series was not used in this situation and this means that the speaker did not set a point of reference anchored to the addressee in order to refer to the dish.

---

93 out of 96 cases with DEM had this expression.
The DEM usage rate was high in Finnish in Situation C2, and the [-PROX] 
tuo-series was used most often. The proximal tä-series [+PROX] was also
found, but very limited in number compared to the tuo-series. The medial se-
series [±PROX] was not used at all.

The tuo-series was often used adnominally but also pronominally. The 
use of the tuo-series as spatial demonstratives indicates the remoteness of the 
referent to the speaker, excluding the dish from her current sphere and re-
garding it as located outside her sphere. As was the case with the JP data, 
even though the use of the tuo-series here indicated that the dish was outside
the speaker’s sphere and remote from her, no negative connotation was con-
vveyed by this use. See Example 6-125–Example 6-127.

Example 6-125 FI58 and others
Hei, mikä tuo-n/to-n ruokalaji-n nimi on?
INTJ what tuo-GEN dish-GEN name COP3
‘Hey, what is the name of that dish?’

Example 6-126 FI49 and others
Mikä ruoka tuo on?
what food tuo COP3
‘What food is that?’

Example 6-127 FI73
Mi-tü=s toi ruoka oli=kaan ?
what-PRTV=EMPH tuo food COP:PST3=ENCL
‘What was that food?’

An interesting case of tuo (toi) was found in Example 6-128. In this example, 
the tuo-series was used repeatedly in an utterance. In this example, toi was
first used pronominally in the subject position to refer to the intended refer-
ent; then toi was repeatedly used as a kind of interjection. As mentioned, the
first use of toi referred to the intended referent, indicating a distance, but the
later mentioned toi seemed to be used in search of the name of the referent
that the speaker could not remember at the time of the utterance, perhaps
hoping that the addressee might know it. This use of tuo ‘that’ may be a
good example of recognitional use also shown in the use of the [-PROX] a-
series in Japanese (see the previous page). At any rate, this use implied an
unavailability of the intended referent. That the speaker was searching for
the referent that she could not recall at the time of the utterance also seemed
to be indicated by a copula in the preterit *oli* ‘was’, also as *olikaan*, as in Example 6-127. Thus the use of the *tuo*-series seemed to be related to the speaker not being able to remember the name.

Example 6-128 FI15

*Ttoi on toi... toi... toi?*

*tuo COP3 tuo tuo tuo*

‘That is that, that, that....

The use of the [+PROX] *tä*-series was very limited (3 cases of 95 used DEM). Nominative *tämä* and partitive *tätä* were each used pronominally and genitive *tämän* adnominally to refer to the dish in question. See Example 6-129. The use of the *tä*-series as spatial demonstratives indicates the proximity of the referent and that the speaker regarded the dish to be in her current sphere. As discussed in Situation C1, considering the actual spatial distance shown in the situation, this use does not seem to be based on the physical distance but rather on the psychological factor extended from the inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere.

Example 6-129 FI81

*Sait=ko sinä selvä-ä mikä tämä-n*

*know:PST2 =Q you clear-PRTV what tä-GEN*

*ruua-n nimi oli?*

*food-GEN name COP: PST3*

‘Did you find out what this food’s name was?’

As mentioned, the number of *tä*-series used was very small and this might indicate that it was not a standard use for this situation. However, it seems reasonable to read this use as ‘inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s current sphere, and thus a psychological proximity.’

*Swedish*

The DEM usage rate was high (91%) in this situation and even though the distribution was rather uneven, all the types of DEM (*den här, denna, den där*, *den N-def*) were used in this situation. Distal DEM, often adnominal *den där* [+PROX] was the most frequent (Example 6-130), but it was also used pronominally to refer to the dish in question (Example 6-131). Adnominal *den* was also used to refer to the dish (Example 6-132).
Example 6-130 SW03
Vad är det den där maträtt-en heter nu igen?
what COP it den där dish-DEF call now again

‘What is it now that dish is called again?’

Example 6-131 SW04
Vad heter det där nu igen?
what call det där now again

‘What is that now again?’

Example 6-132 SW20
Vad heter den maträtt-en? jag har glömt.
What call den dish-DEF I have forget:PF

‘What is the name of that dish? I’ve forgotten’

As in Finnish, the use of proximal DEM was not frequent. Proximal den här [+PROX] was used only adnominally together with a head NP, typically maträtten ‘dish-def’ (Example 6-133). Detta (neuter) was used only pro-nominally to refer to the dish.

Example 6-133 SW100
Vafan hette den här maträtt-en nu igen?
hell call:PST den här dish-DEF now again

‘Now, what the hell was the name of this dish again?’

The use of [–PROX] DEM där, den där as the spatial demonstratives indicates the remoteness of the referent to the speaker, excluded from her sphere. Considering the spatial relations of the speaker, the addressee and the referent in this situation, the use of den där (and its variation) is motivated by the actual distance. Further, as was the case with Japanese and Finnish, the use of [–PROX] DEMs here did not give any negative connotations. Further, the reading of den där can also be, as in Japanese and Finnish, the speaker’s search for the referent, once known to her but forgotten at the time of utterance; den där seemed to be used for its recognitional function. At this point, it should be mentioned that there were also other expressions that were used to indicate the speaker’s search for an expression to refer to the referent in this situation. Such an expression is, for example, (nu) igen ‘(now) again.’ The use of such expressions suggests that the speaker was searching for the answer (the name of the referent). As for the use of [–PROX] den N-def, it seemed to be used for its pointing-out function and did not seem to reflect distance/proximity to the dish perceived by the speaker.
The number of proximal DEMs used was much fewer than the number of distal DEMs. The use of proximal DEMs as spatial demonstratives indicates the proximity of the referent and that the speaker regarded the dish as being in her current sphere. Considering the spatial relation between the speaker and the referent shown on the TV, this use did not seem to be based on the actual distance/proximity to the referent. As was the case in Japanese and Finnish, this use may be explained in terms of the inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, related to the speaker’s psychological proximity towards the referent.

That all types of DEM (den här, denna, den där, den N-def) were used for this situation seemed to indicate that the informants’ use of DEMs was not based on the physical distance to the referent. The number of DEMs used shows that the SW informants preferred to use non-proximal DEMs to refer to the referent in this situation.

Summary
Situation C2 was the situation in which all the language groups had a high DEM usage rate. This may indicate that this situation represents a quite typical case where DEMs are used in all these languages. However, there seemed to be differences in preference about which DEMs were used. While the use of the [+PROX] ko-series seemed to be preferred by the JP informants, the use of the [−PROX] DEMs seemed to be preferred by the FI and the SW informants (i.e., tuo-series in Finnish and där, den där in Swedish). The use of the [+PROX] DEMs for this situation seemed to be explained in terms of the speaker’s inclusion of the referent in her sphere, which is related to psychological proximity and the temporal proximity to the referent. The use of [−PROX] DEMs (Japanese a-series, Finnish tuo-series and Swedish där, den där) on the other hand, seemed to be associated with the actual distance of the referent, extended to an unavailability of the referent in terms of memory and therefore the need to be reminded. The use of Swedish [−PROX] den N-def was analyzed as being based on its pointing-out function.

Situation C3
General
In this situation, the speaker was to ask the addressee what was on TV (which program he was watching). Thus this situation deals with a question about the referent (the TV program). The use of DEMs to point out the referent was expected, but as Example 6-134–Example 6-136 show, the question does not necessarily include the referent.
Example 6-134 JP21
何 見てるの?
nani miteru-no
what watch:ASP-NR

‘What (are you) watching?’

Example 6-135 FI66
Mitä sä katsot?
what you look/watch2

‘What are you watching?’

Example 6-136 SW09
Vad tittar du på?
what look/watch you at

‘What are you looking at?’

Instead of DEMs, NPs with determiners (interrogative pronouns) were frequently used. Examples are 何の番組 nan’no bangumi? ‘What is the program?’ in Japanese, Mitä ohjelmaa katsot? ‘What program are you watching?’ in Finnish, and Vilket program är det? ‘What program is it?’ in Swedish.

**Japanese**

The DEM usage rate was relatively low (66%) in this situation. Use of the [+PROX] ko-series was predominant, but the [±PROX] so-series and the [−PROX] a-series were both used once. Most ko-series were used pronominally (kore), but adnominally used kono with a head noun, typically bangumi ‘program,’ was also found. Most of the DEMs used referred to the TV program, but three of pronominally used kore were judged to refer to what was going on on the TV (Example 6-137). Interpreted as spatial demonstratives, the ko-series indicates the proximity of the referent to the speaker, included in her current sphere. The reading of the ko-series in this situation is, accordingly, the speaker’s inclusion of the TV program in her current sphere, located close to her. Considering the spatial relation between the referent and the speaker given in the situation, this use did not seem to be based on the actual distance but rather the temporal proximity and it suggests a presence of the TV program in the speech situation; it sounded as if the speaker included herself in the TV-watching context.
Regarding the [±PROX] so-series, pronominal sore was used only once to refer to the TV program (Example 6-138). As spatial demonstratives, the so-series indicate that the referent is either proximal to the addressee or at medial distance from the speaker and the addressee. Considering the spatial relations between the referent, the speaker and the addressee in the given situation, this use is motivated by the actual distance between the referent and the speaker (and the addressee). However as Example 6-138 shows, pronominal sore was used in relation to the addressee, as sore was equated with “the one/something you are watching” and the subject of the verb watching was the addressee (‘you’). The use of sore seems to indicate that the speaker regarded the TV program as being in the addressee’s sphere; it was the addressee’s choice of TV program to watch, not the speaker’s choice.

As for the use of the [–PROX] a-series, pronominal are was used once to refer to the TV program or what was going on, shown on the TV (Example 6-139). Interpreted as spatial demonstratives, are indicates the remoteness of the referent to the speaker, excluded from her sphere. The use of the a-series for this situation can be explained in terms of the actual distance of the referent to the speaker (and the addressee). As stated, this use indicates an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s (and perhaps the addressee’s) sphere, and it implies a sense of distance. However, this use does not have any negative connotation. The reading of are is that what is on the TV was simply outside both the speaker’s and the addressee’s sphere.

Example 6-139 JP84
あれ 何？ 料理番組？
are nani ryōri-bangumi?
‘What is that? A cooking program?’
As in Situation C2, the intended referent in Situation C3 was something shown on TV. However, the use (i.e. choice) of DEM was quite different in these two situations. In Situation C2, even though the [+PROX] ko-series was used most frequently, the use of the [−PROX] a-series was quite frequent as well. In Situation C3, on the other hand, basically only the ko-series was used and the a-series was very seldom used (only once).

The frequent use of the a-series in Situation C2 was analyzed to be related to the speaker’s perception of temporal remoteness to the referent and its unavailability. That the JP informants associated the situation in C2 with remoteness in terms of time was supported by the frequent use of a verb in the preterit together with the particle ゝi↑-kke. The use of the particle ゝi↑-kke implies that the intended referent was something the speaker once knew but had forgotten; hence the referent was not temporally present or available at the time of the utterance. In Situation C3, on the other hand, such an expression was seldom used; the situation was not associated with temporal remoteness. My analysis is that most of the JP informants who used DEMs in Situation C3 perceived the TV program to be something new and unknown, but present in the speech situation.

**Finnish**

The use of DEMs by the FI informants was also rather sparse in this situation (49%) and as was the case with JP, it was the [+PROX] tä-series that was mostly used. This is the only situation in Category C where the tä-series outnumbered the distal and proximal DEMs.

The tä-series was used both pronominally and adnominally and referred to the TV program (Example 6-140 and Example 6-141). There was also one (1) case with tässä (tä-series in the inessive case) and one (1) case with adverb of location täällä. Tässä (inessive case), which referred to the TV program, and täällä (adverb of location), which referred to the circumstance, that is, the addressee’s watching of TV, including this TV program. As spatial demonstratives, the tä-series indicate the proximity of the referent to the speaker, included in her sphere. The use of the tä-series may not be motivated in terms of the distance between the referent and the speaker. This use however, may be explained in terms of inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere; that is, the speaker included the TV program, or what was going on on TV, to be within her sphere. The inclusion can thus be regarded as related to presentness and temporal proximity to the referent.
Example 6-140 FI132 and other
Mikä ohjelma tämä on?
what program tämä COP3
‘What program is this?’

Example 6-141 FI16 and other
Mikä tämä ohjelma on?
what tämä program COP3
‘What is this program?’

Regarding the use of the [+PROX] se-series, all eight cases in which the se-series was used in this situation were locative adverbs, siellä or sieltä. The use of siellä was predominant (seven cases of eight; see Example 6-142). As spatial demonstratives, the se-series indicate the proximity of the referent to the addressee, placing the referent in the addressee’s sphere. This use may not be explained in terms of the physical distance. However, it may be interpreted that the speaker regarded the watching of TV (including the TV program) as the addressee’s choice. The number of se-series used (eight cases) was quite high in comparison with the use of the se-series in the other situations in Category C. This result is quite interesting in comparison with the quite rare use of the [+PROX] so-series in Japanese in this situation.

Example 6-142 FI115 and others
Mitä sie-ltä tulee?
what se-ABL come3
‘What’s going on there?’

There was only one case in which the [−PROX] tuo-series was used in this situation; it was in the nominative case, adnominal tuo (toi) (Example 6-143). The tuo-series indicates the distance (remoteness) of the referent to the speaker, that the speaker excluded the TV program, or watching TV, from her own sphere. The use of the tuo-series could be based on the actual distance from the speaker to the referent, but the distance indicated by the tuo-series here did not convey any negative connotation. It seemed that the distal toi was just used for its ‘pointing-out’ function.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Note however, that this result is based on the written data. The spoken data may give a different interpretation, depending on the accentuation or emphasis.
Example 6-143 FI07
Mikä toi ohjelma on?
what tuo program COP3

‘What is that program?’

Swedish

The use of DEMs by the SW informants was quite sparse in this situation (30%). Unlike the results from Situations C1 and C2, it was the proximal DEM [+PROX] that was mostly used for this situation. The use of distal DEM [–PROX] was also found, but much sparser than the use of proximal DEMs. The number of distal DEM was lowest for this situation in Category C. Proximal DEM was used both pronominally and adnominally together with a head noun, typically programmet ‘program-def’ (Example 6-144 and Example 6-145). They were all used to refer to the TV program in question. Pronominal and adnominal detta ‘this, neuter’ was also used to refer to either the program or ‘what was going on on TV.’

As for distal DEM den där [–PROX] and its variants, five cases were found. They were used both pronominally and adnominally (Example 6-146 for the adnominal use). They were used to refer either to the program or to ‘what was going on on TV.’

Example 6-144 SW21 and others
Vad heter det här program-et?
what call det här program-DEF

‘What is this program called?/what is this program?’

Example 6-145 SW96
Vilket program är det här?
Which/what program COP det här

‘What program is this?’

Example 6-146 SW94
Vad heter det där program-et?
what call det där program-DEF

‘What is that program called?/what is that program?’

Regarding proximal DEMs den här, här, denna [+PROX] (and their variants) as spatial deictic demonstratives, they indicate proximity of the referent to the speaker and as was the case with Japanese and Finnish, the use of proxi-
mal DEMs for this situation cannot be explained in terms of the actual distance between the referent and the speaker. This use can be better explained in terms of the inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere. The inclusion can be further related to the presence of the TV program in the speech context, in terms of both time and space. Thus the use of proximal DEMs seemed to be based on psychological and temporal proximity towards the referent.

The use of *den där* and *där* [-PROX] (and their variants), on the other hand, is motivated by the actual distance between the referent and the speaker. *Den där, där* indicate here that the speaker excluded the TV program (what was going on on the TV) from her current sphere, thereby indicating a remoteness of the referent from herself (and possibly from the addressee). The reading is consequently that the program was occurring *somewhere else*, not in the speaker’s current sphere and ‘somewhere’ could be related to the addressee. Considering that the distance from the speaker to the referent and the distance from the addressee to the referent was the same in the given situation, the use of *där, den där* did not seem to indicate a proximity to the addressee (or addressee’s sphere) in terms of physical distance; rather, the use indicated that watching TV was perceived to be the addressee’s action and the TV program was the addressee’s choice (Example 6-147).

Example 6-147 SW81

Vad heter *det där* program-m-et som
What call *det där* program-DEF that/which
du tittar på?
you watch at

‘What is that program you are watching?’

Summary

In this situation, [+PROX] DEMs were the most frequently used DEMs in all three languages. The use of [+PROX] DEMs seemed to be connected to the presentness of the referent (the TV program in question) in the speech context, and thereby, perhaps, the psychological proximity. The use of medial DEM was very seldom in the JP data (only once) and more frequent in the FI data. Some use of distal DEMs in the SW data seemed to indicate that the referent was perceived to be in the addressee’s sphere, and it seemed that the FI and SW informants were more likely to perceive the referent in this situation in relation to the addressee than JP informants did.
Situation C4

General

In Situation C4, the speaker (male, husband of the addressee) was to tell the addressee (female, wife of the speaker) that he would buy (i.e., he promises to buy) the addressee the ring that they were looking at. The ring was in the shop window, located at most 50 cm away from both the speaker and the addressee. The results showed that the usage rate scored by the FI informants was 68% and was slightly higher than that of the JP informants, which was 63%. In Swedish, only 35% of the informants used a DEM in this situation. The majority of the JP informants who did not employ DEM used a verb for “buy” without mentioning the referent, the ring. The majority of the FI informants (24 of 32) who did not use DEM actually used se but in other than locative cases. Such se were not included in DEM in this study since it was difficult to judge whether they were spatial-deictically used DEMs or not (cf. Section 6.2.2, page 101). In the other cases where DEM was not used, the ring was referred to by means of an NP with or without determiners and complements, such as sormus, ring’. In some cases a verb for “buy” was used without referring to the ring. As for Swedish, when DEM was not used, the personal pronoun den was used predominantly.

Japanese

The DEM usage rate was 63% and the use of the [+PROX] ko-series was predominant, but both the [+PROX] so-series and the [−PROX] a-series were also found. The ko-series was used both pronominally (kore) (Example 6-148) and adnominally (kono) together with a head noun, for example yubiwa ‘ring’ (Example 6-149). That the use of the ko-series was predominant for this situation was interesting, because the speaker and the addressee were not able to touch the referent (the ring) physically, even though the spatial distance from the speaker and the addressee to the referent was proximal and the same.

Example 6-148 JP42 and others

これ、 買ってあげるよ。

kore  katte-ageru-yo.

kore  buy:GER-give,you-PTCL

‘I’ll buy this for you.’
Example 6-149JP51 and others
この指輪、買ってあげるよ。
kono yubiwa katteageruyo.
‘I’ll buy this ring for you.’

Considering the spatial relation between the speaker and the addressee, both the speaker and the addressee are included in the deictic center. Interpreted as spatial demonstratives, the ko-series indicates the proximity of the referent to both the speaker and the addressee, included in them. The use of the [+]PROX ko-series can be explained in terms of the physical distance between the referent and the speaker (including the addressee), provided that the distance of 50 cm (at most) was regarded as proximal. This use, then, did not seem to be restricted by the physical accessibility of the referent. The majority of the JP informants who used DEM for this situation chose the ko-series, and their choice seemed to be conditioned or determined by the physical proximity (closeness) of the speaker to the referent, even though in actual fact the speaker had no access to it (the speaker was not able to touch it).

In three cases (of 60 DEMs used) the [-PROX] so-series was used, either pronominally (sore) or adnominally (sono) (Example 6-150 for pronominally used sore). Interpreted as spatial demonstratives, the so-series indicates the proximity of the referent to the addressee or the medial distance of the referent to the speaker. Considering the spatial relation in situations in which the speaker and the addressee share the same deictic center, it may be possible to explain the use in terms of the medial distance to the speaker. Thus the reading of the so-series could be: ‘the ring, which is located a bit away from us.’ On the other hand, this use can hardly be motivated in terms of the physical proximity to the addressee. However, it was shown in Situation C3 that the so-series was used in relation to the addressee, that is, having the addressee as the point of reference. Following the analysis of the so-series used for Situation C3, the use of the so-series in this situation may be explained in terms of the inclusion of the referent in the addressee’s sphere. The reading would then be: ‘the ring that you (= addressee) are interested in’ or ‘the ring that you are looking at.’

Example 6-150 JP04
それ買ってあげね。
sore katteagerun.
sore buy:GER-give:you-PTCL
‘I’ll buy it for you’

There were also three cases in which the [-PROX] a-series was used. The a-series was used only adnominally (ano) together with the noun yubiwa ‘ring’ as in ano yubiwa in all three cases (Example 6-151). As spatial demonstra-
tives, the \textit{a}-series indicate the remoteness of the referent from the speaker, excluded from his sphere (and the addressee’s sphere). Considering the spatial relation between the referent and the speaker (including the addressee) given in the situation, whether the use of the \textit{a}-series for this situation can be explained in terms of physical distance is rather doubtful. However, it may be explained in terms of exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere (and the addressee’s), which can be related to the inaccessibility of the referent \textit{perceived} by the speaker. Thus it is a psychological factor rather than a physical distance factor that is involved in the use.

Example 6-151 JP84

\begin{verbatim}
あの指輪にしよう。プレゼントするよ！
ano yubiwa ni shiyō purezento-suru-yo!
\end{verbatim}

‘Let’s decide on that ring. I’ll give it (to you)!’

\textit{Finnish}

The DEM usage rate was 66\% and as was the case with Situations C1 and C2, the use of the \([-\text{PROX}]\) \textit{tuo}-series was the most frequent in this situation. The number of uses was rather low, but the \([+\text{PROX}]\) \textit{tä}-series was also used. There were a number of the \([±\text{PROX}]\) \textit{se}-series used in this situation, but most of them were not included in the analysis since it was difficult to judge whether they were spatial-deictically used DEM or not.

The \textit{tuo}-series was used both pronominally and/or adnominally to refer to the ring (Example 6-152, Example 6-153 and Example 6-155 for the pronominally used \textit{tuo}-series, and Example 6-154, Example 6-156, and Example 6-157 for the adnominally used \textit{tuo}-series).

Example 6-152 FI07

\begin{verbatim}
Ostetaan tuo sinu-lle.
buy:PASS tuo you-ALL
\end{verbatim}

‘Let’s buy that for you.’
Example 6-153 FI76

Tuo on kaunis. Haluaisitko se-n. Ostan tuo COP3 beautiful want:COND2 se-ACC buy:1 sen sinu-lle. se-ACC you-ALL

‘That is beautiful. If you want it. I buy it for you.’

Example 6-154 FI23

Rakas, tuo sormus on juuri dear tuo ring COP3 just sinu-lle sopiva. Mennään ostama-an se. you-ALL fit/suited go:PASS buy:INF-ILL it

‘Dear, that ring just suits you. Let’s go in and buy it.’

Example 6-155 FI98

Ok. Mä voin ostaa tuo-𝑛 su-lle. ok I can:INF buy:INF tuo-ACC you-ALL

‘OK, I can buy that for you.’

Example 6-156 FI22

Tuo-𝑛 sormukse-𝑛 lupaan ostaa sinu-lle, rakas! tuo-ACC ring-ACC promise:1 buy:INF you-ALL dear

‘I promise to buy that ring for you, dear.’

Example 6-157 FI51

Tykkäätkö tuo-ста sormukse-ста? Mennään like2=Q tuo-ELAT ring-ELAT go:PASS sitten ja ostetaan se! then and buy:PASS se

‘Do you like that ring? Let’s go then and buy it!’

Further, there was one case in which tuo nominative case was used together with tuossa (inessive case) as shown in Example 6-158. In this example, the first tuo (nominative case) referred to the ring and the tuossa (inessive case) referred to the place where the ring was located.
Interpreted as spatial demonstratives, the *tuo*-series indicates a remoteness of the referent from the speaker, excluded from him. As was the case with the use of [–PROX] DEM in Japanese, whether the use of the *tuo*-series can be explained in terms of the actual distance is doubtful. This use can, however, be explained in terms of exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, and as was the case with Japanese, it was accessibility (and hence psychological distance) to the referent that seemed to determine its use. In this case, the speaker did not have access to the referent and did not have control over it. The use of the *tuo*-series did not seem to convey any negative connotations since in some cases adjectives with a positive meaning such as ‘beautiful’ (*kaunis*) and wonderful (*upea, hieno*) were used to describe the referent. The *tuo*-series was the most common DEM used in this situation; that is, most of the FI informants who used a DEM tended to exclude the referent from their current sphere or tended to perceive it to be located outside their current sphere. The FI informants seemed to do so irrespective of their actual (physical) proximity to the referent.

When the proximal *tä*-series was used, it was pronominally or adnominally to refer to the ring (Example 6-159 for the pronominally used *tä*-series). As spatial demonstratives, the *tä*-series indicates the proximity of the referent to the speaker (and the addressee), included in his current sphere. This use can be explained in terms of the physical distance shown in the given situation. As was the case in Japanese, the *tä*-series was then used despite the actual availability or accessibility of the referent.

As for the use of the [±PROX] *se*-series, the number used spatial-deictically was small. In my data, *se* was often used as a pronoun, as an anaphoric means to track (refer back to) the referent mentioned before, as seen in Example 6-153 (example with *tuo*-series). When the *se*-series was used spatial-deictically as DEMs, they were all in the elative case, *siitä*, used to refer to the ring, which was in the position of the direct object of the verb ‘like’ (often, *pidät*). See Example 6-160.
As spatial demonstratives, the se-series indicates the proximity of the referent to the addressee, placing the referent in the addressee’s sphere. As both speaker and addressee were included in the deictic center in the given situation, this use may not be explained in terms of the proximity of the referent to the addressee. However, the use of the se-series might still be related to the addressee ‘you’, since siitä, which referred to the ring in my data, was at the same time syntactically the direct object of what ‘you (i.e., the addressee) like’ uttered by the speaker (Example 6-160). As seen in the use of the so-series in Japanese, we find here that the speaker had a point of reference psychologically anchored to the addressee.

The number of the tä-, se-, and tuo-series used for this situation was not evenly distributed, but all three DEMs were used, which seems to indicate that the use (choice) of DEM depends more on the psychological factor than physical distance.

Swedish

The DEM usage rate was low (35%) in this situation. As was the case with Situations C1 and C2, it was mostly the distal DEMs that were used in this situation. The use of the proximal DEMs was quite limited in number.

Regarding the use of the distal DEMs [−PROX], unlike Situations C1 and C2 in which den där and its variations were often used, it was den together with a head noun, namely ringen ‘ring-def’ as in den ringen that was mostly used for this situation (Example 6-161). As regards den där and its variants, pronominal den där (common) and adnominal den där (common) with a definite NP, ringen ‘ring-def’ as in den där ringen were used (Example 6-162 for adnominally used den där).

Example 6-161 SW05

Precis den ring-en skall du få!
just den ring-DEF shall you get

‘You shall get just that ring!’
As for proximal DEMs, [+]PROX den här and adnominal den här with a definite noun, ringen ‘ring-def’ and adnominal denna with the head noun ring ‘ring’ were used (Example 6-163). All the DEM used referred to the ring in question.

Example 6-163 SW02  
ren här ring-en vill jag ge dig.  
den här ring-DEF will I give you:ACC

‘I will give you this ring.’

The use of proximal DEM indicated that the speaker regarded the referent to be in his current sphere, physically inaccessible as it was. As mentioned, the ring was in the showcase located close to both the speaker and the addressee, and it was not physically accessible for them. Note, however, that the use of the proximal DEM found in the SW data for this situation was quite small compared to the use of the distal DEM.

As regards the distal DEM, as mentioned, two different forms, den där (NP-def) and den N-def, were used for this situation: it was mostly den N-def that was used. As spatial demonstratives, the use of distal DEM indicates the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s (and also the addressee’s) sphere. The reading of distal DEM here is rather complicated. As the spatial demonstratives, den där (and its variants) indicate, like the Japanese a-series and the Finnish tuo-series, the remoteness of the referent from the speaker, excluded from him. Considering the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker (including the addressee), the use of den där cannot be explained in terms of the distance given in the situation. As was the case with the distal DEM in Japanese and Finnish, the use of den där might suggest psychological distance to the referent rather than physical distance. This use did not, however, convey any negative connotations and considering that the ring in the given situation was actually not accessible for the speaker in a physical sense, it may also be reasonable to think that the speaker simply placed the referent outside his own sphere, without adding any extra connotation.

Regarding the other distal DEM den ringen, this indicates that a certain ring was pointed out in contrast to other possible candidates, regardless of the physical distance between the speaker and the referent. Thus this use seemed to be based on the speaker’s intention to point out a specific referent and not necessarily related to its remoteness. The reading of den ringen
should thus be: ‘the one among the others.’ The speaker’s intention to point out the referent was also implied by the inverted word order used by some informants. That is, there were some cases where den ringen ‘the/that ring,’ the direct object, was placed in the initial position of the sentence, instead of placing it after the verb. This inverted word order gave an emphasis which drew more attention to the object. Inverted word order was also found in the sentences in which den där (NP-def) was used. The use of den där (NP-def) also suggests that it was used to point out a certain ring. The SW informants who used DEMs for this situation chose mostly den N-def. Their choice of demonstrative seemed therefore to be determined by the speaker’s intention to ‘point out’ the referent.

Summary
The results showed quite clear differences between the JP informants on the one hand and the FI and SW informants on the other hand. The JP informants’ use of DEM in this situation can be characterized by their frequent use of [+PROX] DEMs, while the Finnish and Swedish informants’ use can be characterized by their frequent use of [−PROX] DEMs.

The use of [+PROX] DEM by all the informant groups, but especially the JP informants, seemed to be connected with the physical proximity of the referent to the speaker, even if the speaker did not have direct access to the referent. The use of the Japanese [−PROX] a-series and the Finnish [−PROX] tuo-series in this situation seemed to be connected with the unavailability (inaccessibility) of the referent at the moment of speech. The use of the Swedish [−PROX] där and den där was also analyzed as being connected with the unavailability of the referent, but Swedish [−PROX] den N-n seemed to be connected with the speaker’s intention to point out the referent.

6.3.3. Summary

Category A
In Category A, the use of the Japanese [+PROX] ko-series was expected. The results showed that, as for Japanese, only the ko-series was used in all the situations. As for Finnish, use of the [+PROX] tä-series was predominant in all the situations. The use of the [+PROX] se-series was also observed in Situations A2 and A3, though limited in number. A small number of [−PROX] tuo-series was also observed in Situations A2 and A4. As for Swedish, the use of [+PROX] här, den här, detta was predominant in all the situations. The use of [−PROX] där, den N-def was observed in Situations A1 and A2, but the number was very small.

The use of [+PROX] DEMs in this category was motivated by the spatial, physical distance between the speaker and the referent shown in the given situations. The use of [±PROX] DEMs in Finnish and [−PROX] DEMs in
Finnish and Swedish, on the other hand cannot be explained in terms of the spatial, physical distance. The use of Finnish \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) DEM (Situations A2, A3), the use of Finnish \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) DEM (Situation A2) and the use of Swedish \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) DEM (Situation A1) were analyzed as being based on the deliberate exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere, depending on the speech participants’ ongoing social interaction. The use of Finnish \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) (Situation A4) was analyzed as being based on temporal distance to the referent and inaccessibility or unavailability of the referent.

**Category B**

In Category B, the use of the Japanese \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) so-series was expected. It was observed in all the situations and was predominant in Situations B1, B3 and B4 but not in Situation B2. The use of the \([+\text{PROX}]\) ko-series was observed in Situations B2, B3 and B4, accounting for the majority in Situation B2, but in Situations B3 and B4, the number was limited. Use of the \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) a-series was observed in Situation B4.

As for Finnish, the \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) se-series was used in all the situations but did not always account for the majority: frequent in Situations B1 and B3, but less frequent in Situations B2 and B4. Use of the \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) tuo-series was observed in Situations B1, B2 and B4 and was quite frequent in Situations B1 and B4. The tuo-series was also observed in Situation B2 but limited in number. Further, a small number of the \([+\text{PROX}]\) tä-series were also observed in Situation B2.

As for Swedish, \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) där, den där, den N-def (and their variants) were used in all the situations and were predominant in Situations B1, B3 and B4. In Situation B2 only a small number of \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) den där were found. The use of \([+\text{PROX}]\) was small in number but found in Situations B1 and B2.

The use of \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) DEM in Japanese and Finnish and \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) DEM in Swedish can be explained by the basic spatial interpretation of the DEM where the speaker placed the referent in the addressee’s sphere. The use of \([+\text{PROX}]\) DEM (Situations B2, B3 and B4 for Japanese, Situation B2 for Finnish, Situations B1 and B2 for Swedish) was analyzed as indicating the inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s current sphere which was based on the presentness of the referent as perceived by the speaker and thus the speaker’s psychological proximity to the referent. Regarding the use of the Japanese \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) a-series, it seemed to be due to the informants’ misunderstanding about the addressee in the given situation. If the intended person in the task was regarded as the addressee, the a-series was not likely to be used. Regarding the use of Finnish \([\neg\text{PROX}]\) DEM (Situations B1, B2 and B4), the use was analyzed as indicating a deliberate exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere. The exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere could be associated with the speaker’s psychological distance towards the referent and to the distance-taking attitude towards the referent.
However, no negative connotation was conveyed by the use of [-PROX] DEM in my data. On the contrary, a head noun in the adnominal construction of DEM in my data had positive meanings and the positive sense of the noun seemed to override the basic semantics of distance.

**Category C**

In Category C, no particular predictions were made regarding the choice of DEM. As for Japanese, use of the [+PROX] ko-series was predominant in all the situations. Use of the [+PROX] so-series was rather scarce, but observed in Situations C3 and C4. Use of the [-PROX] a-series was observed in all the situations; quite frequently in Situations C1 and C2, but scarce in Situations C3 and C4.

As for Finnish, use of the [+PROX] tä-series was observed in all the situations; this use accounted for the majority in Situation C3, but the number was rather small in Situations C1, C2 and C4. Use of the [+PROX] se-series was found in Situations C1, C3 and C4 but only in a limited number. Use of the [-PROX] tuo-series was found in all the situations, accounting for the majority in Situations C1, C2 and C4.

Regarding Swedish, use of [+PROX] DEM was observed in all the situations. As was the case in Finnish, this use accounted for the majority in Situation C3, but the number was small in Situations C1, C2 and C4. Use of [-PROX] DEM was observed in all the situations and this use accounted for the majority in Situations C1, C2 and C4, but not in Situation C3.

The use of [+PROX] DEM in all the languages was analyzed to indicate an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, and this use seemed to be based on the spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker (Situation C4), which was also extended to temporal proximity and to psychological proximity (Situations C1, C2 and C3). Use of the Japanese [+PROX] so-series (Situations C3, C4), the Finnish [+PROX] se-series (Situations C1, C3 and C4) was analyzed as indicating the proximity of the referent to the addressee and this use seemed to be based on the speaker’s intention to guide the addressee where to find the referent. The use of Swedish [-PROX] där, den där was analyzed as indicating basically an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, but it might also indicate an inclusion of the referent in the addressee’s sphere. This use can be explained in terms of either the physical, spatial distance of the referent from the speaker, or the psychological proximity between the referent and the addressee as perceived by the speaker. The use of Swedish [-PROX] den N-def was analyzed as being used for its pointing-out function.
7. Study 2: Learners’ use of demonstratives in comparison with native speaker data

This chapter seeks answers to Research Questions 2, 3 and 4, that is: if there are any similarities or differences between the learner groups (AU, FKF and SU) in the use of the Japanese DEMs; if it is possible to relate the learners’ use of the Japanese DEMs either to the use of DEM by native Japanese speakers or to the use of DEM in their native language; or if their use could be related to the teaching materials used. The hypothesis is that if the learners have learned the use of Japanese DEM, they would use Japanese DEMs as they are described in the textbooks. This means that the FKF and SU learners would use DEMs in a similar manner, while the AU learners might use them differently. If there was any influence of the respective native languages (cross-linguistic influence), the learners’ use would show some similarity to the native use of DEMs. This also means that the Finnish-speaking learners, AU and FKF groups, might show similarities regarding the usage rate and the types of DEM used for each situation, contrasted with the Swedish-speaking, SU learners. The chapter starts with a description of the data used in Study 2 and how the data was analyzed (Section 7.1 and 7.2). The results are presented in Section 7.3.

7.1. Learner data analyzed in Study 2

Of the 20 tasks used for native speaker informants, seven tasks, including one exercise and one filler, were used in the study of the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs. The results from the five tasks were used in the analysis. The five tasks are: B2 ‘dog’s name,’ B4 ‘cake,’ C1 ‘monkey,’ C2 ‘dish,’ C3 ‘TV program.’ Table 7-1 shows the descriptions of these tasks. The pictures used to elicit data are shown in Appendix 1. The exercise and the filler used in Study 2 were also taken from the tasks used in Study 1. Hence, of the five tasks, two were to prompt the use of the medial so-series in Japanese (Category B). The other three are the tasks where the choice between ko-, so-, and a-series was expected to vary individually (Category C).

---

109 The AU learners use Elävää Japania I (2011) and the FKF and SU learners use Shokyū nihongo genki I (2011). Hereafter, Shokyū nihongo genki I is shortened to Genki I.
The selection of the five tasks (situations) was based on two criteria. First, as this dissertation project started off with the author’s interests in the learners’ confusion regarding the use of the *so*-series and *a*-series (Section 1.1), it was planned to include situations in which the use of the *so*-series was expected (Category B). Second, it was also planned to include situations in which the usage rate and the choice of DEM differ considerably between the three languages in Study 1. Thus the selection of tasks used in Study 2 was made after the preliminary analysis of the L1 data. The results of Study 1 showed that B2, B4 and all the tasks in Category C were such tasks. The situations in Category A, that is, tasks designed to prompt the use of the proximal *ko*-series were not included in Study 2 because the preliminary examination of L1 data of Japanese, Finnish and Swedish showed that the conditions for the use of proximal demonstratives seemed to be quite similar between these languages. Among the situations used in Category C, Situations/tasks C1–C3 were considered to provide a common basis for a comparison, as the spatial relations between the speaker, the addressee and the referent given in these situations were the same. These were included in Study 2.

When completing the DCTs, the instructions and the descriptions of each situation were given in the informants’ native language, but the informants were instructed to answer in Japanese, using either the Japanese script *hiragana* or the Latin alphabet. Each task contained an instruction, a description of the scenario and a picture to prompt the informants to use expressions suitable to the given situation. The instructions and description of the situations used in the five tasks are presented in Table 7-1. (See appendix 1 for the pictures.) The situations shown in Table 7-1 are presented by category, not in the order they appeared in the DCT. Answers were to be given in written form: handwritten or by using computers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Given situation/instruction</th>
<th>Expected use of DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Dog’s name</td>
<td>Ask the name of the dog beside which the addressee (the person in the picture) is standing.</td>
<td><em>so</em>-series/ non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>Cake</td>
<td>You are the boy in the picture. You want to buy one of the cakes that the man is holding. How do you express this?</td>
<td><em>so</em>-series/ non-proximal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Monkey</td>
<td>You are the person on the left. Comment that a monkey on the TV is funny.</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) the name of the dish shown on the TV.</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>TV program</td>
<td>You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) what he is watching on the TV.</td>
<td>not given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-1 Intended referent, the instruction given and the expected use of DEM
7.2. Analysis of the learners data

7.2.1. Procedure

L2 data were collected from Finnish-speaking informants at Aalto University (AU) and Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan (FKF), and Swedish-speaking informants from Stockholm University (SU). These three sets of data were analyzed separately, that is, per institution, to see whether there were differences caused not only by the native languages but also by how Japanese was taught.

The analyses of L2 data, the learner informants’ use of Japanese demonstratives (marked +DEM) and non-use of Japanese demonstratives (i.e., non-DEM, marked –DEM) for the intended referents were examined to begin with, and if DEMs were used, which DEMs, ko-, so- and a-series were used. If the expressions the informants used were appropriate in the given discourse context but did not refer to any particular referent, they were included in the analysis, but regarded as non-use of DEM. The learners’ use of DEMs were then analyzed in terms of how DEMs are explained in the teaching materials and how DEMs were used by the native Japanese speakers and the native speakers of the learners’ respective languages (shown in Study 1). As my focus was on the use of DEM, the non-use of DEM is accounted for only briefly.

As was the case in the analysis of the native data, if the informants did not follow instructions, their answers were excluded from the analysis. For instance, there was an informant who used Kore desu. Dōzo (AU13) ‘This one, here you go,’ in Situation B4; this was excluded since it was deemed that the informant acted as the shopkeeper, not the customer as instructed. On the other hand, answers with errors related to particles or conjugation of verbs were included in the analysis, unless they were deemed to influence the interpretation of the DEM used. Answers with orthographical errors were also included in the analysis unless they were deemed to influence the choice of DEM. For instance, the use of すの (犬) sono inu, instead of その (犬) sono inu was included in the analysis. If one informant could not decide which DEM to use and chose to use several different DEMs in the answer, the one first mentioned was regarded as her choice.

7.3. Results

In the following sections, a description of when DEMs were used and/or not used by the learners is given and discussed (7.3.1). Then, types of demonstratives (i.e., ko-, so-, a-) used in the situations (B2, B4, C1, C2 and C3) if DEM was used to refer to the intended referent, are presented and discussed.
(7.3.2). The learners’ results are contrasted to the way in which DEMs are presented in their textbooks, used by the Japanese informants (JP) and used by the learners’ respective native informants.

### 7.3.1. Usage rate

If the learners have learned the use of Japanese DEM, the usage rate would be higher than the rates shown by the speakers of the respective native languages. If the learners’ native language had any influence on the use of Japanese DEMs, the usage rate scored by the AU and FKF learners might be higher than the rate scored by the SU learners. Table 7-2 shows the number of cases included in the study; the number of cases in which DEMs were used (marked +DEM) and not used (marked –DEM) by the learners. These usage rates are contrasted with the JP informants’ data. The DEM usage rates for each situation and language are also plotted in the graph shown in Figure 7-1.

Table 7-2 Number of DEMs used in Situations B2, B4, C1, C2 and C3 per learners’ school, compared with JP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B4</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+DEM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–DEM</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-2 and Figure 7-1 show that the DEM usage rates scored by the learner groups were in general lower than the usage rates scored by JP informants. They also show that one of the two Finnish-speaking learner groups, the FKF learners, scored generally higher usage rates than the AU and the SU learners, and that AU learners scored generally the lowest (except for Situation C3). The DEM usage rate scored by the SU learners varied and it was the highest for situation B4, but the lowest for Situation C3. Table 7-2 also shows that the AU learners used more –DEM than +DEM for four situations out of five; for the SU group, it was three situations out of five and for the FKF group, two situations out of five. Thus the FKF informants used DEMs more often than the AU informants.

Figure 7-1 shows that generally, the relative order of the different situations regarding how often a DEM was used within the two Categories B and C was the same in all learner groups. For example, in Category B, the usage rate scored in Situation B4 was higher than the rate scored in Situation B2, and in Category C, the highest usage rate was scored in Situation C2 and the lowest was scored in Situation C3. Among all five tasks, the highest usage rate was scored in Situation C2 by all the groups. The learners’ DEM usage rates for each situation plotted in Figure 7-1 also shows that while the Finnish learner groups show similar curves, the Swedish learner group shows a different curve.

However, the two Finnish groups used DEMs to a different degree. One possible explanation of these differences is the teaching materials used in AU and FKF respectively. FKF follows the same syllabus as SU, but AU
has its own. Another possibility is the linguistic environment where the learners reside, that is, whether it is linguistically more or less homogeneous. Juvonen (1996) argues that Finnish-Swedish bilingual speakers’ tendency to use more demonstratives to express definiteness in Swedish compared to Swedish monolingual speakers can be interpreted as overgeneralization in the language-contact situation, that is to say, the linguistically heterogenous situation. Our Finnish-speaking informants (learner informants and native speaker informants) all have Finnish as their L1, and their proficiency in other languages is not known. However, in terms of language contact, the environment where the FKF learners study Japanese is likely to be less homogeneous than the environment where the AU learners study Japanese, considering that Swedish is also used at FKF to teach Japanese.

**Comparison of usage rates by learners and native speakers**

Study 1 has shown that the overall DEM usage rates scored by the JP informants in the 12 situations were, in general, highest among the native informants groups. The usage rates scored by the SW informants, on the other hand, were the lowest. This observation is clearly shown in the four of five situations used in Study 2 (B2, B4, C1 and C3 in Figure 7-2). It was argued that the low DEM usage rate in the SW data could be explained by the frequent use of NP with determiner and complement, especially NP with definite articles, and/or personal pronouns.

![Figure 7-2 DEM usage rates scored by the JP, FI and SW informants in Situations B2, B4, C1, C2, C3.](image)

To see a possible influence of the learners’ native language and the target language on the learners’ DEM usage rate, the rates scored by the learners were compared with the rates scored by the respective native speakers and the JP informants. See Figure 7-3 and Figure 7-4.
Figure 7-3 DEM usage rates by the AU and FKF informants compared with the usage rates by the JP and FI informants.

Figure 7-4 DEM usage rates by the SU informants compared with the usage rates by the JP and SW informants.

Figure 7-3 shows that the usage rates scored by the FKF learners were in general higher than the rates scored by the FI informants, but the rates scored by the AU learners were lower. Figure 7-4 shows that the usage rates scored by the SU learners were higher than the rates scored by the SW informants. The usage rates scored by the JP informants were in general the highest in all the groups, and the FKF and the SU learners showed that their use of DEMs in this respect is more target-like than native-like. This may
suggest an influence from the target language. However, as the AU learners often scored lower usage rates than the FI informants, the learners’ usage rate can be independent of both the target language and the native language. The lines plotted for the AU and the FKF learners’ usage rates show similar patterns, and the curve plotted for the SU learners’ usage rate shows a different pattern. The curve plotted for the SU learners’ usage rate is similar to that of the JP informants. We find here that there are differences in the patterns plotted for the usage rates between the language groups, but not between the institutions. The differences between the institutions were found in the usage rates, and a difference was found within the same language group, Finnish.

7.3.2. Types of DEM used in Situations B2, B4, C1, C2 and C3

Table 7-3 shows a detailed breakdown of the DEM used for each situation by the learner and the JP informants, that is, the types of DEM (ko-, so-, a-series) in use, and whether they were in pronominal or adnominal constructions.
Table 7-3 Number and ratio of ko-, so-, a- used by the learners and the JP informants for Situations B2, B4, C1, C2 and C3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B2 “Dog’s name”</th>
<th>B4 “Cake”</th>
<th>C1 “Monkey”</th>
<th>C2 “Dish”</th>
<th>C3 “TV program”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>pronom 0 (27)</td>
<td>pronom 8</td>
<td>pronom 68</td>
<td>pronom 63</td>
<td>pronom 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 3 (60)</td>
<td>pronom 3</td>
<td>pronom 178</td>
<td>pronom 26</td>
<td>pronom 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>pronom 18 (40)</td>
<td>pronom 65</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 21 (72)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 2</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 17 (19)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 2</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>pronom 3 (33)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 6 (67)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 6</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FKT</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>pronom 4 (29)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 3</td>
<td>pronom 6</td>
<td>pronom 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 17 (94)</td>
<td>pronom 6</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SU</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
<th>n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>pronom 3 (16)</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
<td>pronom 3</td>
<td>pronom 4</td>
<td>pronom 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 10 (90)</td>
<td>pronom 10</td>
<td>pronom 10</td>
<td>pronom 10</td>
<td>pronom 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronom 0 (0)</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 0</td>
<td>pronom 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: pronom = pronominal DEM, adn = adnominal DEM

The expected use for Situations B2 and B4 was the [±PROX] so-series since the speaker was to refer to an object located proximal to the addressee. For Situations C1–C3, no particular predictions were made beforehand, but the spatial relations between the speaker, the addressee and the referent were that the speaker and the addressee were sitting side by side and the distance of the referent from the speaker and the learner was non-proximal.

If the learners have learned Japanese DEMs as they are explained in the textbooks, they would use the so-series for Situations B2 and B4. If the learners’ native language had any influence on the use of Japanese DEMs, their use might not be restricted to the [±PROX] so-series, and the [–PROX] a-series might also be used for these situations. As for Situations C1–C3, no particular predictions were made based on the spatial relations of the speaker, the addressee and the referent given in the scenario. However, if the learners’ native language had any influence on their use of Japanese DEMs, the Finnish-speaking learners might mostly use the[–PROX] a-series for Situations C1 and C2, and they might mostly use the [±PROX] ko-series for Situation...
C3, since the FI informants used [-PROX] DEM for Situations C1 and C2, and [+PROX] DEM for Situation C3. They might also use the [+PROX] ko-series for Situations C1 and C2, the [±PROX] so-series for Situation C3. The [±PROX] so-series might be used also for Situation C1, but less often. Further, the [-PROX] a-series might be used for Situation C3, but less likely for Situation C2. As for the Swedish-speaking learners, they might use the [-PROX] a-series mostly for Situations C1 and C2, and they might use mostly the proximal ko-series for Situation C3. They might also use the [+PROX] ko-series for Situations C1 and C2, and the [-PROX] a-series for Situation C3 as well but less in number, since the SW informants used mostly [-PROX] DEM but less [+PROX] DEM for Situations C1 and C2, and they used mostly [+PROX] DEM but less [-PROX] DEM for Situation C3.

Table 7-3 shows that the types of DEMs used for Situations B2, C1 and C2 differ from the learner informants and the JP informants. For Situation B2, while use of the [±PROX] so-series was most frequent in the learner groups, use of the [+PROX] ko-series was most frequent in the JP group. For Situations C1 and C2, while use of the [-PROX] a-series was most frequent in the learner groups, use of the [+PROX] ko-series was most frequent in the JP group. Further, in Situation C3, even though use of the [+PROX] ko-series was most frequent in all the groups, the table shows that use of a pronominal construction was most frequent in the JP informant group, while use of an adnominal construction was most frequent in the learner groups.

In Sections 7.3.3–7.3.7, the types of Japanese DEM, ko-, so- and a-series used by the learners for each situation are presented and discussed in comparison with the descriptions given in the learners' textbooks and the native use of DEM shown in Study 1. The types of expressions other than DEM that the learners used instead of DEM (non-DEM) are also stated here.

7.3.3. Situation B2

General
The expected use was the [±PROX] so-series. Figure 7-5 below shows that the learner informants mostly used the so-series and then the [+PROX] ko-series. There was also one case of the [-PROX] a-series found in the FKF data, but not in the AU or SU data.
When the learner informants did not use DEM, they often used the noun *inu* ‘dog’ to refer to the dog, without any determiner or attribute, as in *inu no namee wa nandesuka* ‘what is the name of dog?’ The noun *inu* ‘dog’ was otherwise used with a possessive *anata no* ‘your’ as in *anata no inu (no namee)* ‘(name of) your dog,’ and/or with an attribute *kawaī* ‘cute’ as in *kawaī inu* ‘cute dog.’ If *kawaī inu* ‘cute dog’ was used, it was used together with an interjection *A!* ‘Oh!’, and this action of giving a comment on the dog can be interpreted as a strategy to initiate a conversation with the addressee. The name of the dog was then asked with a noun *namee* ‘name’ without any determiner or attribute.

**Types of DEMs used in comparison with the textbooks**

As expected, use of the [±PROX] so-series was most frequent in all the learner data. In the learners’ textbooks, the so-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee (*Genki I* and *Elävää japania 1*) and a certain distance of the referent (including a psychological distance), adjacent, but neither close nor far, to the speaker (*Elävää japania 1*).\(^{110}\) The so-series was basically used by the learners only adnominally (sono) together with a head noun, typically *inu* ‘dog,’ to refer to the dog that the addressee was accompanying.\(^{111}\) A typical use of DEM for Situation B2 by the learner informants is shown in Example 7-1.

\(^{110}\) We may call the distance described in *Elävää japania 1* as medial.

\(^{111}\) There was one case of pronominal *sore* found in the AU data. However, this *sore* was placed before a noun *inu* ‘dog’ as in *sore inu*, i.e., syntactically adnominal position, so it was regarded as adnominal DEM.
In the given situation, the location of the dog (the referent) was proximal to the addressee and there was a certain distance between the speaker and the dog. In the learners’ textbooks, the use of the so-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee (Genki I and Elävää japania I) and a certain distance (i.e., medial, including a psychological distance) of the referent to the speaker (Elävää japania I). The learners’ use of the so-series for this situation can be analyzed accordingly, based on the explanation given in the textbooks.

There were some uses of the [+PROX] ko-series found in all the learner groups. The ko-series was used only adnominally (kono) together with a head noun, typically inu ‘dog’ to refer to the dog.

In the learners’ textbooks Elävää japania I and Genki I, the ko-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the speaker. In Elävää japania I, which the AU learners use, the ko-series is further explained as referring to a thing that the speaker feels close to (psychological proximity). That the ko-series can indicate psychological proximity is not stated explicitly in Genki I, which the FKF and SU learners use. Considering the location of the referent in relation to the speaker (non-proximal), the learners’ use of the ko-series for this situation seemed not to be based on the actual spatial distance. While the use of the ko-series by the AU learners might be explained in terms of their textbook that mentions psychological proximity, the use by the FKF and SU learners cannot be explained in terms of the explanation given in the textbook.

One case of the [−PROX] a-series was found in the FKF data, used adnominally together with a head noun inu ‘dog’ to refer to the dog (Example 7-3).
Example 7-3 FKF11

あの 犬の 名前は 何ですか。

ANO dog GEN name TOP what COP:POL-Q

‘What is the name of that dog?’

In *Genki I*, the *a*-series is explained as to refer to a thing that is neither close to the speaker nor to the listener, and far from both. Since the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee in the given situation is proximal, the use of the *a*-series contradicts the given situation. However, since the use of the *a*-series is translated as “that one over there” in *Genki I*, the *a*-series could be understood to refer to a thing located distant only from the speaker.

**Comparison with the native data**

The learners’ use of DEM for this situation was compared with the native informants’ use of DEM. Figure 7-6 shows a comparison between the Finnish-speaking learners, the FI informants and the JP informants regarding the use of DEM for this situation. Figure 7-7 shows a comparison between the Swedish-speaking learners, the SW informants and the JP informants regarding the use of DEM for this situation.

![Figure 7-6 Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation B2.](image-url)
The comparison showed that the ratio of the [±PROX] so-series scored by the Finnish-speaking learners’ was higher than the ratio of the [±PROX] se-series scored by the FI informants and their usage patterns of the [±PROX] DEM were therefore, different. It is difficult to compare the Swedish-speaking learners with the SW informants in terms of the usage rate of [±PROX] DEM since there is no [±PROX] DEM in Swedish. If we allow Swedish [–PROX] den här used for this situations to be used for <±PROX>, the ratio of the [±PROX] so-series scored by the SU learners was higher than the ratio of the native use of [–PROX] den där. Even if we do not allow Swedish [–PROX] den här to have a semantic of ±PROX (i.e., allow only a semantic of – PROX), since the SU learners did not use the [–PROX] a-series for this situation, we find here that the SU learners’ usage pattern of Japanese [±PROX] DEM was different from Swedish [–PROX] DEM.

As seen, the learners scored a high usage rate of the so-series; in fact, the ratio scored by the learners was higher than the ratio scored by the JP informants. The actual use of so-series by the JP informants was analyzed as being based on the spatial relation between the referent and the addressee, indicating a proximity of the referent to the addressee, just as it is described in the learners’ textbooks. As the use of the so-series was expected in this situation, the frequent use of the so-series by the learners was just as expected. Interestingly, the results showed that the JP informants used more ko-series than the expected so-series for this situation. The high usage rate of the so-series by the learners might indicate that the learners used the so-series as it is explained in the textbooks. Further, while the learner informants used basically only adnominal sono, the JP informants used both pronominal sore and adnominal sono. In the textbooks Genki I and Elävää japania I, the difference between adnominal and pronominal DEM is explained in terms of whether they have a head noun (adnominal DEM) or not (pronominal DEM). Considering that pronominal DEM (kore, sore are) is
otherwise described to refer to a thing (i.e., inanimate) in both *Genki I* and *Elävää Japania I,* the learner informants might not know that *sore* could be used for an animate referent. This also seems to indicate that the learners used the *so*-series (i.e., *sono*) as they were taught. The actual use of DEM by the JP informants, on the other hand, turned out to be different from how it is described in the textbooks.

The learners’ use of DEMs was further compared with the native use of the corresponding DEMs in their respective languages. As for the AU and FKF learners’ use of the Japanese *[±PROX]* *so*-series and the FI informants’ use of the *[±PROX]* *se*-series, they were analyzed as being based on the spatial relations between the referent and the addressee, indicating that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere (i.e., the point of reference was the addressee). The similarity found in the semantic interpretation of the *so*-series and *se*-series here may indicate that the AU and FKF learners’ use of the *so*-series can be related to the use of the *se*-series. However, considering that the usage rates of the *so*-series by these two Finnish-speaking learner groups were much higher than the usage rates of the Finnish *se*-series, the influence of the native language remains uncertain.

As for the SU learners’ use of the *[±PROX]* *so*-series, since Swedish does not have *[±PROX]* DEM, this use was compared with non-proximal *[–PROX]* *den där* used by the SW informants. As shown in Figure 7-7, the SU learners’ use of the *so*-series was much more frequent than the SW informants’ use of *den där.* Further, the analysis suggested that the use of *där,* *den där* indicated basically the speaker’s exclusion of the referent from her current sphere. It is therefore rather difficult to relate the use of the *so*-series by the SU learners to the use of *där,* *den där.* This may suggest that it was the target language, specifically the instruction of the target language, that had an influence on the SU learners’ use of the *so*-series.

As for the use of the *[+PROX]* *ko*-series by the learners, the number of uses was quite limited, but it was found in all the learner groups. While the description of the *ko*-series given in *Elävää Japania I* (psychological proximity) might explain the AU learners’ use of this series, the description given in *Genki I* (spatial proximity) does not seem to account for the FKF and SU learners’ use of the *ko*-series. However, *[+PROX]* DEMs were found in all the three native data for this situation, and this use seemed to be associated with the psychological proximity of the referent. Thus the learners’ use of the *ko*-series might be explained in terms of the use of *[+PROX]* DEMs in their respective native languages.

As for the use of the *[–PROX]* *a*-series, one use was found in the FKF data. As the speaker was supposed to refer to the dog (the referent) located close to the addressee in this situation, the use of the *a*-series that excludes the referent from the addressee was inappropriate. The *a*-series was not used by

---

112 *Genki I* uses the word *thing* and *Elävää Japania I* uses the word *esine* ‘thing.’
the JP informants. As for Finnish, we found in Study 1 that the use of the [–PROX] tuo-series was analyzed to be based on the physical distance of the referent to the speaker, indicating the exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, possibly also from the addressee. There is therefore a possibility that the FKF learner used the Japanese [–PROX] a-series according to inference from the use of [–PROX] DEMs in the native language. However, the a-series was not used by the AU learners; thus there was no evidence of native language influence. The learners’ use of the a-series where the use of the so-series was expected has been observed elsewhere by the author and reported by other researchers, for example Sakoda (2001). Thus this seems to be a common characteristics of the interlanguage observed among the learners of Japanese.

Above, it has been shown that the learners, irrespective of their languages and institutions, used the [±PROX] so-series for this situation as it is explained in the textbooks, with some minor discrepancies. It was also suggested that the learners’ use of DEM might to some extent be influenced by their native languages. However, the most influential factor in the learners’ use seemed to be the target language’s grammar as explained in the textbooks.

7.3.4. Situation B4

General

Situation B4 deals with a shopping situation in which a customer has to point out an object located beside the shopkeeper (addressee). Thus the expected use was the so-series. A shopping situation is often used to describe the functions of the ko-so-a series and it is found in Genki I but not in Elävää jaapania I. Table 7-3 in Section 7.3.2 and Figure 7-8 show that when DEMs were used, mostly the so-series was used by the learner informants. The use of the a-series was also observed in all the learner groups. The use of the ko-series was not observed in the AU and FKF data, but it was observed in the SU data.
The expressions other than DEM used by the learner informants varied between the institutions. However, there was one common expression found in all the learner groups. It was mafin/kēki o hitotsu/ikko kudasai, which is translated into ‘please give me one muffin/cake.’ In this expression, a noun, mafin ‘muffin’ or kēki ‘cake’ (and also other similar nouns) without any attribute or determiner, was used in the position of the direct object of the verb kudasai ‘(please) give me,’ accompanied by a numeral (counter), hitotsu ‘one’ or ikko ‘one.’ The numeral here was used as an adverbial to modify the verb kudasai ‘(please) give me.’ There were also some cases in the AU data in which a cardinal number ichi ‘one’ was used as a determiner, but this use is not standard according to Japanese grammar. In the FKF data, the numeral ikko ‘one’ was also used alone with the verb kudasai ‘(please) give me’ as in ikko kudasai ‘give me one, please,’ that is to say, without having an overt object in the sentence. Among the SU data, besides the use of the numerals hitotsu or ikko ‘one’ as adverbials, the use of a bare noun ‘cake’ (and similar words) alone was also found. In kēki o kudasai, the noun ‘cake’ (the referent) was given, but the quantity was not given. The referent was not specified either.

**Types of DEMs used in comparison with the textbooks**

Figure 7-8 shows that, when DEMs were used for this situation, the \[\pm\text{PROX}\] so-series was mostly used in all the learner groups. The use of the so-series for this situation was as expected and as explained in the textbooks. The use of the \[\pm\text{PROX}\] ko-series was limited but also observed in all the learner groups.

\[\text{Figure 7-8 Ratio of } ko, so, a \text{ used by the learner groups (AU, FKF, SU) in Situation B4. Number of occurrences is stated in the graphs.}\]

For example, in ichi mafin onegai ‘one muffin, please’, ichi ‘one’ is a cardinal number, not showing a quantity.
groups. Further, there was one case of the \[-\text{PROX}\] \text{a-series} observed in the SU data.

The most frequently used \text{so-series} was often used adnominally (\textit{sono}) together with a head noun, a word for muffin and/or cake to refer to the cake on the tray that the shopkeeper (the addressee) was holding (Example 7-4). The use of pronominal \textit{sore} was also found in all groups, although the number of \textit{sore} found in the AU data was rather limited (Example 7-5). The pronominal \textit{sore} was used to refer to the cake.

Example 7-4 FKF14 and others

その マフィン/ケーキを (一つ) ください。
sono mafin/kēki o (hitotsu) kudasai.

‘That muffin/cake, please give me one.’

Example 7-5 SU7 and others

それを ください。
sore o kudasai.

‘Please give me that one.’

According to the learners’ textbooks, use of the \text{so-series} indicates a proximity of the referent to the addressee (\textit{Genki I} and \textit{Elävää japania I}) and a certain distance (i.e., medial, including a psychological distance) of the referent to the speaker (\textit{Elävää japania I}). In \textit{Genki I}, a sentence pattern, \textit{sono N o kudasai} ‘give me \textit{sono} \text{N}’ (I’ll take \textit{sono} \text{N}), is presented in a dialogue for a shopping situation. Thus in this situation the learners’ uses of the \text{so-series} were reasonable since it was used as explicitly explained in the textbooks.

The second most used \text{DEM} by the learners was the \[-\text{PROX}\] \text{a-series}. The number of uses was quite limited but it was found in all the learner groups. Most of the uses were adnominal \textit{ano}, used together with a head noun \textit{mafín} ‘muffin’ (Example 7-6); one pronominal \textit{are} was found in the SU data (Example 7-7).

Example 7-6 SU56

？あの 持っている クッキーを お願いします。
?ano motte-iru kūkī o onegai-shimasu.

‘That cookie you are holding, please.’
All a-series used by the learners for this situation referred to the cake. In Elävää Japania I, use of the a-series is described as indicating a thing (both concrete and abstract) which is distant/remote from the speaker, and in Genki I, it is described as indicating the non-proximity (remoteness) of the referent to both the speaker and the addressee. Considering the spatial relations between the speaker, the addressee and the referent given in the situation (in which the referent was located proximal to the addressee), the FKF and SU learners’ use of the a-series that indicates non-proximity of the referent to the addressee contradicts the textbook explanation. One exception, however, was found in the SU data (SU37) when the addressee was the speaker’s mother, not the shopkeeper (Example 7-8). In this example, the a-series was used to refer to the cookie (cake) which was remote from both the speaker and the addressee. This use of the a-series is in accordance with the description of the a-series given in Genki I, but it did not fit the given scenario because originally, the intended addressee was the shopkeeper, not the mother.

Since the a-series is translated as ‘that one over there’ in Genki I, it could be understood to refer to a thing located distant only from the speaker.

As for the use of the [+PROX] ko-series, only one case was found in the SU data, an adnominal kono, used together with a head noun kéki ‘cake’ (Example 7-9).
tance between the speaker and the referent shown in the given situation (non-proximal), the SU learners’ use of the *ko*-series is hardly motivated by the way the semantics of the *ko*-series is described in the textbook.

**Comparison with the native data**

Figure 7-9 shows a comparison between the Finnish-speaking learners, the FI informants and the JP informants regarding the use of DEMs for this situation. Figure 7-10 shows a comparison between the Swedish-speaking learners, the SW informants and the JP informants regarding the use of DEMs for this situation.

![Figure 7-9: Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation B4.](image-url)

Figure 7-9 Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation B4.
As seen in the figures, the usage patterns of DEM shown by the learners were quite similar to the patterns shown by the JP informants. As for the Finnish-speaking learners’ usage patterns, they are different from those shown by the native informants. As was the case in Situation B2, the Finnish-speaking learners’ use of the [+PROX] so-series for this situation was more frequent than the FI informants’ use of the [+PROX] se-series. As for the Swedish-speaking learners’ use of the [+PROX] so-series, as was also the case in Situation B2, it is difficult to compare the Swedish-speaking learners with the SW informants in terms of the usage rate of [+PROX] DEM since there is no [+PROX] DEM in Swedish. If we allow Swedish [–PROX] den där used for this situation to be used for <±PROX>, the usage patterns shown by the SU learners and the SW informants are quite alike since the ratio of the [+PROX] so-series scored by the SU learners and the ratio of [–PROX] den där scored by the SW informants were both high. If we do not allow Swedish [–PROX] den där to have a semantic of ±PROX (i.e., allow only a semantic of [–PROX]), the usage patterns shown by these two groups turn out to be different. That is, even though the SU learners used the [–PROX] a-series for this situation, the usage rate was much low compared to the SW informants’ usage rate of [–PROX] den där, together with the usage rate of [–PROX] den N-n, which was very high (100%). At any rate, the learners’ use of the so-series was slightly frequent than the JP informants’ use of the so-series. As for the use of the a-series, although it was observed in both the JP data and the learner data, the native use of a-series was shown to be caused by misinterpretation of the addressee; the JP informants were actually not likely to use a-series here. The JP informants also used the [+PROX] ko-series for this situation, while in the learners’ data the use of the ko-series was scarce.
The use of the [+PROX] so-series by the learners was compared with the FI informants’ use of the [+PROX] se-series and the SW informants’ use of [-PROX] den där. In Situation B2, the AU and FKF learners’ use of the so-series were analyzed as indicating that the native language influence was small. In this situation (B4), as the use of so-series was expected for this situation, the usage rate scored in the Finnish-speaking learners’ data was high (higher than the rates scored in the JP data). The Finnish native use of se-series for this situation on the other hand, was quite low and this seems to indicate that the learners used the so-series as it is explained in the textbooks; no native language influence was apparent. When it concerns the SU informants’ use of [+PROX] so-series and the SW informants’ use of [-PROX] den där, an influence of the native language on the use of target language can be established, but only when we allow den där to have a semantic of ±PROX. Otherwise no native language influence was apparent.

As for the [-PROX] DEM used by the native informants, the use was observed in all the native data. However, as stated, the JP informants’ use of the a-series indicated a change (misinterpretation) of the intended addressee (instead of addressing the shopkeeper, they addressed the mother). In one learner case (SU37) in which the a-series was used to refer to the cake, having another person than the intended one as the addressee, the use matched the scenario. In the native Finnish data, the [-PROX] tuo-series was observed for this situation. Considering that the usage rate of the [-PROX] a-series in the Finnish-speaking learners’ data was much lower than the usage rate of the [-PROX] tuo-series, the native language influence may only play a marginal role in the learners’ use. Regarding Swedish [-PROX] där, den där, as was the case of the [-PROX] DEM in Finnish, they were also used in the native data irrespective of the actual distance. The learners could have therefore used the Japanese a-series by applying the same rules. However, since the usage rate of the a-series shown in the Swedish-speaking learner data for this situation was limited, it is difficult to show how the learners’ use of the Japanese a-series could be related to Swedish. As seen, it is difficult to relate the learners’ use of the a-series to their respective native languages, but influence from the native languages cannot be excluded.

As for the learners’ use of the [+PROX] ko-series, there was only one case observed in the SU data. Among the JP informants, the use of the ko-series was not as frequent as in Situation B2, but some uses were observed for this situation. In Study 1, the JP informants’ use of the ko-series was analyzed as indicating a inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, not necessarily based on physical proximity, but it could be related to psychological proximity. The physical and psychological proximity indicated by the ko-series is explained in Elävää japania I. In Genki I, on the other hand, psychological proximity is not mentioned. Considering the distance between the speaker and the referent shown in the given situation (non-proximal), the SU learners’
use of the ko-series cannot be explained in terms of spatial proximity. The native data showed that Swedish [+PROX] DEM could be used rather freely irrespective of the actual physical distance (as we have seen in Situation B2), and even though [+PROX] DEM was not used for this Situation (B4), the learners’ use of the ko-series might be explained in terms of the use of [+PROX] DEMs in the native languages. However, as there is only one example, the influence of the native language remains uncertain. This might also simply be an example of production error as there is only a single example of its use in the data.

To sum up, the learners, irrespective of their languages and institutions, seemed to use the [+PROX] so-series for this situation as explained in the textbooks. The learners’ use of the [-PROX] a-series turned out not to be target-like. This use could be partly related to the description or translation of the a-series given in the textbook, and it could also be related to the use of [-PROX] DEMs in the respective native languages. However, the influence of the native language on the learners’ use of the a-series seemed to be marginal. As for the learners’ use of the ko-series, there was only one case found in the SU data, and this use can hardly be explained in terms of the spatial relation given in the scenario. Neither could it be explained by native language influence. The most influential factor in the learners’ use seemed to be the target-language grammar as explained in the textbooks.

7.3.5. Situation C1

General

No particular predictions were made regarding the choice of DEM, since the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location in the given situations. Considering the physical distance involved in watching TV, the spatial location of the TV (and thereby also the monkey shown on the TV) was not immediately proximal to the speaker or the addressee; it was rather non-proximal. However, as Diessel (2012b) states, the distance in this context is a relative distance of the referent to the deictic center, not an absolute one. Depending on how the deictic center is conceptualized, the distance can be thought of as proximal.

Study 1 showed that the JP informants used the [+PROX] ko-series most frequently for this situation. The use of the [-PROX] a-series was also observed, but not of the [-PROX] so-series. Figure 7-11 below shows that when DEMs were used, the a-series was used mostly by the learners. The use of the so-series was also frequent in the AU and the SU data, which was followed by the use of the ko-series. In the FKF data, the usage rate of the so-series and ko-series was the same.
When the learner groups did not use DEM, they often used the noun *saru* ‘monkey’ at the place of the subject without any determiner or attribute. In this construction, an adjective *omoshiroi* ‘funny’ was often used as the predicate, such as in *saru wa omoshiroi* ‘the monkey is funny.’ The learners also used the noun *saru* ‘monkey’ together with the predicative adjective *omoshiroi* ‘funny’, *tanoshī* ‘amusing’ and *hen-na* ‘funny/strange,’ as in *omoshiroi/tanoshī/hen-na saru* ‘funny/amusing/strange monkey.’ These phrases were used as predicatives, without the subjects explicitly stated. In these constructions, the subjects were assumed to be understood.

**Types of DEMs used in comparison with the textbooks**

As briefly mentioned, the learners used the [–PROX] *a*-series most frequently. The frequent use of the *a*-series was followed by the use of the [±PROX] *so*-series. The number of [±PROX] *ko*-series was quite limited, but its use was observed in all the groups. The number of *so* and *ko*-series used was the same in the FKF data.

Most of the *a*-series were adnominal *ano*, used together with a head noun, typically *saru* ‘monkey,’ to refer to the monkey (Example 7-10), but there were also two cases (one in the AU and one in the FKF data) with pronominally used *are* (Example 7-11). Pronominally used *are* referred either to the monkey or to the monkey’s actions. The learners’ uses of the *a*-series for this situation were in accordance with the descriptions given in the textbooks (indicating the distance of the referent to the speaker [the AU learners] or both the speaker and the addressee [the FKF and SU learners]).
Example 7-10 SU67 and others

あのさる、おもしろいね。
*ano saru* omoshiroi-ne.
*ano monkey* funny-PTCL

‘That monkey is funny, isn’t he?’

Example 7-11 FKF29

あれ超面白い！
*are* chō-omoshiroi!
*are super-funny*

‘That is very funny!’

All uses of the \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) so-series were of the type adnominal *sono* together with the head noun *sarû ‘monkey’* to refer to the monkey (Example 7-12).

Example 7-12 SU51

そのさる、おもしろいね！
*sono saru* omoshiroi-ne!
*sono monkey* funny-PTCL

‘That monkey is funny, isn’t he!’

Based on the semantics of the \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) so-series explained in the learners’ textbook, the learners’ uses of the so-series for this situation seem to indicate the proximity of the referent (the monkey and/or its actions) to the addressee (the AU, FKF and SU learners), or a certain distance of the referent to the speaker (the AU learners). However, considering that the speaker and the addressee were sitting side by side at an equal distance from the referent, the physical distance of the referent to the addressee cannot alone account for the FKF and SU learners’ use of the so-series. On the other hand, the AU learners’ use of the so-series can be explained in terms of the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker (non-proximal) since their textbook *Elävää japania I* states that the use indicates a certain distance (including psychological distance) of the referent from the speaker. Further, *Elävää japania I* gives the \([-\text{PROX}]\) DEM tue-series, together with the \([\pm\text{PROX}]\) se-series as a corresponding DEM to the so-series, provided that the referent is proximal to the addressee.

All uses of the ko-series were adnominal *kono*, used together with the head noun *sarû ‘monkey’* to refer to the monkey shown on the TV (Example 7-13).
In the learners’ textbooks, the use of the *ko*-series is explained as indicating a spatial/physical proximity of the referent to the speaker (*Genki I* and *Elävää japania I*) and/or a psychological proximity of the referent to the speaker (*Elävää japania I*). In the given situation, the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location. However, considering the physical distance involved in watching TV normally, the spatial relation between the speaker and the referent was rather non-proximal than proximal. It is therefore difficult to explain the FKF and SU learners’ use of the *ko*-series for this situation in terms of physical proximity as described in their textbook. The AU learners’ use of the *ko*-series can, on the other hand, be explained in terms of a psychological proximity as stated in their textbook.

**Comparison with the native data**

Figure 7-12 shows a comparison between the Finnish-speaking learners, the FI learners and the JP informants regarding the use of DEMs for this situation and Figure 7-13 shows a comparison between the Swedish-speaking learners, the SW informants, and the JP informants regarding the use of DEMs for this situation.

---

**Figure 7-12** Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation C1.
The figures above show that the usage patterns of DEM by the learners differed from the patterns shown by the JP informants. On the other hand, the usage patterns of DEM particularly by the Finnish-speaking learners showed that their usage patterns were similar to their respective native data. That is, while the JP informants used mostly [+PROX] DEM for this situation, the learners and their respective native informants used mostly other DEMs. The result also showed that the learners used the [+PROX] so-series, while the JP informants did not.

The most frequently used [–PROX] a-series by the learners was compared with the [–PROX] DEM used by JP informants and the respective native informants. The JP informants’ use of the a-series indicated an exclusion of the referent from both the speaker’s and the addressee’s sphere, and thereby a remoteness of the referent. The textbooks used also explained this as common use. Hence, the learners’ use could be based on what they had learned. Note, however, that the usage rate of the a-series scored by the JP informants was much lower than the rates scored by the learners.

In a similar vein, the use of the [–PROX] tuo-series in the FI native data indicated an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere. Thus the Finnish-speaking learners’ use of the a-series could be related to the use of the tuo-series in their native language. Also in Swedish, [–PROX] där, den där indicate the remoteness of the referent in terms of exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere. The similarities found between the use of the a-series and the use of där, den där may suggest that the learners’ use could be related to their native language. The use of Swedish [–PROX] den N-def was analyzed as being used to point out the referent, irrespective of distance, and the use of the a-series by the SU informants seemed therefore to be independent of the use of den N-def.
As the usage rate of the \textit{a}-series scored by all learner informant groups was much higher than the usage rate scored by the native JP informants, we seem to have a case of overuse or overextension in the learners’ interlanguage.

The [±PROX \textit{so}-series was observed only in the learner data (in all the groups) and not in the JP data. According to the textbooks, the \textit{so}-series indicates proximity of the referent to the addressee (\textit{Genki I}, \textit{Elävää jpania I}) and a certain distance (including a psychological distance) of the referent to the speaker (\textit{Elävää jpania I}). As the proximity of the referent to the addressee was not the case in Situation C1, the textbook \textit{Genki I} used by the FKF and SU learners cannot be the source of this use. The textbook used by AU, \textit{Elävää jpania I}, however, allows the use of the \textit{so}-series in terms of the psychological proximity of the referent.

Use of the [±PROX \textit{so}-series by the learners was further compared with the native use of the \textit{so}-series, the Finnish [±PROX \textit{se}-series and Swedish [–PROX \textit{där}, \textit{den där}. As for the use of the \textit{so}-series by the Finnish-speaking learners and the use of the \textit{se}-series by the FI informants, although the semantics of the \textit{so-} and \textit{se}-series were basically the same as much as both indicate the proximity of the referent to the addressee, the result from Study 1 showed that the Finnish \textit{se}-series was actually used in a wider context.\textsuperscript{114}

Considering that the usage rate of the \textit{so}-series by the learner groups, especially among the AU and SU groups, was quite high and the JP informants was zero (not used), the AU and FKF learners could have used the Japanese \textit{so}-series analogously to the use of the \textit{se}-series in their native language, and the use of the \textit{so}-series could thus be explained by influence from the native language.

As for Swedish, since Swedish does not have [±PROX DEM, the use of the \textit{so}-series by the SU learners was compared with the native use of [–PROX \textit{där}, \textit{den där}. As mentioned, the interpretation of the SU learners \textit{so}-series, based on the description found in \textit{Genki I}, is to indicate a proximity of the referent to the addressee, and this did not match the given situation. The SW informants’ use of \textit{där}, \textit{den där} (and their variations) observed for this situation was analyzed as indicating an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s current sphere, not necessarily indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee. Considering that the semantics of \textit{där}, \textit{den där} does not exclude a possibility to indicate the proximity of the referent to the addressee, the SU learners’ use of the \textit{so}-series could be explained by how they would use \textit{där}, \textit{den där} in Swedish. That is, the SU learners’ use of the \textit{so}-series could be related to the native language; it may be an instance of applying the rules found in the native language to the target language (i.e., overgeneralization).

\textsuperscript{114} The Finnish \textit{se}-series was used for the situations in which the \textit{so}-series was not used.
Considering that the usage rate of the so-series by the learner groups was quite high (especially among the AU and SU groups) and the JP informants was zero (not used), even though the native use of the corresponding DEM was not very frequent, influence of the learners’ native language on the use of the so-series cannot be excluded.

As for the learners’ use of the [+PROX] ko-series, considering the spatial relation between the speaker and the referent shown in the given situation (non-proximal), the FKF and SU learners use of the ko-series cannot be explained in terms of the spatial-relations explanation given in Genki I. The AU learners use, on the other hand, could be explained in terms of psychological proximity of the referent. The native use of [+PROX] DEMs in the respective languages was analyzed as indicating an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, and thereby proximity despite the actual distance of the referent (non-proximal). This use was further analyzed as being extended to temporal and psychological proximity. The learners’ use of the [+PROX] ko-series that cannot be explained in terms of physical, spatial relations might also be explained in terms of temporal and psychological proximity analogous to their native use of [+PROX] DEMs. Thus the learners’ use of the ko-series might be explained by the use of [+PROX] DEMs in the native languages. Note, however, that the learners’ usage rate of the ko-series in all the learner groups was low, as was the usage rate of the corresponding DEMs in the native languages. The use of the ko-series by the JP informants, on the other hand, was high. This might suggest that the learners’ use of the ko-series was influenced more by their native languages.

Above, we have seen that the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs for this situation was quite different from the Japanese native informants’ use. The learners’ use showed certain similarities to the respective native speakers’ use. It has shown that the descriptions and/or explanation of Japanese DEMs given in the learners’ textbooks cannot always account for the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs, and it is suggested that it might be the learners’ native languages that had influenced their use of Japanese DEMs.

7.3.6. Situation C2

General
As was the case with Situation C1, no particular predictions were made regarding the use of DEMs, since the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location in the given situations. The distance of the referent to the speaker (and the addressee) was not immediately proximal. However, as the distance in this context is a relative distance of the referent to the deictic center, and not an absolute one, depending on how the deictic center is conceptualized, the distance can be thought of as proximal.
Study 1 showed that the JP informants used the [+PROX] ko-series most frequently for this situation. They used the [−PROX] a-series quite frequently as well, but they did not use the [+PROX] so-series at all. Figure 7-14 below shows that when DEMs were used by the learners, the a-series was used mostly, irrespective of the languages and the institutions. Use of the so-series was also frequent among all the learner groups, which was followed by the use of the ko-series.

![Figure 7-14 Ratio of ko, so, a used by the learner groups (AU, FKF, SU) in Situation C2. Number of occurrences is stated in the graphs.](image)

The expressions other than DEM used by the learners were quite similar between the AU and FKF groups. They often used the noun tabemono/ryōri ‘dish’ with a determiner TV no (literally meaning ‘TV’s’) to refer to the dish, as in TV no tabemono/ryōri ‘dish on the TV.’ This noun phrase was used as the subject and followed by the predicative, which contains an interrogative, nani ‘what.’ Among the SU learners, on the other hand, there were some cases in which the noun tabemono/ryōri was used as an attribute to the head noun namae ‘name,’ as in tabemono/ryōri no namae ‘dish’s name.’ This noun phrase often had an interrogative phrase nan datta ‘what was (it),’ used directly after an expression corresponding to ‘I cannot remember.’ Using this construction, the speaker seemed to implicitly assume that the dish (the referent) was understood by the addressee.

**Types of DEMs used in comparison with the textbooks**

As mentioned, use of the [−PROX] a-series was most frequent in all the groups. The a-series was often adnominal ano, used together with the head noun typically tabemono ‘food’ and ryōri ‘dish’ to refer to the referent, the dish shown on TV (Example 7-14). Some pronominal are were also found, but only in the FKF and SU data (Example 7-15). The use of are found in the FKF and SU data referred to the dish shown on TV in order to ask the
name of it. As the learners’ textbooks explain that the a-series is used to refer to a thing which is remote from the speaker (Elävää Japania I) or from both the speaker and the addressee (Genki I), the learners’ use of the a-series for this situation can be explained by the DEM description given in the textbooks.

Example 7-14 AU01 and others
あの料理は何ですか。
anô rîôri wa nan desu-ka.
‘What is that dish?’

Example 7-15 SU43
あれはどんなりょうりですか。
are wa donna rîôri desu-ka.
‘What kind of dish is that?’

Example 7-16 FKF29
あれなんて言うんだっけ。
are nan te iu-n-dakke.
‘What was that again?’

The second most commonly used DEM was the [±PROX] so-series, observed in all the groups. The use of the so-series was often adnominal sono, used together with a head noun, typically tabemono ‘food’ and rîôri ‘dish,’ to refer to the dish in question (Example 7-17). Pronominally used sore was also found in all the groups and was used to refer to the dish (Example 7-18).

Example 7-17 AU15
その“dish”はなんですか。
sôo dish wa nan desu-ka.
‘What is that “dish”?’
As mentioned, in the learners’ textbooks, the so-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee (Genki I and Elävää japania I) and a certain distance of the referent (medial), including psychological distance, to the speaker (Elävää japania I). As discussed in Situation C1, considering that the distance to the referent (the dish) from the speaker and the addressee was the same in the given situation, the physical distance of the referent to the addressee cannot alone account for the FKF and SU learners’ use of the so-series. The AU learners’ use of the so-series, on the other hand, can be explained by the spatial relation of the referent to the speaker (medial) and the psychological distance, as described in their textbook. Note also that in Elävää japania I, [–PROX] tuo, is given as a corresponding DEM in the explanation of the so-series.

The number of [+PROX] ko-series used was quite limited but observed in all the groups. Regarding the learners’ use of the ko-series, the majority of the uses was in adnominal kono used together with a head noun tabemono ‘food’ and ryōri ‘dish’ to refer to the dish (Example 7-19). There was one case of pronominally used kore found in the FKF data; it was used to refer to the dish (Example 7-20).

Example 7-19 SU63

この料理は何と言うの?
kono ryōri wa nan to iu-no?

‘What is this dish?/What do you call this dish?’

Example 7-20 FKF09

これは何と言う食べ物ですか。
kore wa nan to iu tabemono desu-ka.

‘What food is this?’

In the learners’ textbooks, the ko-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the speaker. In Elävää japania I, which the AU learners use, the ko-series is further explained as referring to a referent that the speaker feels proximity to (psychological proximity). Considering the spatial relations of the referent and the speaker shown in the given situation, the semantics of the ko-series, proximity of the referent to the speaker as stated
in *Genki* I and *Eläväät japania* I seems hardly to account for the learners’ use of the *ko*-series. On the other hand, the semantics of *psychological proximity* of the referent as stated in *Eläväät japania* I might explain the AU learners’ use of the *ko*-series.

**Comparison with the native data**

No particular predictions were made regarding the use of DEMs. Study 1 showed that the JP informants used the *ko*-series most frequently for this situation. They used the *a*-series quite frequently as well, but not the *so*-series. Figure 7-15 shows a comparison between the Finnish-speaking learners (the AU and FKF learners), the FI informants and the JP informants regarding the choice of DEM for this situation. Figure 7-16 shows a comparison between the SU learners, the SW informants and the JP informants regarding the choice of DEM for this situation.

![Figure 7-15 Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation C2.](image)

Figure 7-15 Types of DEM used by the JP, AU, FKF and FI informants in Situation C2.
As was the case in Situation C1, the usage patterns of Japanese DEM shown by the learners differed from the patterns shown by the JP informants. On the other hand, the learner groups and their respective native informants showed a similarity in their use of DEM inasmuch as their use of respective [+PROX] DEM was quite limited, while the use of DEM other than [+PROX] DEM, that is [+PROX] DEM and/or [−PROX] DEM, was frequent. Moreover, use of the [±PROX] so-series was found in all the learner groups, but not in the JP data. Below, the learners’ use of the ko-, so- and a-series was compared with the JP informants’ use of the ko-, so- and a-series and the respective native use of corresponding DEMs.

The JP informants’ use of the a-series indicated an exclusion of the referent from both the speaker’s and the addressee’s sphere, and thereby a remoteness of the referent. The textbooks used also explained this as a common use. Hence, the learners’ use could be based on what they had learned.

The native uses of [−PROX] DEM were also all analyzed to indicate a remoteness of the referent by excluding it from the speakers’ (also from the addressee’s) sphere. Thus the learners’ use of a-series can be motivated not only by the descriptions in the textbooks, but also by the use of [−PROX] DEM in Japanese and their respective native languages (tuo-series in Finnish and dår, den dår in Swedish). Considering that the usage rate of the a-series scored by all learner informants groups was higher than the rate scored by the JP informants, as was the case in Situation C1, we seem to have a case of overuse.

As for the use of Swedish [−PROX] den N-def, the number of uses was quite limited and it was analyzed as being used to point out the referent irre-
pective of actual distance and it did not seem to account for the learners use of the a-series.

As for the use of the [+PROX] so-series, as mentioned, it was observed in all the learner groups but not in the JP data. The corresponding [+PROX] se-series in Finnish was not used either. The use of the se-series otherwise, as shown in Study 1, shares features with the Japanese [+PROX] so-series; both indicate proximity of the referent to the addressee. The Finnish se-series can also be used in a wider context. Considering that the se-series was not found in the native data, and that the use of the so-series cannot be motivated by the explanations given in Genki I, the FKF learners’ use of the so-series seemed to be independent of both the native use of the se-series in Finnish and the explanation of the so-series given in Genki I. As for the AU learners’ use of the so-series, however, this can be related to Elävää japania I.

Regarding the use of the so-series by the SU learners compared with the native use of [–PROX] där and den där (and their variants), since the use of Swedish där and den där was analyzed basically as indicating remoteness of the referent by excluding the referent from the speaker’s sphere, the learners’ use of the so-series could be related to the use of där, den där in Swedish and as was the case in Situation C1, this may be a case of overgeneralization.

As for the use of the [+PROX] ko-series by the learner groups, the number of uses was very limited, as was the FI informants’ use of the [+PROX] tämä-series and the SW informants’ use of [+PROX] här and den här (and their variants). The JP informants’ use of the ko-series, on the other hand, formed the majority. The JP informants’ use of the ko-series was analyzed as indicating an inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere, and thereby proximity of the referent to the speaker. The analysis also showed that this use was not necessarily based on physical (spatial) proximity but also on psychological proximity. Considering that the native use of Finnish and Swedish [+PROX] DEMs was not necessarily restricted by the actual spatial distance, the learners’ use of the ko-series could be related to the use of [+PROX] DEMs in the native languages. Further, the similarity between the learner groups and the native informants regarding the low usage rate of the [+PROX] DEMs in contrast to the high usage rate of [+PROX] DEMs by the JP informants may also suggest that it was the learners’ native language that had an influence on the use of DEM.

Above, as was the case with Situation C1, we have seen that the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs was quite different from the Japanese native informants’ use. Some uses of Japanese DEMs by the learners, for instance the use of the [–PROX] a-series, seemed to be motivated by the explanations given in the textbooks, but not always. It has shown at the same time that certain uses, such as the use of the ko-series by the FKF and SU groups, cannot be motivated by the spatial relations of the referent and the speaker alone. Their use, however, might be explained by the use of DEMs in the respective native
languages. The learners’ use of DEMs showed some similarities to the use of DEMs by native speakers, suggesting that the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs was influenced by their native language. However, a closer analysis also showed cases where the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs, for instance the FKF learners’ use of the so-series, could be independent of both their native language and the target language, Japanese.

7.3.7. Situation C3

**General**

As was the case with Situations C1 and C2, no particular predictions were made regarding the use of DEMs, since the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location in the given situations. Considering the distance involved in watching TV (the spatial location of the TV and thereby also the program), the spatial distance to the referent was not immediately proximal either to the speaker or to the addressee. However, as the distance in this context is a relative distance of the referent to the deictic center, and not an absolute one, depending on how the deictic center is conceptualized, the distance can be thought of as proximal. Study 1 showed that the JP informants used the ko-series most frequently for this situation. They used the a-series quite frequently as well, but not the so-series. Figure 7-17 shows that the learners mostly used the ko-series for this situation. The use of the a-series was also frequent in the AU and the SU data, which was followed by use of the so-series. In the FKF data, the usage rates of the a-series and so-series were the same.
The expressions other than DEM used for this situation were quite similar among all the learner groups. The use of the interrogative nani ‘what’ in the position of the object to a verb miru ‘watch,’ as in nani (o) miteiru? ‘what are you watching’ was frequent. The interrogative nani ‘what’ was also used as a determiner of a noun proguram ‘program’ and similar words. It was used in the position of the object as in nan(i) no puroguramu o miteiruno ‘what program are you watching?’

Types of DEMs used in comparison with the textbooks

Figure 7-17 shows that, unlike Situations C1 and C2, the use of the [+PROX] ko-series was most frequent in the all the learner groups for this situation. The second most used DEM was the [−PROX] a-series, which was observed in the all the learner groups. Further, a limited number of the [±PROX] so-series was observed and it was also observed in all the learner groups.

Regarding the learners’ use of the [+PROX] ko-series, it was often adnominal kono, used together with a head noun, typically bangumi ‘(TV) program’ and puroguramu ‘program’ (Example 7-21) to refer to the TV program. Pronominally used kore was also observed, but only in FKF and SU data, and the number was limited (Example 7-22). The pronominally used kore referred to the ongoing action shown on the TV, alternatively the TV program.

Figure 7-17 Ratio of ko, so, a used by the learner groups (AU, FKF, SU). Number of occurrences is stated in the graphs.
Use of the ko-series was, as stated, explained as indicating spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker (Genki I and Elävää Japania I) and/or psychological proximity of the referent to the speaker (Elävää Japania I). However, considering the spatial relations between the referent and the speaker given in the situation, the semantics of spatial proximity of the referent to the speaker seems hardly to account for the learners’ use of the ko-series. The semantics of psychological proximity stated in Elävää Japania I, on the other hand, might explain the AU learners’ use of the ko-series.

As for the use of the [~PROX] a-series by the learners, the number of uses was limited and only adnominally used ano was found in the learner data. This was used together with a head noun bangumi ‘(TV) program’ or puroguramu ‘program,’ to refer to the TV program (Example 7-23).

In Elävää Japania I, the a-series is explained as indicating a referent (both concrete and abstract) which is distant/remote from the speaker, and in Genki I, it is described as indicating non-proximity (remoteness) of the referent to both the speaker and the addressee. Considering the spatial relations between the speaker, the addressee and the referent given in the situation, the learners’ use can be explained by the DEM description given in the textbooks.

As for the use of the [±PROX] so-series, the number of uses was very limited. Adnominally used sono was found only in the AU and SU data, and pronominally used sore was found only in the FKF data. The adnominally used sono was typically used together with a head noun bangumi ‘(TV) pro-
gram’ to refer to the TV program (Example 7-24) and the pronominally used *sore* referred to what was shown on the TV (Example 7-25).

**Example 7-24 AU05**

そ の ば んぐ ん み は な な で す か

*sono* bangumi wa *nan desu-ka*.

‘What is that TV program?’

**Example 7-25 FKF19**

そ れ 何 の 番 組 ？

*sore* nan no *bangumi*?

‘What TV program (is) it/that?’

Use of the *so*-series is explained as indicating proximity of the referent to the addressee (*Genki I* and *Elävää japania I*) and a certain distance (medial) of the referent, including psychological distance, from the speaker (*Elävää japania I*). As discussed in C1 and C2, since the distance of the referent from the speaker and from the addressee were the same in the given situation, the FKF and SU learners’ use of the *so*-series is hardly motivated by the spatial distance. The AU learners’ use could, on the other hand, be motivated by the explanation of its semantics: *a certain (medial) distance* of the referent from the speaker, or *psychological proximity* of the referent to the addressee.

**Comparison with the native data**

Figure 7-18 shows a comparison between the Finnish-speaking learners, the FI informants and the JP informants regarding the choice of DEM for this situation. Figure 7-19 shows a comparison between the Swedish-speaking learners, the SW informants and the JP informants regarding the choice of DEM for this situation. The proximal *ko*-series was most frequently used by both the JP informants and the learner groups, irrespective of the languages and the institutions. Use of the [*±PROX*] *so*-series and the [*–PROX*] *a*-series was also found in both the JP’s and the learners’ data, but the number of uses was limited.
The figures show that the use of [+PROX] DEM was most frequent in all the groups, irrespective of whether they were learner groups or native groups, and that the pattern of DEM usage was quite similar between all the learner groups. Further, the ratio of the DEM types used shows that the learner informants used the a-series and so-series more than the JP informants. The figures also show that the use of DEMs other than [+PROX] was more frequent in the FI and SW data than in the JP data.
Regarding the use of the *ko*-series, the JP informants and the learner groups (irrespective of the languages and the institutions) showed a common tendency to use the *ko*-series. However, a closer study showed that the learner groups, especially the AU learners tended to use adnominal *kono* (see page 215), while the JP informants tended to use pronominal *kore* (see page 164). A typical response found among the learner informants (especially the AU learners) is shown in Example 7-26 and a typical response found among the JP informants is shown in Example 7-27. The sentence pattern shown in Example 7-27 was also found in the FKF and SU data, but the number was limited and it was not found in the AU data. To see whether the learners’ frequent use of adnominal *kono* was related to their native languages, the distribution of pronominal and adnominal DEM used by the native informants and the learner informants for Situation C3 was examined (Table 7-4 and Table 7-5).

Example 7-26 AU20 and others

この番組は 何ですか。

*kono* bangumi wa nan desu-ka.

*kono* (TV) bangumi *TOP what COP:POL-Q*

‘What is this/that/that TV program?’

Example 7-27 JP41 and others

これ は 何 の / ど な た / 何 て い う 番 組。

*kore* wa nan-no/donna/nante iu bangumi

*kore* *TOP what GEN what.kind what:GER say (TV)*program

（ですか/なのは）。

COP:POL-Q/COP:NRCOP:POL-Q/COP:NR

‘What kind of program is this?’
Table 7-4 Distribution of pronominal and adnominal DEM used by the native informants for Situation C3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>tämä</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>se</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>den här</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>denna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>den där</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>den Nn</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-5 Distribution of pronominal and adnominal DEM used by the learner informants for Situation C3, compared with the JP informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>Pronominal</th>
<th>Adnominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKF</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>so</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-4 shows the distribution of pronominal and adnominal constructions of DEMs among the native data. In the FI data, the distribution of pronominal constructions was slightly higher than the distribution of the adnominal data, and in the SW data, the distribution was quite even. In the JP data, the pronominal construction (especially the construction used for [PROX] DEM) was more frequent than the adnominal construction. As for the learner groups, Table 7-5 shows that the distribution of pronominal and adnominal constructions was quite even in the FKF and the SU data, resembling the distribution shown in the native data. However, the AU data shows a different distribution, namely that only adnominal constructions were used. That the distribution of the pronominal and the adnominal constructions in the FKF and SU data was quite similar to the distribution shown in the native data may suggest that there was influence of the native language on the use of DEM. However, since there was a difference between two learner groups within the same language, the differences could be due to the institutions, not the language.
Further, the learners’ use of the ko-, so- and a-series was compared with the JP informants’ use and the native use of the corresponding DEMs. As seen in Situations C1 and C2, the JP informants’ use of the ko-series for this situation was analyzed as indicating inclusion of the referent in the speaker’s sphere and thereby proximity, despite the actual distance of the referent to the speaker (non-proximal). Since [+PROX] DEMs were used for this situation in all the languages and the use was analyzed as being based on psychological proximity, the learners’ use of the ko-series might be explained by the use of [+PROX] DEMs in the native languages. Note, however, that the learners’ usage rate of the ko-series, irrespective of the languages and the institutions, was low, as was the usage rate of the corresponding DEMs in the native languages. Use of the ko-series by the JP informants, on the other hand, was high. This might also suggest that the learners’ use of the ko-series was influenced more by their respective native languages. Further, considering the distribution of pronominal and adnominal constructions used for [+PROX] DEMs discussed above, the learners’ native language seemed to have an influence on the learners’ use of the ko-series.

The use of the so-series in the JP data was very limited; only one case was found. The JP informants’ use of the so-series was analyzed as indicating both a medial (i.e., spatial) distance of the referent to the speaker and a proximity of the referent to the addressee. The latter was analyzed as dealing with psychological proximity, which suggests that the ongoing program (the referent) was the addressee’s choice, not the speaker’s. As for the comparison between the learners’ use of the so-series and the native use of corresponding DEMs in the respective languages, it was shown that the analysis of the Finnish [+PROX] se-series used for this situation indicated that the referent was in the addressee’s sphere (i.e., the referent was located proximal to the addressee), and that the Swedish [–PROX] där, den där could also be related to the addressee’s sphere by excluding the referent from the speaker’s sphere. We find here a similarity between the learners’ use and the respective native use. Use of the so-series might therefore be related to their native languages.

There was only one case of the [–PROX] a-series in the JP data for this situation. This was analyzed as indicating an exclusion of the referent from the speaker’s sphere, and thereby a remoteness of the referent to the speaker. The analysis of the FI data shows that the use of corresponding DEMs, the [–PROX] tuo-series, indicated a remoteness of the referent to the speaker: this may suggest that the Finnish-speaking learners’ use of the a-series could be related to the use of the tuo-series in Finnish. However, as the use of the tuo-series was scarce for this situation, influence of the native language on the learners’ use remains uncertain. As for the SU learners’ use of the a-series and the corresponding DEMs in Swedish, the corresponding DEM [–PROX] där, den där used for this situation was analyzed as being related to the ad-
dressee in the given situation. Even though there were some där, den där observed for this situation, the number of the a-series used by the SU learners was very limited. Consequently, it is difficult to relate the learners’ use of the a-series to the native use of där, den där for this situation.

Above, we have seen that there were some similarities in the use of demonstrative types in all the groups ([+PROX] DEM) and that the patterns of DEM usage among the learner groups were quite alike. As far as the ratio of the DEMs used by the learners and their respective native informants is concerned, it seemed to be possible to attribute the learners’ use of DEM to the use of DEM in their native language. However, as a closer analysis showed, this may not always be the case. Also, the learners’ frequent use of the ko-series resembles the JP informants’ frequent use of the same series. However, the ratio of the a-series used by the learners indicates that the learners were more inclined to use the a-series than the JP informants. Further, while the use of pronominal kore was prevalent among the JP informants, it was adnominal kono that was prevalent among the learner informants.
8. Summary and discussion

The aim of this thesis was 1) to investigate the actual use of spatial-deictic demonstratives in Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and 2) to investigate the interlanguage of Finnish-speaking and Swedish-speaking learners regarding the use of Japanese spatial-deictic demonstratives. Study 1 (Chapter 6) was conducted to clarify the use of spatial-deictic demonstratives by Japanese, Finnish and Swedish native speakers. The results of Study 1 served as the basis for Study 2 (Chapter 7), where the learners’ use of spatial-deictic demonstratives was investigated. The Research Questions posed for this thesis were as follows:

Research Question 1: What similarities or differences are found between Japanese (JP), Finnish (FI) and Swedish (SW) native informant groups, regarding the use of demonstratives in the respective languages and in the given situations?

Research Question 2: What similarities or differences are found between the learner groups, two Finnish-speaking groups (AU from Aalto University and FKF from Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan) and one Swedish-speaking group (SU from Stockholm University), regarding the use of Japanese demonstratives in the given situations?

Research Question 3: In relation to Research Question 2, what similarities or differences are found between the learners’ use of demonstratives in Japanese and the use of demonstratives in their respective native languages? What kinds of relations can be established between them?

Research Question 4: What similarities or differences are found between the learners and the native Japanese speakers regarding their use of Japanese demonstratives and what kinds of relations can be established between them?

Research Question 5: Is it possible to relate the learners’ use of Japanese demonstratives to similarities or differences in teaching materials and methods?
This chapter examines the possible influence of the target language (Japanese) and the learners’ native language on the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs by discussing the findings from Studies 1 and 2, and in relation to the Research Questions listed above. These findings are also discussed in terms of the theory of interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence. The chapter starts with a brief review of the standard description of Japanese DEMs that the categories used in the DCTs are based on, and the standard description of Finnish and Swedish DEMs that the findings of the native speakers’ use are based on (Section 8.1). These findings are summarized and discussed in Section 8.2, and the chapter concludes with suggestions for future studies (Section 8.3).

8.1. Spatial deictic demonstratives and the design of the thesis

8.1.1. Standard description of Japanese DEMs and the categories used in DCTs

Japanese demonstratives are a set of referring expressions with initial mora, ko-, so- and a- which indicate deictic contrasts. According to the standard description of the semantics of Japanese DEM, based on a distance-oriented and person-oriented view of DEM, ko- indicates proximity of the referent to the speaker, so- indicates proximity of the referent to the addressee (if the deictic contrast is based on the speaker’s location alone) and medial-distance to the speaker (if the deictic contrast is based on the location of both the speaker and the addressee), and a- indicates distal distance to the speaker (possibly to both the speaker and the addressee). Typologically, Japanese DEMs are described with three terms to indicate three deictic contrasts, putting the speaker at the deictic center: i) proximity to the speaker, ii) proximity to the addressee, and iii) distance to the speaker and the addressee. This description is often adopted in the textbooks for Japanese as a foreign language, such as Genki I (1999). Some textbooks, such as Elävää japania I (2011) also include medial to the speaker as a property of the so-series. According to this standard description, the ko-series can be described as [+PROX], the so-series as [±PROX] and the a-series as [−PROX]. Table 8-1 shows how DEMs are used according to the standard descriptions of Japanese DEMs.
The use of Japanese DEMs according to the standard description of DEMs based on distance-oriented and person-oriented semantics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JP</th>
<th>Proximity/distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>+PROX ◯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>±PROX ◯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>−PROX ◯</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

The symbol ◯ indicates the condition (spatial relation) in which DEMs can be used.

‹ › = Spatial relations of the referent to the speaker/addressee.

[ ] = Forms according to the semantics of DEM given in the standard description.

The situations used in the discourse completion tasks (DCTs) for elicitation of the DEMs in Categories A and B were based on the standard description for the use of ko-series and so-series given above. The situations used in the DCT for Category C were mainly based on situations that can occur in everyday conversations. The following is the descriptions of the categories in the DCT. The expected use of Japanese DEMs in the categories is summarized in Table 8-2.

Category A: The spatial relation of the referent to the speaker was proximal in the given situations, thus the use of the proximal ko-series was expected. Situation A4 was slightly different from the other situations in that the referent was audible, but not visible, and there was no obvious addressee. The situations used in this category can be represented as +PROX.

Category B: The spatial relation of the referent was proximal to the addressee and/or non-proximal to the speaker in the given situations, thus the use of the medial so-series was expected. The situations used in this category can be represented as ±PROX.

Category C: In the given situations, the deictic center could be difficult to equate with the physical location in the given situation, so no prediction was made; in Situation C1, C2 and C3, the speaker and the addressee were located side by side, and the spatial relations of the referent to them were non-proximal. In Situation C4, the speaker and the addressee were located side by side and the spatial relations of the referent to them was proximal but inaccessible.
Table 8-2 Expected use of Japanese (JP) DEMs for Categories A, B, and C, according to the standard descriptions of Japanese DEMs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>[-/PROX]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>[-PROX]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- O = use is expected according to the standard use.
- - = use is not expected according to the standard use.
- no = no prediction was made.
- ( ) = Spatial relations of the referent to the speaker/addressee, given in the situations.
- [ ] = Forms according to the semantics of DEM given in the standard description.

8.1.2. Standard description of Finnish and Swedish DEMs and the predicted use by the native speakers for DCTs

**Standard descriptions of Finnish and Swedish DEMs**

Finnish demonstratives, like Japanese demonstratives, distinguish three deictic contrasts indicated by three demonstrative roots, tä-, se- and tuo-. That is, having a speaker as the deictic center, they distinguish i) proximal to the speaker (tä-), ii) proximal to the addressee (se-), and iii) distal to the speaker and the addressee (tuo-). According to this standard description, the tä-series has a form [+PROX], the se-series has a form [±PROX] and the tuo-series has a form [−PROX].

Swedish demonstratives distinguish two deictic contrasts with a speaker as the deictic center, i) proximal and ii) distal, which are indicated by the adverbial, locational demonstratives här and där respectively. In the standard description of Swedish DEMs, the location referred to by här is explained as indicating the sphere where the speaker is located, while the location referred to by där is explained as indicating the space outside the speaker’s sphere. Besides the aforementioned adverbial demonstratives, there are two demonstratives with proximal meaning, den här (N-def) and denna (N), and two demonstratives with distal meaning den där (N-def) and den N-def. Thus här and där in den här and den där retain their semantics of proximity/distance. The difference between den här (N-def) and denna (N) is basically variations in colloquial, formal written and dialectal language use. The difference between den där (N-def) and den N-def concerns the way they are used to contrast the referent with other possible referents; while the use of den där (N-def) presupposes the existence of other possible referents con-
trasted in terms of distance, the use of *den N-def* does not necessarily pre-suppose the existence of possible referents contrasted in terms of distance. According to this standard description, *här, den här, denna* can be described as [+PROX], and *där, den där, den N-def* as [−PROX]. There are, however, examples in which *där, den där* are used to indicate the proximal spatial relation of the referent to the *addressee*, in contrast to the *speaker*. Note that *där, den där* is not explained explicitly as indicating the proximity of the referent to the addressee ([±PROX]) in the literature. Table 8-3 shows the use of Finnish and Swedish DEMs according to the standard description.

Table 8-3 The use of Finnish (FI) and Swedish (SW) DEMs according to the standard description of Finnish and Swedish DEMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FI</th>
<th>Proximity/distance</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>Proximity/distance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[+PROX]</td>
<td>±PROX</td>
<td>−PROX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamä</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[±PROX]</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−PROX]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The symbol ○ indicates the condition (spatial relation) in which respective DEMs can be used.
○ = Spatial relations of the referent to the speaker/addressee.
[ ] = Forms according to the semantics of DEM given in the standard description.

**Hypotheses regarding the usage rate and the usage types**

Predictions were made about the DEM usage rate in Finnish and Swedish based on the typological similarities and/or differences. Finnish and Japanese are said to lack definite articles and it was predicted that DEMs would be used more often in these languages than in Swedish. Swedish, which has definite articles, would, on the other hand, utilize NPs with definite articles as deictic expressions instead of DEMs. Consequently, the use of DEMs in Swedish was predicted to be less frequent than in Finnish.

As for the usage types, the predictions were based on the typological similarities/differences and the standard description of DEMs in the languages mentioned above. Finnish, like Japanese, distinguishes three spatial deictic contrasts (proximal to the speaker, proximal to the addressee and distal to both the speaker and the addressee), and has three different terms for them. Thus the types of DEM used for each category and situation may show some kind of similarity to the types of DEM used in Japanese. That is, for Category A, the [+PROX] *tä*-series would be used and for Category B, the
[±PROX] se-series would be used. For Category C, no prediction was made regarding which DEM would be used, but the types of DEM used might show similarities to the use shown by the JP informants. For Swedish, which distinguishes only two spatial deictic contrasts (proximal and distal), the types of DEM used for the situations was expected to show its own pattern, different from both Japanese and Finnish. As for Category B, Swedish does not have a form [±PROX] to express proximity of the referent to the addressee as Finnish does, but the use of [−PROX] där, den där has been observed for such situations (≪±PROX≫) and can therefore be expected although it is not explicitly explained in the literature. The expected use per language and the categories are stated below. Table 8-4 provides an overview.

Finnish:
Category A: [+PROX] täh-series would be used.
Category B: [±PROX] (medial) se-series would be used
Category C: no predictions were made, but the choice of DEMs would show some similarities to the choice shown by JP informants

Swedish:
Category A: [+PROX] den här, här, denna would be used.
Category B: [−PROX] den där, där, den N-def could be used
Category C: no predictions were made, but the use would differ from the use shown by the JP informants and the FI informants.
Table 8-4: Expected use for Categories A, B and C, according to the standard description of how Finnish (FI) and Swedish (SW) DEMs are used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FI</th>
<th></th>
<th>SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tama</td>
<td>(+PROX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>(+PROX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuo</td>
<td>(+PROX)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
Ø = use is expected according to the standard use.
(O) = use is not explicitly stated in the grammar, but the use may be found.
- = use is not expected according to the standard use.
no = no prediction was made.
(+PROX) = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal.
(+PROX) = Spatial relation of the referent to the addressee is proximal.
(+PROX) = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker and the addressee is difficult to define.
[] = Forms according to the semantics of DEM given in the standard description.

8.2. Summary of the results

8.2.1. Usage rate

Study 1

The results showed that the general usage rate was highest among the JP informants. An exception was Situation B2 in which the usage rate scored by the JP informants turned out to be lower than for the other languages. The FI informants scored the next highest rates. That the FI informants scored higher usage rates than the SW informants was as expected. The patterns of graphs plotted for the usage rates by the FI informants and the SW informants were quite similar. As regards the first Research Question, it was hypothesized that the SW informants might use fewer DEMs than the FI and the JP in general, because Swedish can utilize nouns with the definite article for spatial deixis. This hypothesis was therefore supported.

Study 2

Based on the result of Study 1, a prediction was made about the usage rate of Japanese DEMs by the learners. Regarding Situations B2 and B4, if the
learners used Japanese DEMs as they had learned, their DEM usage rates for these situations would be higher than the rates scored by the informants of the respective native languages. If the learners’ native language had any influence on the learners’ usage rates of DEMs, the Finnish-speaking learner groups would score higher usage rates than the Swedish-speaking learner group.

Regarding Situations C1, C2, and C3, if the learners’ native language had any influence on the learners’ usage rates, the AU and FKF learners might show higher DEM usage rates than the SU learners, since the native FI informants scored higher usage rate than the native SW informants.

The result was that the graphs plotted for the usage rates scored by the AU and the FKF learners showed similar patterns, and the graph plotted for the usage rate scored by the SU learners showed its own pattern. A difference was thus found between the language groups regarding the patterns for the usage rates. Regarding the usage rates, a difference was also found between the two Finnish learner groups, AU and FKF. The usage rates scored by the AU learners were generally lower than the rates scored by the FKF learners and the SU learners. Further, their rates were also lower than for the native FI informants.

As regards the second research question, it was hypothesized that the learner groups AU and FKF would show some similarities because both groups have the same native language. As seen, the AU and FKF learners showed a similarity concerning the pattern of graphs, but they showed a difference concerning the usage rates. The hypothesis was therefore only partially supported.

Regarding the differences in the usage rate of Japanese DEM found in the same language (Finnish), this might indicate an intra-group heterogeneity within the language group. There are two possible factors that may cause this heterogeneity. One is the differences in the textbooks used by the AU and FKF learners. That is, the FKF and the SU learners follow the same syllabuses and use the same textbook, but the AU learners have their own syllabus and textbooks. Another possibility is the linguistic environment where the learners reside: whether it is more homogenous or less homogenous in terms of language contacts. The environment where the FKF learners study Japanese is likely to be less homogenous than the environment where the AU learners study Japanese. According to Juvonen (1996), bilingual speakers in her study had a tendency to use DEMs in order to express definiteness more than monolingual speakers, possibly due to the language-contact situation.
8.2.2. Types of DEMs used

Study 1
The expected use of DEMs for the tested categories by the JP, FI and SW informants are compiled in Table 8.5. The actual uses of DEMs by the native informants shown in Study 1 are summarized in Table 8.6.

Table 8.5 Expected use for Categories A, B and C, according to the standard view of how DEMs are used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JP Category</th>
<th>FI Category</th>
<th>SW Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a [-PR]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
O = use is expected according to the standard use.
(°) = use is not explicitly stated in the grammar, but the use may be found.
- = use is not expected according to the standard use.
no = no prediction was made.
(+) = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal.
(±) = Spatial relation of the referent to the addressee is proximal; to the speaker, it is medial.
(±/) = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker and the addressee is difficult to define.
[ ] = Forms according to the semantics of DEM given in the standard description.
Table 8-6 Actual uses of DEMs by JP, FI, and SW informants shown in Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JP</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko</td>
<td>〈+〉</td>
<td>〈+〉</td>
<td>〈+〉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so</td>
<td>〈±〉</td>
<td>〈±〉</td>
<td>〈±〉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>〈±/–〉</td>
<td>〈±/–〉</td>
<td>〈±/–〉</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
- □ = the use of DEM was observed in 4 situations, (□) = the use of DEM was observed in 3 situations, (△) = the use of DEM was observed in 2 situations, (△*) = the use of DEM was observed in 1 situation, but the DEM was used having other person than intended person as the addressee.
- 〈+〉 = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker is proximal.
- 〈±〉 = Spatial relation of the referent to the addressee is proximal; to the speaker, it is medial.
- 〈±/–〉 = Spatial relation of the referent to the speaker and the addressee is difficult to define.

The result showed that among the JP informants the use of the [+]PROX ko-series was frequent and it was also used in some situations where the spatial relation of the referent to the addressee or to the speaker was 〈±PROX〉. The FI informants and the SW informants showed similarity in that both groups used non-proximal DEM ([±PROX] and/or [–PROX] DEM) frequently. For instance, the Finnish informants used the [±PROX] se-series and the [–PROX] tuo-series and the Swedish informants used [–PROX] där, den där, den N-def for some situations in Category A where the spatial relation between the referent and the speaker is [–PROX].

Regarding the aforementioned frequent use of the ko-series by the JP informants, Table 6-6 on page 111 shows that this use was frequent for all the situations in Category C. This contrasts with the frequent use of non-proximal DEM by the FI and SW informants. For instance, the FI informants used the [–PROX] tuo-series most frequently for the situations in Category C, except for Situation C3. The SW informants also used [–PROX] där, den där and/or den N-def most frequently for the situations in Category C, except for Situation C3.

An important observation made here is that the actual uses of spatial DEM by the native speakers were not always consistent with the standard description of the DEMs. As displayed in Table 6-6, the use of [±PROX] DEMs was found in all the informant groups for Category B. The use of [+PROX] DEMs in Category B, which deals with the situations represented as 〈±PROX〉 (and therefore the use of [±PROX] DEMs are expected), cannot be explained in terms of the distance-oriented view of DEMs. Likewise, the use of [±PROX] and/or [–PROX] DEMs found in Category A, that is, situa-
tions which deal with those represented as \(+\text{PROX}\) cannot be explained by
the spatial distance-oriented view of DEMs.

Thus these uses cannot be explained by the actual distance factor. How-
ever, they can be explained in terms of the psychological proximity/distance
of the referent as perceived by the speaker. The use of the Japanese \(+\text{PROX}\)
ko-series for the dog to ask its name might be a good example. Some such
uses could also be explained by social interaction. For instance, some the
Finnish \(-\text{PROX}\) tuo-series used for the situation \(\Leftrightarrow\text{PROX}\) in Category B,
were analyzed to indicate the speaker’s intention to make her utterance in-
personal. There were also uses of the tuo-series that are analyzed as indi-
cating uncontrollability.

Returning to the first research question, the hypothesis was that typologi-
cal similarities and differences would be reflected in the native informants’
use of demonstratives. Specifically, it was hypothesized that Japanese native
informants and Finnish native informants would show some kind of similari-
ties in terms of type of DEM used for certain situations since Japanese and
Finnish share similarities regarding the number of deictic contrasts ex-
pressed by the demonstratives. The result, however, showed that there were
similarities in the use of DEMs between the Finnish and the Swedish in-
formants which were not shared by the Japanese informants. The hypothesis
was therefore not supported with regard to the types of DEM used.

Spatial demonstratives such as deictic expressions and their uses are often
explained according to their basic semantic features: i) distance from the
speaker to the referent (distance-oriented view) and/or ii) discourse partici-
ants’ interactional role either as the speaker or as the addressee, or a non-
participants (person-oriented view). In my data, however, there were cases in
which the uses were based on social, interactional factors. The use of DEM
based on the social factor in my data indicated, as mentioned, for example
the speaker’s intention to make his own statement impersonal (in the case of
Finnish) and/or to indicate uncontrollability of the referent, and the speaker’s intention to point out the referent (in the case of Swedish). The results
showed that the uses of Finnish and Swedish DEM, non-proximal DEM in
particular, were not necessarily restricted by the distance of the referent to
the speaker and/or the addressee. In these languages, spatial DEM seem to
be used frequently according to interactional factors. The use of Japanese
DEM, on the other hand, non-proximal DEMs (the a-series and so-series),
were more bound to spatial factors. The results of Study 1 also showed the
JP informants’ tendency to use \(+\text{PROX}\) DEM for certain situations. Finnish
and Swedish native informants, on the other hand, tended to use other DEMs
than \(+\text{PROX}\) for the same situations.

As the answer to the first research question indicated, the typological sim-
ilarities or differences found in the respective languages were not necessarily
reflected in the native use of DEMs. As regards the similarities found be-
tween Finnish and Swedish, considering these two countries’ close geographical and historical relations over more than 700 years, I suggest that language contact may override typological dissimilarities and influence language use.

**Study 2**

*Predictions*

Based on the theories of interlanguage and third language development, together with the results of Study 1, the use of the type of Japanese DEMs used by the learners was predicted.

If the learners (irrespective of their languages and institutions) used Japanese DEMs as they were taught, they would mostly use the *so*-series in Situations B2 and B4. If the learners’ native language had any influence on the their use of Japanese DEMs, there was a possibility that the AU and FKF learners might use the [−PROX] *a*-series in addition to the expected [±PROX] *so*-series.

Regarding Situations C1, C2 and C3, no predictions were made about which demonstratives would be used, since it was not likely that the learners were familiar with the situations in relation to learning the grammar and the semantics of DEMs. However, if the learners’ native languages had any influence on the learners’ use, there was a possibility that the AU and FKF learners would use mostly the [−PROX] *a*-series for Situation C1. The proximal [±PROX] *ko*-series and the [±PROX] *so*-series might also be used, but in a limited number. As for the SU learners, there was a possibility that the [−PROX] *a*-series would be used. As for Situation C2, if the learners’ native languages had any influence, there was a possibility that the AU and FKF learners would mostly use the *a*-series for this situation. The proximal *ko*-series might also be used, but in a limited number. As for the SU learners, there was a possibility that they would use the *a*-series. The proximal *ko*-series might also be used, but less often. As for Situation C3, if the learners’ native language had any influence on the learners’ use, the AU and FKF learners might use mostly the *ko*-series (unlike Situations C1 and C2). There was a possibility that the *so*-series would also be used. As for the SU learners, there was a possibility that they would mostly use the *ko*-series. The SU learners might use the *a*-series too, but less often.

*Results*

For Situations B2 and B4, the learners (irrespective of their languages and institutions) used the *so*-series frequently and the learners seemed to use DEMs as their textbooks explained them. Use of the *ko*-series was observed in all learner groups, and the use of the *a*-series was also observed in the FKF group. The use of the *ko*-series and *a*-series for Situations B2 and B4 cannot be explained by the standard view of DEMs, which is often adopted...
in the textbooks. Such uses by the learners can, however, be explained in terms of psychological and social/interactional factors, and they seemed to be related to the uses of DEMs in both their native languages and the target language. Since the expected use of DEM for Category B was the so-series, the fact that the JP informants used the [+PROX] ko-series for these situations (especially for Situation B2) was rather unexpected. As seen in Situation B2, the use of [+PROX] DEM was observed in the learners’ native languages, and the use of the ko-series by the learners seemed therefore to be influenced by their native languages rather than the target language. (Note, however, that the number of uses is rather limited compared to the JP informants’ use.)

As for Situations C1, C2 and C3, the types of DEMs used by the learners showed similarity to the types used by the native informants in their respective languages rather than the types used by the JP informants. For example, both the learners (irrespective of their languages and institutions) and their native informants used the non-proximal DEM frequently for Situations C1 and C2. The JP informants, on the other hand, mostly used the ko-series for these situations. This may suggest that the use of DEMs in the learners’ native languages influenced the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs. The learners’ use of DEM for these situations (especially the frequent use of the [+PROX] so-series) cannot always be explained by the standard description of DEM based on spatial distance or the person-oriented view of DEMs. It can, however, be motivated by psychological and social, interactional factors.

As for Situation C3, Study 1 showed that the types of DEM used for this situation were quite similar in all the native groups, which is characterized by the frequent use of [+PROX] DEM. The learners also mostly used the ko-series for this situation and the learners’ use of the ko-series might therefore be related to the native use of [+PROX] DEMs in the native languages. However, a closer analysis of the structures (whether the DEMs used were in a pronominal or adnominal construction) showed that the learners seemed to overuse the adnominal construction in relation to native use, where the distribution of the adnominal DEM and the pronominal DEM was quite even. The analysis also showed that the learner informants seldom used constructions with the Japanese [+PROX] kore, which were frequently used by the JP informants. Considering that the adnominal construction is not explicitly presented in the learners’ textbook, its frequent use by the learners may be explained by the familiarity of this construction in their native languages. Alternatively, the scarce use of pronominal kore by the learners can be explained by their absence in the textbooks.

Influential factors on the learners’ use
The learners’ use of Japanese DEM may be influenced both by the grammar of the target language (Category B) and by the grammar of the native language (Category C). We may describe the situations dealt with in Category
B (where Situations B2 and B4 were used in Study 2) as quite familiar situations for the learners, as similar situations were often presented in the textbooks. The situations dealt with in Category C (where Situations C1, C2 and C3 were used in Study 2) were, on the other hand, not explicitly presented or explained in the textbooks. Hence, the learners might have used Japanese DEMs (i.e., chosen between ko-, so-, a-series) as they were explained in their textbooks when the given situations were familiar because they had been dealt with during their education. In contrast, the learners might have used Japanese DEMs in the same way as they use DEMs in their respective native languages when the given situations were rather unfamiliar to them because they had not been presented in the textbooks. My data indicated that the typological similarities between the target language and the learners’ native language did not have any particular influence, either an advantage or a disadvantage, on the learners’ use of DEMs.

Above we have seen that the learners’ use (usage types) of DEMs can be influenced by both the target language and the native language, depending on whether they are already familiar with their use in the target language or not. This can be summarized as shown in Table 8-7. We may relate the learners’ familiarity with the use of the demonstratives (i.e., the grammar of demonstratives) to the proficiency level of the learner as a beginner or an advanced level. Note however that although the hours of studies are usually specified in the syllabuses, the actual hours that a student has spent on language study is difficult to measure. The learners’ levels in this study are therefore labeled according to the numbers of terms they have studied Japanese; this does not necessarily reflect the actual proficiency level of the student.

Table 8-7 Influence of native language (NL) or target language (TL) on the learners’ use (choice) of DEMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learned/familiar situations (B2, B4)</th>
<th>Influence of native language (NL) or target language grammar (TL)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not learned/unfamiliar situations (C1, C2)</td>
<td>NL &gt; TL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Target language grammar as explained in the textbooks

Above, we find an answer to the third research question, which hypothesized that the learners’ use of Japanese DEM might reflect the use of DEMs in their respective native languages. As seen, the results showed that the hypothesis was partially supported. We also find an answer to the fourth research question and its related hypothesis; there is an influence of the target language (the grammar) on the learners’ use of DEM when the uses are already known (taught).
Further, as for the fifth research question and its related hypothesis, the differences found in the DEM usage rate mentioned earlier indicate that there was a difference between the learner groups depending on the institutions where the learners were studying Japanese. Thus the hypothesis in the fifth research question was supported.

8.2.3. Theoretical implications

The theoretical background of the present thesis is manifold. On the one hand, it relies on theories of deixis and the use of spatial deictic demonstratives in the languages of the world. These have guided the analyses and descriptions of the use of the spatial deictic demonstratives studied, especially in Study 1, where the native speakers’ use of demonstratives was studied. On the other hand, the second part of the thesis studies the use of spatial deictic demonstratives in learner language and relies on theories of interlanguage and third language development.

With regard to theories of deixis and spatial deictic demonstratives, the results of the empirical data in Study 1 indicate that the traditional descriptions of the use of spatial deictic demonstratives are not sufficient. An important finding in these data was that native speakers’ use of deictic demonstratives could not be solely explained in terms of semantics based on distance. For example, some uses of the Finnish distal DEM tuo-series were shown to be used regardless of the actual physical distance between the speaker and the referent. In certain cases, the speakers used the tuo-series to make the statement impersonal or to indicate a kind of irony. Such factors that determine the use may be called social or interactional factors. This is in line with Laury’s (1997) view on the semantics of Finnish demonstratives; she claims that “what is and is not in the speech participants’ sphere (i.e. referent) is not determined by perceptual factors, such as what the speaker or hearer is able to perceive, but rather that both the spheres and the roles, of speaker and hearer themselves are determined by social and interactive factors” (ibid., 55). She continues that the referent is “not only expressed, but also constituted, by the demonstrative usage” (ibid.). This social and interactive view of the deictic demonstratives is, however, not always prevalent in the description of deictic demonstratives, especially in the field of Japanese language education. The results of this study further showed that such social factors could be both common among the languages studied and language-specific. For example, in my data, the use of proximal DEMs by the JP, FI and SW informants all indicated a positive impression of the referent. This aspect of proximal DEM seems to be common for Japanese, Finnish and Swedish. The non-proximal demonstratives were, however, used in order to obtain different results in the languages studied. For example, impersonalization of the statement could be a factor for the use of the
Finnish [−PROX] tuo-series, but not for the use of the Japanese [−PROX] ako-series. This aspect of non-proximal DEM seems to be language specific.

With regard to theories of interlanguage and third language development the results of Study 2 support some, but not all factors that have been suggested as having an impact on L3 learner language. The hypothesis that typological and psychotypological similarities/dissimilarities between the learners’ previous languages (particularly L1) and the target language appeared to influence L3 learning (Cenoz 2001, De Angelis & Selinker 2001, Hammarberg 2001; 2009, Kellerman 1983, Ó Laoire and Singleton 2009, Ringbom 2001) was not supported in this study, as there were no particular differences found between the learner groups regarding the types of DEM used in the given situations. One divergence observed among the learner groups was that the [−PROX] ako-series was used in the situation of ±PROX, in which use of the so-series was expected. This divergence was observed in both the Finnish-speaking learners and the Swedish-speaking learners. This may suggest that the Swedish-speaking learners’ use of the [−PROX] ako-series in the situation ±PROX was not necessarily caused by the lack of [±PROX] DEMs in their L1, because the Finnish-speaking learners also used the [−PROX] ako-series in the same situations, although Finnish has [±PROX] DEMs. Considering that the types of DEM used for each situation were similar in all the learner groups, including the divergence from native use, the typological similarities between Finnish and Japanese did not seem to give the AU and FKF learners any particular advantage. The typological dissimilarities between Swedish and Japanese did not seem to give the SU learners any disadvantage either.

With regard to the learners’ proficiency in the target language (Cenoz 2001; Ringbom 1987; Möhle 1989; Poulisse 1990), even though the learners’ proficiency levels in this study were labeled, they were based only on the number of the terms they had studied Japanese, and did not therefore necessarily reflect the actual proficiency levels. However, the results showed that the types of DEM that the learners chose for the situations seemed to be determined by their familiarity and unfamiliarity with the situations; in other words, whether the situations and the pertinent use of DEMs were already part of the learners’ knowledge or not. We may thus assume that a learner’s familiarity and unfamiliarity with the grammar of DEM are related to her proficiency, that is, that grammar instruction does matter. As the learners’ choice of Japanese DEMs (between [+PROX, ±PROX, −PROX] DEMs) for the unfamiliar situations resembled the choice of DEMs in their respective native language, the results seemed to be in accordance with Cenoz’s (2001) theory about proficiency which postulates that less proficient learners have a tendency to transfer more elements from their NL (ibid, 9).

Regarding the recency of the L2 (Cenoz 2001, 10; Hammarberg 2001, 22-23) and L2 status (foreign language effect) (Cenoz 2001, 9; Cenoz Iragui
2006, 689; Hammarberg 2001, 22-23), since this study did not investigate which language was a learner’s L2 and used recently (and therefore had easy access to it), or which language had L2 status on an individual basis,\(^\text{115}\) their effect or influence on the interlanguage could not be attested. However, in a bilingual environment as in Vaasa (where the FKF learners study Japanese), we may assume that Swedish is “activated” as L2. The difference found in the Finnish-speaking group between the AU group and FKF group regarding the usage rate of DEMs, was analyzed as relating to the language environment in terms of bilingualism or language contact, and this may support the idea of *recency*. Considering that these two Finnish-speaking groups use different textbooks, written in Finnish (the AU group) or in English (the FKF group), the aforementioned difference between the groups was also thought to relate to the languages used in the textbook. That is, the higher usage rate by the FKF group could be attributed to English. The AU, FKF and SU learner groups are therefore compared in terms of the languages that they had contact with when they studied Japanese, that is, the L1, the general language environment and the language used in the textbook. Table 8-8 shows a summary.

Table 8-8 Languages that the learner groups had contact with when they studied Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner group</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>General language environment</th>
<th>Language used in the textbooks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKF</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Table shows that the FKF group is at the top among the learner groups when it concerns the number (or variety) of languages, besides the target language that the informants had contact with. Even though all the learner informants may have studied one or more additional languages, the languages shown in the Table are the ones that they normally had contact with when they studied Japanese. As the DEMs usage rate was scored highest by the FKF group and lowest by the AU group, with the SU group in the middle, we find here that the ranking of the usage rate corresponds to the *number* and thereby the *variety* of languages that the learner groups usually have contact with. This may suggest that it was *number* or *variety* of the languages that the learners had contact with at the time of TL learning, rather than *one*, certain language that was recently activated or had L2 status that affected the learners’ interlanguage, as long as it concerned the usage rates of DEMs.

\(^\text{115}\) Although questions about the learners’ general language background were included in the study, the questions about which language(s) besides L1 and TL the learner informants used actively or questions about which language was their L2 were not asked.
The findings of this study were discussed above by referring to the theory of interlanguage and cross-linguistic influence in terms of L3 learning. As seen, the findings are partly in accordance with these theories, but not entirely. For instance, unlike the common claim about typological similarity in which a language (L1 or L2, maybe both) that is typologically close to L3 will influence L3 learning, the typological similarities between the target language and the learners’ native language did not show any particular influence, either advantage or disadvantage, on the learners’ use of DEMs as far as the choice of DEM was concerned.

8.2.4. Methodological implications
The discussions in this study are based on findings of the data collected by the discourse completion task(s) (DCT, see Section 5.3), and some limitations are recognized as a characteristic of this method of data-collecting; the number of situations dealt with in the DCTs is quite limited and the elicited data is less naturalistic than, for example, data elicited from naturally occurring speech. Also, the readers should be reminded again that this study has focused on the use of DEMs as the outcome of learning. The use itself may not show how the learning goes. The use does not necessarily reveal the learners’ experience about the learning as difficult or easy, and the learners’ psychological attitudes to L3 learning that influence their interlanguages were not measured either. Further, this study focused on the learners’ interlanguage and even though the learners’ textbooks were taken into consideration, the way in which the Japanese language teaching took place was not studied. The generalizability of the findings is therefore limited until further investigations using more varied methods are conducted.

8.2.5. Implications for Japanese language education
The differences found in the DEM usage rate within the same Finnish-speaking learners (between the AU and FKF learners) suggest that the usage rate can be influenced by differences in the linguistic environment where the learners lived (more monolingual-like or more bilingual-like) and/or institutional differences. Regarding the learners’ choice of DEM, the results of the analyses suggested that this can be influenced by the grammar of the target language so far known to them, especially when the given situation or con-

\[116\] In this study, a use of certain DEM types by the learners, dissimilar to the JP standard use, is not treated as an error; it is a divergence from the standard use shown by the JP informants. In traditional CA, learners’ errors have been thought to indicate the learners’ difficulty in learning the point (grammar) in question. However, this idea was criticized since the difficulty is not always associated with the errors; it can be observed in the form of, for example, avoidance and paraphrasing. Divergence is not an indicator of the difficulty either.
text is familiar to the learners. Considering that the classroom is often the main channel where the language learners are exposed to the language in question, the significance of the grammar (of DEM) taught in the classroom is self-evident. A closer examination to determine what grammar should actually be taught in the target language should therefore be crucial; the grammar to be taught must be based on native speakers’ actual use.

The textbooks that the AU, FKF and SU learners use contain a number of example or model sentences and the explanations attached to them are also plentiful. The example sentences help the learners to understand the uses of demonstratives. However, the present study revealed that the native speakers’ actual use of spatial deictic demonstratives could differ from what is explained in the textbooks. I argue therefore that the actual use of the target language regarding deictically-used demonstratives should be investigated more thoroughly; and the contents of the teaching materials, especially the examples used, should be based on the results of such a study.

The results of the analyses also showed that the learners’ use of DEMs was influenced by their native language use and grammar when the given situation or context was unfamiliar to them. An examination of the actual use of DEMs in the learners’ native languages revealed that both FI and SW native speakers’ use of DEMs could also diverge from what is often (or traditionally) described in the respective languages, so the importance of the analyses of the native speakers’ actual use (native data) should also be emphasized.

8.3. Conclusions and suggestions for future studies

The present study is 1) an investigation of the actual use of spatial-deictic demonstratives by native speakers of Japanese, Finnish and Swedish, and 2) an investigation of the Finnish-speaking learners’ and Swedish-speaking learners’ interlanguage regarding the use of Japanese spatial-deictic demonstratives in the light of the native speakers’ use. The discussions are based on the findings of the data collected by the discourse completion tasks (DCTs). At the beginning of the study, it was hypothesized that the typological similarities and differences between Japanese, Finnish and Swedish regarding the number of deictic contrasts – Japanese and Finnish have three-way contrast while Swedish has two-way contrast – might result in showing a similar pattern of DEM uses among the Japanese and Finnish native speakers while the DEM uses by the Swedish native speakers might show a different pattern. In a similar manner it was also hypothesized that Finnish-speaking learner groups (AU and FKF) might show some common ways of using Japanese demonstratives that differed from the Swedish-speaking
learner group (SU), and that the Swedish-speaking learner group might show its own particular pattern.

Contrary to expectations, the native speaker data showed that the FI and SW informants shared a similar pattern regarding the use of distal DEM in certain situations whereas the JP informants tended to use proximal DEM. The learners’ use of DEM did not seem to reflect the typological similarities or differences of DEM regarding the number of deictic contrasts found between the respective native languages.

Thus the present study has shown that language-specific social factors rather than typological similarities or differences were more influential in the learners’ use of Japanese DEMs in certain cases. I therefore argue that such social factors that determine the use of DEMs should be studied more thoroughly, and the social factors, parallel to the spatial relation (traditionally described deictic contrasts), should be more focused on or emphasized in the description of DEMs, both in research and in teaching material.

Further, as stated in Section 2.4.1., there are several other uses than the deictic use found in DEMs. In Japanese DEMs, discourse deictic use, anaphoric use, associative deictic use and associative anaphoric uses are found. Whether the results shown in the present study are also valid for these uses is something for future research to reveal. Moreover, the languages dealt with in this study were Finnish and Swedish with a different number of deictic contrast (three-way and two-way respectively), and to seek an universality of the findings, the comparison with the data from other languages with different number of deictic contrast, such as Korean (three-way) or Thai (three-way) and Chinese (two-way) or English (two-way) would be of interest.
Sammanfattning på svenska

Denna avhandling har två syften. Det ena är att komparativt undersöka och belysa hur modersmålstalare av japanska, finska och svenska använder rumsdeiktiska (spatialdeiktiska) demonstrativer på sina respektive språk, till exempel hur man i svenska använder den här och den där för att peka ut en referent som finns i en samtalssituation. (Härefter används termen demonstrativer för rumsdeiktiska demonstrativer.) Det andra syftet är att undersöka och belysa hur finsktalande och svensktalande inlärrare av japanska använder japanska demonstrativer. Avhandlingen handlar därmed huvudsakligen om analys av två typer av empiriska data, modersmålstalardata och inlärrardata, insamlade genom s.k. Discourse Completion Task(s) (DCT) designade och utförda av författaren. Avhandlingen består av två delstudier, studie 1 som handlar om analys av modersmålstalares användning av demonstrativer på respektive språk och studie 2 som handlar om analys av inlärares användning av japanska demonstrativer. Resultaten av studie 1 utgör bas för analys av inlärrardata. Inlärrardata jämföres sedan med modersmåltalarnas användning av demonstrativer i respektive språk och japanska, samt med de standardbeskrivningarna av demonstrativer som finns i inlärrarnas läroböcker.

Teoretiska utgångspunkter: rumsdeiktiska demonstrativa uttryck


Demonstrativer är deiktiska uttryck där tolkningen av referenten är bunden till talsituationen och de förekommer i alla språk (jmf. Diessel 1999; 2012b). De brukar beskrivas efter sina semantiska egenskaper i termen av det relativa avståndet mellan referenten, talaren och adressaten utifrån talarens position/plats (det deiktiska centret). De japanska demonstrativarna indikerar då det relativa avståndet mellan referenten och talaren som proximal/nähet (ko) eller distal/lång distans (a). Det demonstrativa morfemet so- i japanska i sin tur indikerar referentens relativa avstånd till adressaten eller att referenten

Finska liksom japanska demonstrativa har tre demonstrativa stammar, tä-, se- och tuo-. Med talaren som det deiktiska centrumet indikerar de referentens relativa avstånd till talaren alternativt till adressaten; tä- indikerar proximal/närhet till talaren, se- indikerar proximal/närhet till adressaten och tuo- indikerar distal/lång distans till talaren.


**Teoretiska utgångspunkter: tredjespråksinlärning**


**Material och insamlings- och analysmetoder**

Både modersmålstalardata och inlärardata samlades in genom Discourse Completion Task(s) (DCT). I DCT ges olika situationer genom både text och bild för att få fram vissa uttryck (här demonstrativa) från försökspersonerna. Modersmålstalardata samlades in från modersmålstalare på japanska (JP),
finska (FI) och svenska (SW). Inlärdedata samlades in från två finsktalande grupper (AU, Aalto universitet, och FKF, Fria Kristliga Folkhögskolan) samt en svensktalande grupp (SU, Stockholms universitet). Inlärarnas användning av japanska demonstrativer jämfördes med samtliga modersmåltares användning av demonstrativer i respektive språk, samt med beskrivningarna av demonstrativer i inlärarnas läroböcker.

I studie 1 undersöktes modersmåltares användning av demonstrativer i 20 olika situationer inklusive övningsmaterial och utfyllnadssuppgifter (fillers/dummies). Situationerna som användes i studien kan delas in i tre kategorier baserade på referentens relativa avstånd till talaren eller till adressaten, vilka är A) situationer där referenten finns i närheten av talaren (användning av ko-demonstrativer kan förväntas när det gäller japanska), B) situationer där referenten finns i närheten av adressaten (användning av so-demonstrativer kan förväntas när det gäller japanska) samt C) situationer där det deiktiska centrumet är svårdefinierat och därmed placeringen av referenten i avståndsförhållande till talaren eller adressaten är svår (inga förutsägelser har gjorts angående typ av demonstrativer). I studie 2 undersöktes inlärarnas användning av japanska demonstrativer i fem situationer (två situationer från kategori B och tre från kategori C) tillsammans med ett övningsmaterial och en utfyllnadssuppgift som ingick i studie 1.

Resultat av studie 1

Hypotesen angående modersmåltares användning av demonstrativer var att den japanska och finska gruppen skulle visa vissa likheter med varandra eftersom japanska och finska delar språktypologiska likheter gällande hur de differentierar det relativa avståndet mellan referenten, talaren och adressaten i demonstrativa uttryck. Dessa skulle i sin tur stå i kontrast till användningen av demonstrativer i den svenska gruppen, som har ett annat antal markerade kontraster.

Analysresultatet av studie 1 visade att de språktypologiska likheterna och olikheterna mellan de japanska, finska och svenska demonstrativerna inte återspeglades i modersmåltares användning av dessa. Inga speciella likheter i användningen av demonstrativer observerades mellan de japanska och de finska talarna. I motsats till förväntningarna visade de finska och svenska modersmåltares emellertid vissa likheter. Detta gällde vilken typ av demonstrativer som användes i vissa situationer i Kategori C. Då använde både de finska och de svenska talarna icke-proximala demonstrativer i stor utsträckning medan de japanska modersmåltares mest använde proximala demonstrativer. Resultatet visade också att modersmåltares användning av demonstrativer i de givna situationerna inte nödvändigtvis var baserade på de fysiska, spatiala relationerna (dvs. avstånden) mellan referenten, talaren och adressaten; det visade sig att användningen av demonstrativer hos de finska och svenska modersmåltares i vissa fall bättre kunde förklaras i
termer av socialt-interaktionella faktorer. Till exempel användes de distala demonstrativerna (*tuo*) av finska informanter i vissa situationer i Kategori B (där användning av japanska *so*- förväntades) för att göra utsagen opersonlig. Denna användning nämns sällan i grammatikor och läroböcker.

**Resultat av studie 2**

Hypotesen, baserad på tidigare forskning, angående inlärarnas användning av de japanska demonstrativerna var att den finsktalande inlärargruppen (AU-gruppen och FKF-gruppen) skulle uppvisa någon typ av gemensamt mönster som liknar målspråket (japanska) gentemot den svenska inlärargruppen (SU-gruppen) på grund av de språktypologiska likheterna och olikheterna hos demonstrativerna i deras modersmål. Resultaten bekräftade inte denna hypotes. De visade istället på en viss skillnad mellan de tre inlärargrupperna avseende andelen använda demonstrativer, men inte som förväntat mellan de finska och svenska grupperna, utan mellan de två finska inlärargrupperna. Detta tolkades här som ett tecken på att det var skillnader i läromedel snarare än modersmålet, samt möjligtvis språkmiljön där inlärarna studerar målspråket, som hade påverkan på deras användning av de japanska demonstrativerna, eftersom en av de finska grupperna (FKF) använder sig av samma lärobok och följer samma kursplan som den svenska inlärargruppen (SU). Det är också så att gruppen som läser finska i Vasa, Finland, (FKF) befinner sig i en mer tvåspråkig miljö än de andra grupperna.

Vidare analyser av de demonstrativtyper som användes av inlärarna visade att deras användning (valet av demonstrativtyper) påverkades av om den situation där demonstrativerna skulle användas redan var välkänd eller välbekant (med andra ord inlärda) eller ej. När de givna situationerna var bekanta från läroböcker använde inlärarna demonstrativerna som de förklaras i läroböckerna, oavsett språkgrupp eller lärosäte. När de givna situationerna var nya (dvs. ej explicit presenterade i läroböckerna) visade inlärarnas val av demonstrativtyper likheter med modersmålstatardata, vilket antydde att inlärarna inför nya situationer förlitade sig på modersmålets grammatik.

**Slutsatser**

Baserat på den grundläggande semantiken vad gäller demonstrativer beskrivs de rumsdeiktiska demonstrativerna vanligtvis i termer av det relativa avståndet mellan referenten, talaren och adressaten utifrån talarens position/plats (det deiktiska centret). Analysresultaten av studie 1 visade dock att denna talarcentrerade, avståndsbaserade beskrivning inte räcker för att förklara modersmålstaternas faktiska användning av demonstrativier i dessa data. Vissa användningar i mina insamlade visade sig bättre kunna förklaras i termer av socialt-interaktionella faktorer.

Inom forskningen om främmandespråksinlärmning betraktas de typologiska likheterna och olikheterna mellan inlärarnas modersmål och målspråket ofta
som några av de mest inflytelserika faktorerna som påverkar inlärarnas bruk av målspråket och därmed deras interimspråk. Mina data visade att inlärarnas modersmål kunde ha påverkan på inlärarnas bruk av målspråket, men de typologiska likheterna eller olikheterna spelade bara en marginell roll. Analysresultatet av denna studie överensstämmer delvis med tidigare studier kring språkinlärning och interimspråk. Framför allt tycks ”kännedom om den aktuella grammatiken”, vilket kan relateras till färdighetsnivå i målspråket, ha större inflytande på inlärarnas bruk av målspråket och utformningen av interimspråket än tidigare rapporterats. Detta innebär i sin tur att läromedel (vilka grammatikförklaringar som ges, vilka exempelmeningar och övningar som används) kan spela en mycket viktigare roll än man tidigare trott. Med tanke på att modersmålståarnas användning av demonstrativer i mina data inte alltid stämde överens med hur de beskrevs i grammatikor och läroböcker, innebär detta samtidigt att läroböckernas innehåll, dvs. grammatikförklaringar, exempelmeningar, övningar osv., bör bli mer verklighetsbaserade.
指示詞はダイクシス表現の一つで、発話場面において話し手（ダイクシスの中心）から指示対象までの相対的な距離のコントラストを示すとされ（Diessel 1999; 2012）また極めて普遍的であり、すべての言語体系に存在するとされる（同上）。日本語の指示詞はコソア語とも呼ばれ、最初の拍（語）コ／ソ／アが、話し手から指示対象までの距離のコントラスト、近／中／遠をそれぞれ表すとする距離区分説、「ソ」に関して、聞き手から指示対象への距離（近）を表すとする聞き手領域説（或は人称区分説）によって一般的に説明される。指示詞が持つさまざまな用法の中でダイクシス用法（直接用法、現場指示用法とも言う）が、最も基本的な用法であり、外国人日本語学習者向けの日本語教科書の多くで、かなり初期にこの用法が導入されている。また外国人日本語学習者（以降、特に区別する必要がある場合を除き、学習者）においては中級、上級になっても誤用が見られることから指示詞の習得は難しいとされている。

本博士論文における研究では、指示詞のダイクシス用法（特に空間ダイクシス用法）に関して、日本語、フィンランド語、スウェーデン語のそれぞれの母語話者が与えられた場面上でどのような指示詞を使用するかを調査・分析し、これらの言語における指示詞の使用の特性を明らかにすることを第一の目的とし、また、フィンランド語、スウェーデン語をそれぞれ母語とする学習者が、日本語指示詞をダイクシスとしてどのように使用するかを調査・分析することにより、これらの学習者における指示詞使用の特性を中間言語の観点から明らかにすることを第二の目的とする。

第1章では、研究の背景、目的、本論文の構成について記述した。先述の通り、本研究では指示詞が持つ数ある用法の中でも空間ダイクシス用法に注目し、日本語、フィンランド語、スウェーデン語のそれぞれの母語話者の、母語における使用の仕方を明らかにし、またそのをもとに、フィンランド語とスウェーデン語をそれぞれ母語とする学習者が日本語の指示詞を空間ダイクシス用法としてどのように使用しているか調査・分析し、学習者における指示詞使用の特性を明らかにすることを試みる。

第2章では、理論的枠組みとして、ダイクシスは何かその特性について、また指示詞がダイクシスとして用いられる場合の特徴について、既存の研究で明らかになっている点について記述した。また、日本語、フィンランド語、スウェーデン語の指示詞に関して、空間ダイクシス用法を中心に類
型論的に概観し、既存の研究で明らかになっている点を記述した。日本語指示詞は、類型論的に見て、ダイクシスの中心（話し手）から指示対象までの相対的な距離コントラストが3項対立（話し手から近、話し手から中、または聞き手から近、話し手から遠）で、それぞれ表す3種の指示詞、コ・ソ・アがある（佐久間1992；田中1981）。フィンランド語指示詞においては、一般に同コントラストは日本語と同じく3項対立（話し手から近、聞き手から近、話し手から遠）で、それぞれtämä, se, tuoの3種で示される（VISK 2008）。また、スウェーデン語指示詞は、話し手から近、遠が区別される2項対立で、それぞれhärとdärで示されるほか、形としてden här, denna（近）とden där, den Nn（遠）を持つ（SAG 1999）。（注：Nn = 名詞の定形）よって、日本語とフィンランド語の指示詞は類型論上、共通性があり、スウェーデン語は異なることが分かる。

第3章では、言語学習者の中間言語に関する先行研究を概観し、既存の研究で使用されてきた様々な用語に関して本研究のための統一化を図った。また、本研究の対象であるフィンランド語、またはスウェーデン語、または日本語識者にとって、日本語は厳密には第3言語（或いはそれ以降の言語）であるため、既存の研究をもとに第3言語（或いは以降の言語）学習環境において中間言語に影響を与えると考えられる要因をまとめ、第3言語学習に影響を与えるとされる要因とともに、考察した。

第4章では、指示詞に関する既存の対照研究及び習得研究について概観した。対照研究に関しては対英語、中国語、トルコ語、タイ語に関しての先行研究について記述した。習得研究に関しては、母語話者の日本語指示詞習得と、学習者の日本語指示詞習得に関する先行研究について記述した。

第5章では、本研究における方法について、データ収集の方法、被験者（インフォーマント）について記述した。本研究では、母語話者データ収集、学習者データ収集の両方においてDiscourse Completion Task(s)（談話完成タスク）という方法を用いた。これは、被験者に文章とイラスト（写真）を提示することで場面を与え、特定の発話を促す調査方法である。母語話者を対象とした研究1（Study 1）では、日本語（JP）、フィンランド語（FI）、スウェーデン語（SW）の母語話者それぞれ100名を被験者とした。調査では、日本語指示詞が示す距離的コントラストをもとに、3つのカテゴリーに分類されるタスク/状況を設定し、この言語の異なる3グループの被験者がどのような指示詞を用いるかを調査・分析することとした。タスクの3つのカテゴリーは以下の通りである。A)指示対象が話し手から近に存在する状況（日本語ではコ系指示詞使用が期待される）、B)指示対象が聞き手から近に存在する状況（日本語ではソ系指示詞の使用が期待される）、C)ダイクシスの中心をどこに置くかの判断が人によって異なると考えられ、指示対象の位置分けが難しい状況（指示詞の使用が期待されるがどれの指示詞が使用されるか予測しない）。学習者を対象とした研究2（Study 2）では、フィンランド語とスウェーデン語をそれぞれ母語とする学習者（フィンラン
ド人学習者２グループ、Aalto University と Fria Kristliga Folkhögskola からそれぞれ３３名、２９名の合計６２名とスウェーデン人学習者１グループ Stockholm University から６７名（Study 1)で使用したタスクのうち何点かを用いて被験者の日本語指示詞使用を調査後、その結果を被験者グループが使用する教科書にある指示詞の説明、及び調査１(Study 1)で得た結果と比較し、分析することとした。なお、フィンランド人学習者の２グループのうち Fria Kristliga Folkhögskola とスウェーデン人学習者グループ Stockholm University は調査当時、同じシラバスのもと、同じ教科書を使用して日本語を学習していた。

第6章では、調査1(Study 1)として、先述の通り日本語母語話者、フィンランド母語話者及びスウェーデン語母語話者を被験者として、それぞれの言語グループにおける指示詞使用について調査・分析し、その結果について述べた。実際の調査には練習用タスク、フィラータスクを含む２０のタスクを用いた。また、分析では得られた回答のうち１２項目についての分析を行った。

第7章では、調査２(Study 2)として、先述の通り学習者を被験者とし、調査のため５つのタスク（ソ系指示詞の使用を促す場面２点、使用される指示詞の予測を立てない場面３点）及び練習用タスクとフィラータスクを含めた計７つを設置し、学習者グループにおける日本語指示詞の使用の実際について調査、また学習者が使用している教科書に記載されている指示詞の説明、及び調査１(Study 1)で得た結果と比較分析し、その結果について述べた。

最後に第8章では、第6章と第7章で得られた主要な結果について、第2章と第3章で記述したこれまでの研究及び理論と照らし合わせて考察し、本論文の総括とした。
日本語—フィンランド語間よりも、フィンランド語—スウェーデン語間に見られる場合があった。また、一見ダイクシス用法と見られる指示詞使用は、必ずしも話し手・聞き手・指示対象の空間的距離に基づくものではない、社会的相互作用を要因とした使用であることがあり、文法書や外国人向け日本語教科書に記載されている一般的な説明とは必ずしも一致しないという結果が出た。

学習者の日本語指示詞使用に関しては、データの分析結果、使用率についてフィンランド人学習者である2グループ間で違いが認められた以外に相違が見られず、指示詞の選択パターンに関してもスウェーデン人学習者グループを含む計3つのグループ間で特に相違は見られなかった。指示詞の使用率においてフィンランド人学習者2グループ間で相違が見られたことに関して、フィンランド人学習者2グループのうちの1グループFria Kristliga Folkhögskolaとスウェーデン人学習者グループStockholm Universityは調査当時同じ教科書を使用していたということと、またFria Kristliga Folkhögskolaが位置する地域は、Aalto Universityが位置する地域に比べてバイリンガルな地域であるということから、この差異は母語の違いよりも学習教材また学習時における言語環境に基づくものであることが示唆された。

また、学習者の使用した指示詞の種類を分析したところ、その使用は、該当の指示詞が使用される状況が学習済みかどうか（既に学習されて身近であるかどうか）に影響されることが示唆された。つまり、タスクに現れた指示詞使用の状況が、会話や文法説明の形などで、教科書に明示されている場合、学習者は教科書で説明されている指示詞を説明通りに使用する傾向にあり、逆にタスクに現れた指示詞使用の状況が教科書に記載されていない（教科書で説明されていない）場合、学習者は母語での指示詞使用と同じような使用をする（指示詞選択をする）傾向を見た。中間言語に影響を与える要因、また第3言語習得に影響を与える要因という点から今回の調査の結果を見ると、既存の研究で示唆されてきた「母語との距離や、言語間距離に基づく母語の影響」は要因でであり得るもの、学習者が使用する日本語学習教材、また学習者が置かれた言語環境、文法項目が既習で身近なものになっているか、といった要因のほか、まずは影響力を持つようであった。今回の研究の結果は、教科書をはじめとする学習教材（文法説明、例文提示、練習）の影響力が今まで考えられていたより大きい可能性があることを示唆するものであり、外国語教育で教えられる文法項目の説明を今一度吟味する必要があることを示していると言える。さらに、今回の調査では母語話者の指示詞の使用は、文法書や外国人向け日本語教科書に記載されている一般的な説明と必ずしも一致しないという結果が出たが、これは文法項目に関する説明は、母語話者の実際の使用に基づくべきであることを示していると言えるだろう。
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Appendix

Pictures and instructions given for Situations A1–C4. The instructions are approximately translated into English.

A1: You are the nurse in the picture. Ask the patient whether the wrist you are holding hurts
A2: You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (sitting beside you) if she knows the reading of the kanji/answer to the math problem.

A3: You are the veterinarian in the picture. Tell the (imaginary) audience that the dog you are holding is called Gizmo.
A4: You are listening to a new song and you think it is fantastic. Comment on the song.

B1: You are receiving massage. Tell the masseuse that the part she is pressing hurts.
B2: Ask the name of the dog beside which the addressee (the person in the picture) is standing.

B3: You are the person on the left. Ask your friend (on the right) whether the water where she is swimming now is deep.
B4: You are the boy in the picture. You want to buy one of the cakes that the man is holding. How do you express this?

C1: You are the person on the left. Comment that a monkey on the TV is funny.
C2: You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) the name of the dish shown on the TV.

C3: You are the person on the right. Ask your partner (on the left) what he is watching on the TV.
C4: You are the man in the picture. Promise your wife (beside you) that you will buy the ring you two are looking at.