J Ę Z Y K O Z N A W S T W O

ARTUR BARTNIK

DEMONSTRATIVE OR ARTICLE?
THE CASE OF *TEN* IN POLISH

A b s t r a c t. The paper discusses the syntactic status of the Polish demonstrative pronoun *ten* 'this' in the light of grammaticalization theory. The discussion begins with establishing formal (morpho-syntactic) as well as semantic criteria for discriminating between articles and demonstratives. Then it reviews arguments for the demonstrative status of *ten* put forward in the literature. The paper ends with providing evidence for the definite article status of *ten*. Although the primary function of *ten* is still that of a demonstrative pronoun, it reveals some traces of categorial change on the grammaticalization cline in spoken Polish.

Key words: grammaticalization; demonstrative pronouns; definite article; spoken Polish; semantic criteria; formal criteria.

1. INTRODUCTION

The majority of Slavic languages do not have definite articles. Some exceptions are Bulgarian, Macedonian, Albanian and Torlak (Torlakian), a group of South Slavic dialects spoken in Serbia. Therefore, it is understandable that the concept of the definite article rarely appears in the linguistic literature on the noun phrase in Slavic languages. Polish is not an exception in this respect. However, the lack of a dedicated definite article in most Slavic languages does not preclude discussions on the nature of definiteness because articles are not the only source of definiteness in the noun phrase (cf. Lyons 1999). The issues that linguists focus on concern strategies and/or elements that express defi-

Dr. ARTUR BARTNIK — Department of the History of English and Translation Studies, Institute of English Studies, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; address for correspondence: Al. Racławickie 14, PL 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: bartnikart@kul.lublin.pl

niteness in articleless languages. In Polish, for example, definiteness can be expressed by sentence stress, word order, determiners and the topic-comment distinction, or a combination of these factors (cf. Szwedek 1976). On the theoretical level, there is a heated discussion on whether we should assume the DP hypothesis (Abney 1987) in articleless languages like Polish. Some scholars assume a null D in languages without articles, while others argue for a bare NP layer (cf. Cinque 2002, Bošković 2008 for a cross-linguistic perspective and Willim 2000 for the discussion on Polish data).

The main aim of this article is to take up the former, less discussed side of the problem concerning definite articles. More specifically, we want to examine the properties of the demonstrative pronoun *ten* and its potential for becoming a definite article in the future on the basis of evidence found in modern Polish. It must be stressed at this point that the paper does not question the demonstrative status of *ten*. Nor does it offer robust evidence for its status as a definite article. Rather, it shows that there are contexts which indicate that its categorial status might change in the future. Therefore, it is not surprising that the issue has not been widely discussed in the literature. However, some suggestions have been made that the demonstrative *ten* can evolve into a definite article (cf. Pisarkowa (1968), Miodunka (1974), Kryk (1987) and, especially, Bacz 1991). We will review some of these arguments in section 4. In this article we would like to bring in new evidence from spoken Polish that could shed some light on the status of *ten*.

The paper is organized in the following way. In section 2 basic criteria for distinguishing articles from demonstratives are established. Then, in section 3, *ten* is considered as a demonstrative pronoun, while in section 4 the evidence given shows that it has the potential of becoming the definite article in the future. Section 5 concludes the discussion.

2. CRITERIA FOR DISTINGUISHING ARTICLES FROM DEMONSTRATIVES

In most cases definite articles are historically derived from demonstrative pronouns. This is a classic example of the process called grammaticalization, which can be defined as 'the attribution of grammatical character to a formerly autonomous word'[1] (Meillet (1912 [1951]: 131). For the demonstra-

---

[1] 'L'attribution du caractère grammatical à un mot jadis autonome.'

tive pronoun → definite article development, Greenberg (1978) proposes the following cline:

(1) demonstrative pronoun – definite article – specific article – noun marker

This somewhat basic cline assumes an abrupt change from the demonstrative pronoun into the definite article. Himmellman (1997: 23) proposes a more fine-grained grammaticalization path with two intermediate stages between the demonstrative pronoun and the definite article.

(2) […] demonstrative pronoun – demonstrative determiner – weakly demonstrative definite determiner – definite article […]

In many accounts the demonstrative pronoun → definite article change is explained by the loss of some feature(s), be it [+demonstrative] (Lyons 1999) or [+deictic] (Giusti (2001). With respect to (2), Studler (2013: 163), proposes the following loss of features (terminology after Lehmann (2002) and Himmellman (1997)):

(2a) Demonstrative pronoun [deictic, demonstrative, definite, determinative]
      Demonstrative determiner [deictic, definite, determinative]
      Weakly demonstrative definite determiner [anaphoric, definite, determinative]
      Definite determiner   [definite, determinative]

As we can see from (2a), the crucial change in the evolution of the definite article is a gradual loss of deixis, with its intermediate, anaphoric state.

   Obviously, the analyses presented above assume some sort of idealization in the sense that the loss of (a) feature(s) immediately changes the status of a given determiner. In reality, it is often difficult to determine whether a given element is still a demonstrative or whether it has already started acquiring features of the definite article, because the data are ambiguous. Therefore, formal (morphosyntactic) and semantic criteria have been postulated in the literature in order to help to distinguish between the different grammaticalized forms of demonstratives (cf. Himmelmann 2001, Skrzypek 2010). From a morphosyntactic point of view, there are two basic criteria for distinguishing demonstratives from articles. First, demonstratives may function as pronouns, adverbials, predicates and adnominal modifiers, while articles are only used in nominal expressions. Second, the position of an article in a nominal expression is fixed. More specifically, articles consistently appear to the left or to the right of the noun head, while demonstratives can appear in both positions.

A further diagnostic that supplements the two formal criteria is that articles are obligatory in grammatically definable contexts such as superlatives, e.g. *the greatest singer*, nouns taking complement clauses, e.g. *the fact that they lost the game*, or count nouns that must be accompanied by a marker for definiteness or specificity in core argument positions (Himmelmann 2001: 832). This suggests that articles are always high frequency items.

Apart from formal requirements, semantic criteria are employed to discriminate articles from demonstratives. However, most semantic tests cannot yield unequivocal results since in typical contexts both demonstratives and articles can appear. These contexts include anaphoric use, illustrated in (3) below, situational use, given in (4), discourse-deictic use, shown in (5), and recognitional use, exemplified in (6). The examples in (3)–(6) are taken from Himmelmann (2001: 833). On the one hand, this is a problem, as you cannot determine precisely if an element performs the article or the demonstrative function. On the other hand, however, ambiguous contexts are a necessary step in the demonstrative → definite article change and show that a given element might be changing its categorial status.

(3)   ... and a man comes along with a goat, and this/the goat obviously is interested in the pears
(4)   This/the guy behind you waits to get back to his seat (referring to a person present in the utterance situation)
(5)   ... and that's the end of that/the story (referring to a preceding stretch of discourse)
(6)   hitting one of those/the bounce-back things, you know, the little thing that had elastic, and it has a ball (*those* occurs in the first mention, as bounce-back things have not been mentioned before)

Arguably, there are two more contexts from which demonstratives are excluded. These are larger situation uses – contexts in which unique referents are mentioned for the first time, e.g. *the sun, the king, the restaurant*, and associative-anaphoric uses — contexts in which definite articles are used with referents mentioned for the first time, but at the same time connected with previously mentioned entities. The latter context is illustrated below:

(7)   The man drove past our house in a car. The exhaust fumes were terrible.

                                                        (Himmelmann 2001: 833)

In (7) the phrase *the exhaust fumes* are mentioned for the first time but *fumes* are produced by *a car* mentioned in the previous sentence.

In the next sections we will apply these criteria to *ten* to try to determine its actual status in Polish.

3. *TEN* AS A DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN

Traditional grammars (Topolińska 1984, Nagórko 2007, Swan 2002) leave no doubt that *ten* is a demonstrative pronoun in Polish. Two formal criteria mentioned in section 2 only confirm this claim. Specifically, demonstratives are pronominal elements and are described as such in most grammar books.

(8) Jarek zapytał profesora,   ale ten nie odpowiedział.
     Jarek ask.PAST professor, but this not answer.PAST
     'Jarek asked the professor but he didn't answer'

                              (Swan 2002: 171)

In (8) *ten* 'this' replaces the personal pronoun *on* 'he' to indicate the second of the two persons referred to. Demonstratives show number, gender, case and the proximity-distance opposition. In Polish they can also function as adnominal modifiers because they modify nouns. Klemensiewicz (1953: 36) calls them adjective attributes[2]; for Topolińska (1984) they are adjective demonstratives[3]. This is illustrated in (9):

(9) Ten student jest młody
     This student is   young
     'This student is young'

             (Topolińska 1984: 336)

The other formal criterion, which concerns the mobile position of *ten* in the noun phrase, also suggests its demonstrative status, as shown in (10) below. The postnominal position of the demonstrative indicates that the noun *artykuł* 'article' and its modifier are the topic of discussion.

(10) Wczoraj   przeczytałem   ciekawy   artykuł. (Ten) artykuł ten
     Yesterday read.1SG.PAST   interesting article. (This) article this
     napisał   niejaki profesor Korbe
     write.3SG.PAST some   professor Korbe

---

[2] In Polish 'przydawka przymiotna.'
[3] In Polish 'zaimki przymiotne wskazujące.'

'Yesterday I read an interesting article. The article was written by some professor Korbe'

(Swan 2002: 172)

Ten can also appear in the four semantic contexts in which demonstratives as well as articles can occur (see section 2). This suggests that *ten* still retains its demonstrative status. Let us illustrate this point with two examples from Mendoza (2005), (11) and (12). The next two sentences, (13) and (14), are Polish translations of English examples. In (11) we observe anaphoric use, in (12) situational use, in (13) discourse-deictic use and, finally, in (14) recognitional use:

(11)   Tytuł książki   nie był   zły. Pochodził   z
       Title book.GEN not be.3PRS.PAST bad. Come.3PRS.PAST from
       jakiegoś wiersza. Z   jakiego wiersza? Joe potrząsnął   głową.
       some   poem. From what   poem   Joe shake.3PRS.PAST head
       Był   przekonany, że zna   ten wiersz
       Be.3PRS.PAST convince.PART that know.3PRS.PRS this poem
       'The title of the book wasn't bad. It came from some poem. From what poem?
       Joe shook his head. He was convinced that he knew the poem'
                   (Joe Alex, *Gdzie przykazań brak dziesięciu*, Mendoza 2005: 12)
(12)   [Context: telephone conversation about how to tape telephone conversations]
       X – A co, telefonem   go [magnetofon] połączyłeś?
       X – So, telephone.INSTR it [tape deck]   connect.2PRS.PAST?
       Y – Tak.
       Y – Yes.
       X – Przez jakiś czujnik czy tylko tak mikrofon?
       X – By   a   sensor or only   microphone?
       Y – Nie po prostu przykręciłem   do tych śrubek dwa
       Y – No just   connect.1PRS.PAST to these screws two
          druty i   włączyłem   do magnetofonu i cześć.
          wires and connect.1PRS.PAST to take deck   and OK
       'X – So, did you connect it [the tape deck] with the telephone?
       Y – Yes.
       X – By a sensor or a microphone?
       Y – No, I just connected two wires to *the screws* and connected them to the tape
          deck and that was it'

(Mendoza 2005: 11)

(13)   I   to   jest koniec tej   historii…
       and this is   end   of this story
       'and this is the end of this story'

(14) Czy nadal   masz   <u>ten długopis</u>, który ciotka
     if   still   have.2PRS.SG that pen   which auntie
     dała   Ci na urodziny?
     give.3PRS.PAST you for birthday
     'do you still have that pen that your auntie gave you for your birthday?'

In sum, both the formal and the semantic criteria suggest that *ten* retains its demonstrative properties. In the next section we will turn to arguments pointing to a different direction: *ten* will be considered as an element with the properties of an article in spoken Polish.

4. *TEN* AS A (POTENTIAL) DEFINITE ARTICLE

The most common source of the definite article is a distal demonstrative pronoun. The Polish *ten* is a proximal demonstrative pronoun so it does not seem to be an ideal candidate for the definite article. However, nowadays the contrast between proximal and distal forms is hardly visible in Polish because *ten* is neutral as to proximity or distance. Given this, *ten* can serve as a possible source of the definite article. Therefore some scholars (Topolińska 1984, Kryk 1987, Mendoza 2005) suggest that many functions of *ten* overlap with the functions of definite articles in other languages. For example, Bacz (1991) examines three contexts which, according to her, indicate article-like properties of *ten*. They are given below:

(15) Na ulicy pojawił się jakiś człowiek. Początkowo człowiek <u>ten</u> nie zwracał
     in street appear.PAST some man.   At first   man   this not pay.PAST
     na nas uwagi
     to us attention
     'Some man appeared on the street. At first the man paid no attention to us'

                                   (Bacz 1991: 5, Topolińska 1984: 328)

(16) <u>Ta</u> Zosia   jest po prostu nieznośna
     That Sophie   is   simply   unbearable
     'That Sophie is simply unbearable'

                                    (Bacz 1991: 8, Topolińska 1984: 351)

(17) Czemu on tam   tak sterczy jak <u>ten</u> kołek w płocie?
     Why   he there so stick   like this peg   in fence
     'Why is he stuck like the/that peg in the fence?'

                                    (Bacz 1991: 11)

In (15) *ten* is used to express anaphoric reference. When discussing anaphoricity, Bacz (1991: 6) draws a similarity with the article systems in Bulgarian, Albanian and Romanian, which also postpose their articles. She adds, however, that it is very difficult to detect any difference between the demonstrative *ten* and its variant, the alleged candidate for the definite article in such contexts. We indicated the same problem with ambiguous anaphoric examples in section 3. Sentence (16) exemplifies the 'emotional' use of *ten* in front of proper nouns and unique referents. Even though such constructions are typical of articles, they are also found with demonstratives in English (cf. *that* in Wolter 2006) and other languages, for example German. Therefore they cannot be a clinching argument for the article status of *ten*. Example (17) shows the 'emphatic' use of *ten* in expressions of comparison. It has no equivalent in English, since such expressions of comparison typically do not use articles. However, as noted by Bacz (1991: 12), in spoken English the definite article is marginally possible. Consider (18) below:

(18) Black as <u>the</u> tar (Lady commenting on the state of her children)

As shown above, Bacz's (1991) arguments do not unequivocally point to the article-like status of *ten*, as either demonstratives are equally possible in the contexts described above (examples 15 and 16), or the use of *ten* has no equivalent in a language that has articles (example 17). On the other hand, ambiguous contexts might be the first step towards the syntactic change in the status of *ten*.

Himmelmann's (2001) formal criteria outlined in section 2 indicate that *ten* is a demonstrative because it can appear as a pronoun and has no fixed position in the nominal expression (*długopis* <u>*ten*</u> versus <u>*ten*</u> *długopis* 'this pen'). Furthermore, *ten* is frequently used in facultative rather than obligatory contexts. However, one thing that suggests that *ten* might be on the way of becoming a definite article is its high frequency of occurrence in spoken Polish (cf. Miodunka 1974: 44).

Semantic criteria shed more light on the issue of the article-like status of *ten*. Apart from the ambiguous contexts from section 3 in which demonstratives and articles can occur, that is anaphoric use, situational use, discourse-deictic use and recognitional use, Himmelmann (2001) distinguishes two other contexts from which demonstratives are excluded. One of them is the associative-anaphoric use, which is a clear indication of the article status of a given element. It turns out that *ten* can be found in this context in spoken Polish, although it is not obligatory. Consider:

(19) Wczoraj byłem   w kin-ie.   Ale (<u>ten</u>) film   był   nudny.
   yesterday be. PAST1SG.M in cinema. But (this) film   be. PAST3SG.M boring
   'I went to the cinema yesterday. But the film was boring'[4]

<div align="right">(Czardybon 2013: 7)</div>

Example (19) exhibits the so called relational definite associative anaphora, the context in which crosslinguistically definite articles but not demonstratives can be used. This might be taken as an argument for the article status of *ten*. The fact that it is optional suggests that *ten* is only at the beginning of its way to become a definite article in the future.

  Another argument for the potential articlehood of *ten* comes from nominal structures in which it is combined with possessive pronouns. Consider the data taken from the National Corpus of the Polish language:

(20) Jeżeli <u>mój   ten</u>[5]   projekt,
   if   my.SG.NOM this.SG.NOM   project.SG.NOM
   który niby   miałem   podpisać, był zły…
   which apparently be_supposed.PAST1SG sign.INF   was bad…
   'if my project, which I was supposed to sign, was bad…'

<div align="right">(PELCRA_7123000000081, commission of inquiry on Orlen
2005, 17th May: 11, the Chancellery of the Sejm)</div>

(21) A   na imię jak <u>twojej   tej</u>   narzeczonej   jest?
   and on name how your.SG.DAT.F this.SG.DAT.F fiancée.SG.DAT.F is
   'and what is your fiancée's name?

<div align="right">(PELCRA_7203010000189, family meeting, conversations)</div>

Allen (2006), who examined similar structures in Old English, argues that determiners in possessive-determiner sequences in Old English could function only as definite articles (a similar point is made for Old Norse by Heusler 1962). If this restriction can be extended to other languages,[6] *ten* in

---

  [4] Note that example (19) has an alternative, more emotional, version: *Ależ ten film był nudny!* 'Wasn't that film boring!' In this case the use of *ten* seems to be obligatory (cf. example 16 above).

  [5] Note that this is one of many alternatives of the co-occurrence of demonstrative and possessive pronouns. For instance, demonstratives may precede possessive pronouns when they co-occur, as in *ten mój project* 'this my project'. In fact this pattern is more common crosslinguistically. Moreover, the nominal head may be flanked by the elements in question, as in *ta książka ma* 'this book my'. We will not discuss these patterns because they are not variants of the construction examined below. They arose differently and have very different grammatical properties. For example, demonstratives retain their categorial status in demonstrative-possessive constructions (see Allen 2006 and Bartnik 2014 for evidence).

  [6] Bulgarian is another example of a language in which this hypothesis holds (cf. Scatton 1984).

such combinations functions as a definite article rather than a demonstrative pronoun. Apart from cross-linguistic similarity, there are other clues that suggest that the status of *ten* is changing. First, the combinations illustrated in (20)-(21) are very scarce, restricted to spoken Polish (cf. Bartnik 2014). This is exactly the same context in which associative anaphora with *ten* is found. Miodunka (1974), discussing the high frequency of *ten*, also mentions spoken Polish. Second, most of the combinations in question are anaphoric. This is one of the important contexts in which definite articles can be found, as shown above. One potential difficulty with the data in (20)-(21) is that they are open to different interpretations, as these are transcripts of spoken conversations, monologues etc. Unfortunately, PELCRA transcriptions do not mark elements that might be crucial in the interpretation of the examined sequences such as stress pattern or intonation. Thus, in (20) the speaker might want to distance themselves from a bad project by adding *ten*, and *tej* in (21) might serve as a filler which gives the speaker time to decide what to call the addressee's female partner. Yet, similar examples can be found on the Internet, on various blogs and internet forums - newly emerging communicative written forms - linguistically close to the spoken register. It seems that at least in some cases there is no pause between the possessive, the demonstrative and the noun. If this is the case and no phonetic aspects interfere, *ten* should be regarded as part of the noun phrase. Consider (22) and (23) below:

(22) Mój   ten   projekt   zacznie się
      my.SG.NOM   this.SG.NOM   project.SG.NOM begin.FUT3SG
      kiedy   ja'm   na   wakacjach
      when   I-be.PRES1SG   on   holidays
      'my project will begin when I'm on holidays'

                                      (układy scalone forum - jmtalbot.pl/project/?a=6155,
                                                                 accessed on 10.08.2015)

(23) To   zaraz na następny dzień,   po   moim tym mailu zadzwoniła
      so   soon on next   day   after my   this email call.PAST3SG.F
      Pani ze   sklepu, proponując reklamację
      lady from shop   suggesting letter of complaint
      'so next day, soon after my email, a lady from the shop called, suggesting that I should write a letter of complaint'

                                   (okazje.info - http://www.okazje.info.pl/sklep-internetowy/megastore-pl,
                                                                 accessed on 10.08.2015)

In sum, apart from a body of indirect formal and semantic evidence that *ten* might function as a definite article in Polish, there are some indications that its status might be changing in spoken Polish. The crucial contexts are connected with associative-anaphoric use of *ten* and its rare co-occurrence with possessive pronouns in the noun phrase. The fact that the contexts are restricted to spoken Polish or registers similar to spoken Polish is expected, as the change normally proceeds from spoken to written registers.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Polish, as most Slavic languages, is traditionally considered as an articleless language. This paper is not meant to challenge this view and claim that *ten* is a definite article. However, it shows that many observations made by Polish scholars that 'the Polish pronoun *ten* correspond[s] to or resemble[s] some definite functions in languages with articles' (Bacz 1991: 3) are further supported by evidence. While the contexts provided by Bacz (1991) are inconclusive in the sense that most of them are ambiguous between demonstrative and definite functions, semantic evidence for *ten*, such as the associative-anaphoric use, shows that there are contexts which exclude demonstrative pronoun functions. The definite article status of *ten* is further supported by combinations in which it follows possessive pronouns. Interestingly, the analysis of the Polish data suggests that almost all the potential definite article contexts are restricted to colloquial Polish, either in spoken or in written form, though it must be admitted that the number of such examples is very small (cf. Bartnik 2014 for quantitative corpus data). This is in line with general principles of language change which show that linguistic change begins in spoken registers and only then leaks through to the written register.

If such a categorial change is indeed under way in spoken Polish, we might wonder whether *ten* can be located in one of the two intermediate stages on Himmelmann's (1997) grammaticalization cline repeated below for convenience:

(24) […] demonstrative pronoun– demonstrative determiner– weakly demonstrative definite determiner– definite article […]

Anaphoric examples presented in this paper suggest that *ten* has reached the weakly demonstrative definite determiner stage, according to the featural

make-up presented by (Studler 2013: 163). The evidence from spoken Polish indicates that *ten* could even reach the definite article level. If this is indeed the case, the data show that the change proceeds gradually and involves a number of micro-changes, subtle and fine-grained 'local steps' that appear to be gradient (Traugott and Trousdale 2010: 23). An accumulation of micro-changes may lead to macro-changes manifested by the change of the syntactic status of elements like *ten*.

REFERENCES

Abney, Steven. 1987. *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. PhD dissertation. MIT.
Allen, Cynthia. 2006. "Possessives and determiners in Old English." In *Types of Variation: Diachronic, Dialectal and Typological Interfaces*. Terttu Nevalainen, Juhani Klemola and Mikko Laitinen (eds.), 149–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Bacz, Barbara. 1991. "On some article-like uses of the demonstrative *ten* [this] in Polish. Could *ten* become an article?" *Langues et Linguistique* 17,1–16.
Bańko, Mirosław, Rafał L. Górski, Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, Marek Łaziński, Piotr Pęzik, and Adam Przepiórkowski. 2012. *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. [National Corpus of the Polish Langauge] Warszawa: IPI PAN.
Bartnik, Artur. 2014. "Determiners and possessives in Old English and Polish." In *Advances in the syntax of DPs*. Anna Bondaruk, Gréte Dalmi and Alexander Grosu (eds.), 247–266. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
Bošković, Željko. 2008. "What will you have, DP or NP?" Available at: http://web.uconn.edu/boskovic/papers/nels.illinois.proceedings.final.pdf.
Cinque, Guglielmo. 2002. *Functional Structure in DP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Vol.1. New York: Oxford University Press.
Czardybon, Adrian. 2013. "Definiteness and concept types in Polish." A paper presented at *Languages with and without articles 2013 Workshop*, Université Paris 8, France.
Giusti, Giuliana. 2001. "The birth of a functional category: from Latin ILLE to the Romance article and personal pronoun." In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Guglielmo Cinque and Giampaolo Salvi (eds.), 157–171. Amsterdam: North Holland.
Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. "How does a language acquire gender markers?" In *Universals of Human* Language. III. Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson and Edith Moravcsik (eds.), 47–82. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Heusler, Andreas. 1962. *Altislandisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter [Germanische Bibliothek 1].
Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2001. "Articles." In *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher, and Wolfgang Raible (eds.), 831-841. Berlin: de Gruyter.
Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 1997. *Deiktikon, Artikel, Nominalphrase: zur Emergenz syntaktischer Struktur*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
Klemensiewicz, Zenon. 1953. *Zarys składni polskiej* [An outline of Polish syntax]. Warszawa: PWN.

Kryk, Barbara. 1987. *On Deixis in English and Polish: the role of demonstrative pronouns*. Frankfurt am Main: Varlag Peter Lang.

Lehmann, Christian. 2002. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meillet, Antoine. 1912. "L'évolution des formes grammaticales." *Scientia* 12/26. Reprinted (1951): *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale*, 159–174. Paris: Champion.

Mendoza, Imke. 2005. "Polish demonstrative pronouns as 'markers of value'." *Glossos* 6: 1–20.

Miodunka, Władysław. 1974. "Funkcje zaimków w grupach nominalnych *współczesnej polszczyzny mówionej* [The functions of pronouns in nominal phrases in contemporary spoken Polish]." Kraków: Zeszyty Naukowe UJ 43.

Nagórko, Alicja. 2007. *Zarys gramatyki polskiej* [An outline of Polish grammar]. Warszawa: PWN.

Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1968. "Zaimek w polskim zdaniu. 2. Obserwacje przydawki zaimkowej [The pronoun in the Polish sentence. 2. Observations of the pronominal attribute]." *Język Polski* 48: 12–33.

Scatton, Ernest A. 1984. *A reference grammar of Modern Bulgarian*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Skrzypek, Dominika. 2010. "Between a demonstrative and an article. The status of *-in* in Old Swedish." *Folia Scandinavica* 11: 145–162.

Studler, Rebekka. 2013. "The morphology, syntax and semantics of definite determiners in Swiss German." In *Crosslinguistic Studies on Noun Phrase Structure and Reference (Syntax and Semantics)*. Patricia Cabredo Hofherr and Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds.), 143–171. Brill: The Netherlands.

Swan, Oskar E. 2002. *A grammar of contemporary Polish*. Bloomington: Slavica.

Szwedek, Aleksander. 1976. *Word order, sentence stress and reference in English and Polish*. Linguistic Research: Edmonton, Canada.

Topolińska, Zuzanna. 1984. "Składnia grupy imiennej [The syntax of the noun phrase]." In *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Składnia* [The grammar of contemporary Polish. Syntax]. Zuzanna Topolińska (ed.), 301–389. Warszawa: PWN.

Traugott, Elisabeth Closs and Graeme Trousdale. 2010. "Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization. How do they intersect?" In *Gradience, gradualness and grammaticalization*. Elisabeth Closs Traugott and Graeme Trousdale (eds.), 19–44. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Willim, Ewa. 2000. "On the grammar of Polish nominals." In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka (eds.), 319–346. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Wolter, Lynsey. 2006. *That's That: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases*. PhD dissertation University of California Santa Cruz.

ZAIMEK WSKAZUJĄCY CZY PRZEDIMEK?
PRZYPADEK POLSKIEGO *TEN*

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Niniejszy artykuł omawia składniowy status polskiego zaimka wskazującego *ten* w ramach teorii gramatykalizacji. W pierwszej części artykułu zostały ustalone kryteria formalne (morfoskładniowe) i semantyczne pomocne w odróżnianiu zaimków wskazujących od przedimków. Następnie przedstawione zostały argumenty potwierdzające status zaimka wskazującego omawiane-

go elementu. Ostatnia część artykułu jest poświęcona przedimkowym właściwościom zaimka *ten*. Pomimo że podstawową funkcją tej części mowy jest funkcja zaimka wskazującego, artykuł pokazuje, że *ten* zdradza również cechy przedimkowe szczególnie w potocznym języku polskim.

Słowa kluczowe: gramatykalizacja; zaimki wskazujące; przedimki; mówiony polski; kryteria semantyczne; kryteria formalne.