SIMILE DEMONSTRATIVES IN CROATIAN: QUANTITY, QUALITY AND BEYOND

Brala-Vukanović, Maja; Gärdenfors, Peter; Matešić, Mihaela

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-08-08**

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

387

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić

SIMILE DEMONSTRATIVES IN CROATIAN: QUANTITY, QUALITY AND BEYOND

Maja Brala-Vukanović, PhD, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
marija.brala@ffri.uniri.hr ⓘD *orcid.org/0000-0002-5708-7624*
Peter Gärdenfors, PhD, Department of Philosophy, Lund University
peter.gardenfors@lucs.lu.se ⓘD *orcid.org/0000-0001-7423-828X*
Mihaela Matešić, PhD, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
mihaela.matesic@ffri.uniri.hr ⓘD *orcid.org/0000-0002-4780-8512*

We investigate a particular subclass of semantic features associated with demonstratives of quantity and quality, and the respective interrogatives. We explore these lexical elements as they behave linguistically in simile constructions in Croatian. We show that the semantic features that can be focused on in similes are the same as the references of the full system of Croatian demonstratives. However, the possibility to focus on a particular semantic feature by a specific choice of demonstrative or interrogative in simile constructions is being replaced in usage by the generic simile word 'kao'.

Key words: *demonstrative; interrogative; simile; Croatian; semantic feature; semantic domain*

388

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian…*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

1. Introduction

Demonstratives form a universal, typologically well-established grammatical category which is used to establish a joint focus of attention between speaker and addressee (Diessel 1999, 2003). Languages vary a lot in terms of what demonstratives they contain (Diessel 1999). Some languages only have location demonstratives, some have location and object nearness demonstratives, but some, such as Croatian, contain a very elaborate system of demonstratives.

Diessel (2003) notes that demonstratives and interrogatives have a number of features in common, in particular their pragmatic function to initiate search for information. In this article, we will provide support for this position by showing that the rich set of interrogatives in Croatian is also used in simile constructions.[1]

In this paper we propose a thorough review of Croatian interrogatives of quantity and quality, and of the ways in which these are used in Croatian simile constructions. In this sense it should be made clear that while being a contribution to the study of simile (or similative) and equative constructions (in general, and – more specifically – in Croatian), this paper aims at contributing to the extant studies of:

a) the link that exists between demonstratives and interrogatives and, relatedly, the connections between demonstratives, interrogatives and simile / equative constructions. This latter task stems from the former, and, in this sense, this paper is to be understood more as an analysis contributing centrally to the former and only marginally to the latter;

b) the links that exist between the semantic domains expressed by (Croatian) demonstratives and interrogatives on the one hand, and the single domain hypothesis that was put forward by Gärdenfors (2014). In fact, our aim is to show that the set of domains which we identify as basic ontological domains lexicalized by Croatian interrogative/simile demonstratives fully corresponds to Gärdenfors' (ibid.) single semantic domains (such as space, time, size, shape, weight, color etc.).

As pointed out in a), our results – stemming from a systematization on real language data – could and possibly should be taken as a starting point for a future more finely grained and systematic typological investigation

---

[1] Croatian is not in Diessel's (2003, 651) data set.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian…*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

389

of simile/equative constructions in Croatian – something that has so far, despite the recent surge of interest in the topic over the past few years[2], not been done.

Before we move on, a note on terminology is due. What in this paper is termed 'simile construction' (also termed 'similative' in the literature – see footnote 2 below) is sometime in linguistics referred to also with the term 'equative' construction (König and Umbach 2018, Rett, 2020). We have decided to use the former, and leave the term 'equative' (or 'equational') for constructions where one entity is equated with another in a copular construction (X is Y) and also for usages where two expressions are equated by means of a non-verbal element (such as the demonstrative pronoun).[3]

Simile constructions are expressed in English in a comparative relation established by means of lexical items such as 'as':

(1) Robert is as tall as this

or 'like':

(2) Robert is tall like his father.[4]

Sentence (1) would be used in combination with a gesture and involves a comparison between the height of Robert and the height indicated by the gesture. In sentence (2) Robert's height is compared to that of his

---

[2] For insightful and detailed treatments of simile / similative and equative constructions from a theoretical point of view as well as a typological treatment and in a number of world languages we refer the reader to Haspelmath & Buchholz, 1998; Rett, 2020 (who also considers examples from Croatian language), Treis & Vanhove, 2017; Treis & Woytylak, 2018 (a collections of papers exploring equative, comparative and superlative constructions in a variety of little known languages); Umbach, 2012; Umbach & Gust, 2014.

[3] **Simile constructions seem to highlight the comparative rather than the equational fea**ture. In other words, in simile constructions we look at what is similar (what is made informatively prominent is a parallel between two – or more – elements in the sentence), rather than what is necessarily the same. Another alternative terminological possibility, that of 'comparative' construction (see Koenig & Vezzosi, in press) has not been adopted here in order not to create confusion with degrees of comparison in English as well as in Croatian (see also comparative and superlative constructions in Treis & Woytylak, 2018).

[4] While Haspelmath and Bucholz (1998: 279) argue that 'like' expresses only similarity (equal manner) but not equal extent, Umbach and Gust (2014) have shown that similarity 'like' constructions can also be used to express equal extent (used as equatives).

father. Sentence (2), however, is ambiguous. It can either mean that the two are of the same height (both are 185 cm):

(2a) Robert is as tall as his father

or they are both tall (not short), but not necessarily of the same height:

(2b) Robert is tall, as is his father.[5]

Interestingly, the Croatian language provides a multiplicity of lexical means for expressing the meanings rendered by English sentences (1) and (2) above, and, furthermore, offers tools to disambiguate between the two readings of sentence (2).

In fact, we could say:

A) as a direct translation of (1), in combination with a gesture:

(3) *Robert   je   ovoliko   visok.*
    Robert   be-PRS.3SG   this-ADV   tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M
    Robert   is   this   tall
    'Robert is this tall.'

B) for the exact equative reading rendered in (2a), i.e. they are of the same height:

(4) *Robert   je   visok   koliko   i*
    Robert   be-PRS.3SG   tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M   how much-ADV   and / too[6]
    Robert   is   tall   how much   and / too
    'Robert is as tall as

    njegov   otac.
    his-NOM.SG.M   father-NOM.SG.M
    his   father
    his father.'

---

[5] In the second interpretation, the appropriate orthography of (2) would perhaps include a comma: 'Robert is as tall, like his father'.

[6] The best translational choice between the two alternatives in English remains unclear. The two options remain throughout the paper, but the alternation is not indicated in the remaining examples for clarity of target text purposes.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

391

C) for the comparative reading (2b), i.e. they are both tall:

(5) *Robert je visok, kao i njegov otac.*
    Robert be-PRS.3SG tall-ADJ.NOM.M as and his-NOM.M father-NOM.SG.M

    Robert is tall, as and his father

    'Robert is as tall as his father.'

In this article we show that such comparisons can be made with respect to a number of different semantic features.

There are two key questions that prompted our investigations:

(a) What types of semantic features can be selected by simile particles (i.e. in simile constructions) in order to act as attention focus (on which the attention of speaker and addressee meet)?

(b) Are some of the semantic features that can be selected in (generic) simile constructions cognitively more salient than other features?

We begin by presenting a review of the demonstratives and interrogatives in Croatian, as well as a brief review of simile constructions (Section 2). Then we move on to explore the behavior of the interrogatives in Croatian simile constructions (Section 3) and show that the semantic features of interrogative similes map completely onto the rich set of features expressed by the non-simile demonstratives. In addition to the class of demonstratives used in similes, Croatian allows an alternative choice between the generic simile word 'kao'[7] (meaning 'as' or 'like') and the corresponding interrogative.

2. Background

2.1. The domain hypothesis for demonstratives

Bühler (1934) identified demonstratives as a subclass of deictic expressions, the references of which are determined in relation to a center of orientation provided by the place, time and participants involved in the utterance. Building on the comparison with interrogatives, Diessel (2003, p. 640) identifies the following list of semantic features as possible referen-

---

[7] In his analysis of the complex and still unclear grammatical status of the lexical item 'kao' in contemporary standard Croatian, Pranjković (2013: 212-219) decides to categorize 'kao' as a particle. Given the insights stemming from the analysis presented in this paper, we have decided to classify the word 'kao' as a simile particle, since establishing relations of similarity or sameness seems to be its exclusive role in the Croatian language.

392

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

ces: person, thing, place, direction, time, manner and amount. In this article we expand manner to the more general notion of *quality*, ultimately proposing the distinction between semantic features associated with (demonstratives of) quantity and quality as a particular subclass (see König and Umbach, 2018). More specifically, we will explore demonstratives and interrogatives of quantity (corresponding to Diessel's amount) and quality as they behave linguistically in simile constructions in Croatian. Our results will provide an answer to question (a) in that the set of interrogatives that are also used as similes will identify a set of semantic features that are more detailed than the list presented by Diessel (2003). As an answer to question (b), we will show that the class of entities that can be focused on are as rich as the references of the full system of Croatian demonstratives (Gärdenfors and Brala-Vukanović 2018).

As we have already pointed out above, in this work the term 'demonstrative' is analysed and used in the sense that has emerged from cross-linguistic and typological studies (e.g. Diessel, 1999; Dixon, 2003) and is, among other things, characterized also by a simple semantic structure that combines a deictic component and an ontological component.

Gärdenfors and Brala-Vukanović (2018) argue that the meanings of demonstratives can be analyzed in terms of a combination of the spatial domain (expressed by distinctions between proximal, medial and distal demonstratives) and a small set of semantic domains. This is an extension of the single domain hypothesis for verbs, adjectives and prepositions that was put forward by Gärdenfors (2014). As a case study they analyze the Croatian system of demonstratives. This system is very rich (see Table 1) and contains demonstratives for several types of domains.

Table 1. The system of Croatian demonstratives (from Gärdenfors and Brala-Vukanović 2018).

Domain	Semantic component	Proximal	Medial	Distal	Word class	Corresponding question
Space *Location*	1. Static point (location)	*OVDJE* Here	*TU* There	*ONDJE* Over there	Adverb of place	*Gdje?* (Where?)
	2. Goal point (motion)	*OVAMO* (Over) here	*TAMO* Over there	*ONAMO* All the way over there		*Kamo?* (Where to?)
	3. Source point (motion)	*ODAVDE* From here	*ODATLE* From there	*ODANDE* From over there		*Odakle?* (From what point?)
Path	4. Path (motion)	*OVUDA* Toward here	*TUDA* Toward there	*ONUDA* Toward over there		*Kuda?* (Which way?)
	5. Path goal (direction of motion)	*DOVDE* Up to here	*DOTLE* Up to there	*DONDE* Up to over there		*Dokle?* (To what point?)
	6. Path source (direction of motion)	*ODOVUD(A)* From this direction	*OTUD(A)* From that direction	*ODONUD(A)* From that direction over there		*Otkud(a)?* (From what point?)
Object	7. Object (person)	*OVAJ* This one	*TAJ* That one	*ONAJ* That one over there	Noun/adjective	*Koji? / Tko? Što?* (Which? / Who/What)
	8. Size domain	*OVOLIK* Of this size	*TOLIK* Of that size	*ONOLIK* Of that size	Adjective	*Kolik?* (Of which size? How much /adjectival/)
Object property	9. Other property domain	*OVAKAV* Of this type	*TAKAV* Of that type/	*ONAKAV* Of that type		*Kakav?* (Of which type?)
Action *Time point*	10. Static time	*SADA* Now	*TADA* Then	*ONDA* Back then	Adverb of time	*Kada?* (When?)
Time path	11. Quantity	*OVOLIKO* This much / this long	*TOLIKO* That much / that long	*ONOLIKO* Way that much / way that long		*Koliko (dugo)?* (How long / how much /adverbial/)
Property	12. Action property	*OVAKO* This way	*TAKO* That way	*ONAKO* The other way	Adverb of manner	*Kako?* (How, in which way?)
Discourse	13. Element in common ground	*EVO* Here – Here we go	*ETO* There – There we go	*ENO* Way there	Particle	

394

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

It should be noted here that Table 1 only contains the masculine forms of the demonstratives. Parallel tables can be constructed for the feminine and neuter terms.

As can be seen, the semantic domains identified in Table 1 map well on the semantic features identified by Diessel (2003), although Croatian introduces a further category (category 9 related to the quality of objects) as well as distinguishing between several forms of direction and two forms of time.[8] Furthermore, for each of the domains, with the exception of category 13,[9] there is a corresponding question word. This supports Diessel's thesis with regard to the parallelism between demonstratives and interrogatives.

'Kolik' in category 8 is the interrogative word for the adjectival demonstratives 'ovolik', 'tolik', 'onolik' (referring to size – a quantity – as the property in the object domain). It is the masculine form, but there are also the neuter forms – 'ovoliko', 'toliko', 'onoliko' – for which the interrogative word is 'koliko'. This should not be confused with the adverbial interrogative word 'koliko' in category 11 (how long / how much, relative to the duration of an activity – a quantity in the action domain), which has as answers the demonstratives 'ovoliko', 'toliko', 'onoliko'. In other words, the neuter 'koliko' in category 8 and 'koliko' in category 11 are homographs, but they have a different semantic value.

2.2. Demonstratives of quantity and quality in simile constructions

König and Umbach (2018) study demonstratives of manner, quality and degree. Their main concern is the different uses of equatives, in particular the German 'so'. They choose the term "degree" for one of the types of equatives, but we think that "quantity" is a preferable term since there are Croatian demonstratives, to wit, categories 8 and 11 in Table 1, that

---

[8] For time we can ask 'Koliko dugo čekate u redu' (How long have you been waiting in line (for)?) or 'Koliko čekate u redu' (How (much) have you been waiting in line?).

[9] The discoursal category, i.e. line 13 in Table 1 does neither allow a question word nor simile constructions and is thus not considered here. However, let us note that although there is no specific question word for the discoursal category (see line 13 in Table 1), the particles 'evo', 'eto' and 'eno' can appear in the pragmatic role of indicating (replacing) the demonstrative or intensifying the demonstrative in the answer, e. g.: '*Gdje je torba*? Evo / eto / eno je. / Evo ovdje / Eno ondje.' (Approx. transl. Where is the bag? Here / There it is / Over here / Over there).

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

395

express not just degree, but quantity in general. These demonstratives are not only used in equative expressions. We view degree as a subset of quantity (in the sense of being some sort of gradable subcategory). Furthermore, we regard manner as a quality of an action (see category 12 in Table 1), which means that we restrict ourselves to analyzing quantity and quality, albeit distinguishing between quantities and qualities of objects and actions respectively.

König and Umbach (2018, p. 303) state that their semantic analysis starts out from the idea that the equative demonstratives express similarity. This may be true for the German 'so'. But they want to generalize this to something universal so they claim that it "seems safe to assume that the corresponding demonstratives in other languages [...] are equivalent in meaning in terms of the similarity analysis [...]". In our opinion, this statement should be modified since, as we have just shown, Croatian demonstratives that express manner, quality and quantity are also used in contexts that do not involve similarity comparisons. Apart from the examples of quantity above there are also examples of demonstratives involving quality (including manner) that are not equatives.

Our main purpose in this article is to extend the domain analysis to the use of similes involving quantity and quality in Croatian and to investigate how different constructions involving such demonstratives express different kinds of similarity. We propose that a basic distinction can be drawn between quantitative expressions of size and time (categories 8 and 11 in Table 1) and qualitative expressions of type and manner (categories 9 and 11 in Table 1).

3. Interrogative words as similarity demonstratives in Croatian

Croatian language allows for several ways of expressing simile constructions. In this section we show that *each* of the interrogatives in categories 1-12 from Table 1 can be used as a similarity demonstrative (with the exception of the discoursal category 13, as explained in footnote 7).

3.1. The similarity particle 'kao'

Before we embark on this presentation, however, it should be noted that Croatian has a generic similarity/comparative particle 'kao' (corresponding to the English 'as' or 'like'). Trying to systematize the usage and

396

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

syntactic properties of the lexeme 'kao' within the Croatian grammatical tradition, Pranjković (2013) concludes that 'kao' in its central sense cannot be treated as an adverb (as it tends to be treated in most Croatian dictionaries and grammar books) because it does not establish a direct relation to the verb but it should be, rather, treated as a particle which primary function is to condense the comparative constructions whereby these construction shift from verbal to nominal[10]:

lijep	*kao*	*slika*	<	*lijep*	*kao*	*što*	*je*
pretty-ADJ. NOM.SG.M	as/like	picture-NOM.SG.F		pretty-ADJ. NOM.SG.M	as/like	what-CONJ	be-PRS.3SG
pretty	as/like	picture		pretty	as/like	what	is
'pretty as/like a picture'				'pretty as/like a picture is'			

lijepa	*slika*
pretty-ADJ.NOM.SG.F	picture-NOM.SG.F
pretty	picture

The etymology of 'kao' is not entirely clear, but it is usually explained as having developed from the question word 'kako' (see Budmani, 1892-1897: 828-833). It is particularly interesting to note that within Croatian dialects we find – to our knowledge – 12 different lexical and/or phonological variants to express the meaning of what in the standard Croatian language is 'kao'.[11] An analysis of all the forms yields that it is plausible that 'kao' inherently contains a semantic component of deicticity which is not equally present in 'kako' – where 'kako', in turn, seems to be the older form.[12] Given this, and the fact that amongst the dialectal Croatian forms

---

[10] Pranjković lists two adittional usages of 'kao': that of a modal particle in the 'so-called' i.e. 'navodno, tobože' sense ('On se kao snebiva') and a connecting particle in complex conjunctions (e.g. 'kao što', 'kao da', 'kao kad').

[11] They are *kao*, *ka*, *ko*, *kot*, *kod*, *kano*, *kaj*, *kej*, *kak*, *kako*, *kakti,* and *kakono*. Among these words, we find the last one of particular interest, as it combines the interrogative-relative adverb 'kako' with the demonstrative 'ono' (for its etymology see Budmani 1892-1897: 759, 761, 762, kao i Jedvaj, 1959-1962: 840).

[12] We observe that most Slavic languages have a translational equivalent for 'kako' that is similar in form and used as both a question word and as a simile particle. Only the South Slavonic group of languages has, alongside 'kako', also introduced another form, namely 'kao', which serves as a simile particle only. This is presumably why 'kako' no longer serves as a simile particle (while other question words for demonstrative categories do). Of course,

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

397

we find the form 'kakono', we hypothesize that 'kao' is a contraction of two older forms, to wit, 'kako' (how) and 'ono' (distal object demonstrative; see category 7 in Table 1).

The interrogative form 'kako' is used as a relative pronoun in dependent clauses (see sentence (6) below). As one of the possible relations established by this relative pronoun is that of similarity (comparison), 'kako' has, indeed, become the generic indicator for the expression of similarity. The use of interrogative form as a relative pronoun that introduces a dependent clause holds for the other question words as well: frequently, Croatian grammar books indicate interrogative words as 'interrogative-relative'.[13] All the interrogatives function as the relative pronouns when introducing subordinate clauses of different kind. However, when it comes to simile constructions, it is important to notice that the interrogative 'kako' – while being attested in grammars (Silić-Pranjković 2005: 340) – is no longer recognized as an acceptable similarity interrogative by native speakers (or at least it is not native speakers' first choice) and it is in fact common to replace it by the similarity word 'kao'.

Given that (a) 'kao' is usually seen as having developed from the interrogative 'kako', (b) that similarity constructions in Croatian are possible by means of both the similarity / simile interrogative and the similarity / simile particle 'kao', and (c) that similarity / simile constructions with 'kao' are linguistically more economical (i.e. syntactically condensed), it is reasonable to posit that the comparison by way of interrogatives is historically older than that by the simile particle 'kao'.

In order to illustrate the contrast between the relative usage of 'kako' on the one hand, and the proper simile usage of 'kako', on the other, consider the following two examples:

---

there are some South Slavonic dialects which have preserved 'kako', as mentioned in footnote 9.

[13] The development from interrogative to the relative is, of course, found in many languages, English being one of them (cf. English who, which, etc.). To illustrate the usage of a relative interrogative in Croatian, consider the sentence: 'Ivan je doputovao iz Dubrovnika odakle i Marko' (John has arrived from Dubrovnik *from where* Mark as well). The same construction is *not* possible with the demonstrative, i.e. *'Ivan je doputovao iz Dubrovnika, odatle i Marko' (John has arrived from Dubrovnik, *from there* Mark as well). An interesting topic to explore is whether the development from interrogative to relative has followed the same path in all languages.

398

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian…*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

(6) *Ivan   je   uzgojio   pšenicu*
     John   be-AUX.PRS.3SG   grow-PST.PTCP.SG.M   wheat-ACC.SG.F
     John   is   grown   wheat
     'John has grown the wheat

     kako   mu   je   Marko   savjetovao.
     how-ADV   he-DAT   be-PRS.3SG   Mark   suggest-PST.PTCP.SG.M
     how   him   has   Mark   suggested
     in the way in which Mark has suggested.'

(7) *Ivan   je   uzgojio   pšenicu*
     John   be-AUX.PRS.3SG   grow-PST.PTCP.SG.M   wheat-ACC.SG.F
     John   is   grown   wheat
     'John has grown the wheat

     kako   ju   je   uzgojio   i   Marko.[14]
     how-ADV   she-ACC   be-PRS.3SG   grow-PST.PTCP.SG.M   and   Mark
     how   her   is   grown   and   Mark
     in the way in which Mark has grown it.'

If we contrast (6) and (7) we note that in (6)[15] 'kako' is more of a relativizer and cannot be replaced with 'kao'. In (7) 'kako' is clearly used to express the similarity (it should be noticed that the same verb is used in the main and in the subordinate clause) and in this case it is possible to replace 'kako' with 'kao':

---

[14] In sentence (6) 'kako' introduces the relative adverbial clause. In sentence 7) it conjoins two comparative clauses (for more details on this contrast see Silić and Pranjković, 2005: 340). Crucially, while usage of 'kako' in simile constructions as the one presented in sentence (7) is given in Standard Croatian grammatical literature, it is generally rated as unacceptable by native speakers of Croatian. In fact, the simile interrogative 'kako' is in usage replaced by the simile particle 'kao' or, alternatively, 'kao što' (the fact is noted also by Silić and Pranjković (ibid.)).

[15] Although sentence (6) is not an example of an equative construction, but rather an example of an expression of manner, we have decided to include both because it is one of the most frequent constructions for the expression of the given meaning, as well as to show the full range of possibilities for the expression of the given meaning, so as to allow for full comparison of all possible constructions. The same reasoning applies to section 3.2.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

399

(8) | *Ivan* | *je* | *uzgojio* | *pšenicu* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be-AUX.PRS | grow-PST. | wheat- | like | and | Mark |
| | PRS.3SG | PTCP.SG.M | ACC.SG.F | | | |
| John | is | grown | wheat | like | and | Mark |

'John has grown the wheat like Mark.'

This replacement is possible in (7) since in this sentence we have the same verb in both clauses, which allows for a contraction expressed in (8), as the repetition of the verb is not needed. In other words, when comparing 'two things of the same kind' we can replace the interrogative-relative simile 'kako' with the proper simile particle 'kao'.

3.2. Parallelism between interrogatives and similes

Departing from the interrogative word used in relation to each category of demonstratives, below we list the various alternative possibilities for simile constructions for each of the twelve categories from Table 1. Our aim is to show how these demonstratives are used to express different kinds of similarity.

– Interrogative word: Gdje? (Where? – line 1, Table 1)

(9) | *Ivan* | *pere* | *auto* | *u* | *vrtu,* | *gdje* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | wash- | car-ACC.SG.M | in | garden- | where-ADV | and | Mark |
| | PRS.3SG | | | LOC.SG.M | | | |
| John | washes | car | in | garden | where | and | Mark |

'John is washing the car in the garden, where Mark is washing it too.'

(10) | *Ivan* | *pere* | *auto* | *u* | *vrtu,* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | wash-PRS.3SG | car-ACC.SG.M | in | garden-LOC.SG.M | as | and | Mark |
| John | washes | car | in | garden | as | and | Mark |

'John is washing the car in the garden, as Mark is / and so is Mark.'

The option with 'kao' with the comma before 'kao', as in sentence (10), expresses the similarity meaning that is focused on the activity itself (John and Mark are washing their cars in the garden). However, the same sentence without a comma (i.e. *Ivan pere auto u vrtu kao i Marko*) expresses, according to Standard Croatian ortographic norm, the following meaning: John is washing his car in the garden (in a certain manner, i.e. using three different sponges) and Mark is washing his car in the same way as well, i.e.

also using three different sponges). The same distinction (sentence with or without comma) also applies to all examples below.

In (9) the relativizer 'gdje' refers to the adverbial circumstance of place expressed in the main clause. When replaced with simile particle 'kao' (10), the similarity meaning becomes dominant, and the lexicalization i.e. expression of the semantic particle relative to place, while still being present, becomes secondary with respect to other information and rather than being used to compare the location of two scenes, the particle is used to compare the entirety of the two scenes / images being put into relation.

– Interrogative word: Kamo? (Where to? – line 2, Table 1)

(11) | *Ivan* | *nosi* | *košulju* | *na* | *kemijsko* | *čišćenje,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | take-PRS.3SG | shirt-ACC.SG.F | on | chemical-ADJ.ACC.SG.N | cleaning-ACC.SG.N |
| John | takes | shirt | on | chemical | cleaning |

'John is taking the shirt to the drycleaner,

kamo	*i*	*Marko.*
where-ADV	and	Mark
where	and	Mark

where Mark is taking it too.'

(12) | *Ivan* | *nosi* | *košulju* | *na* | *kemijsko* | *čišćenje,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | take-PRS.3SG | shirt-ACC.SG.F | on | chemical-ADJ.ACC.SG.N | cleaning-ACC.SG.N |
| John | takes | shirt | on | chemical | cleaning |

'John is taking the shirt to the drycleaner,

kao	*i*	*Marko.*
as	and	Mark
as	and	Mark

as is Mark / and so is Mark (too).'

As was the case with the previous examples, in (11) the relativizer 'kamo' refers to the adverbial circumstance of place expressed in the main clause. When replaced with simile particle 'kao' (12), the focus of the expression shifts from place, i.e. the spatial component, to the establishing similarity. The information relative to place loses prominence and becomes

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

401

equivalent to other informative elements expressed in the main clause. Once again, rather than being used to compare the location of two scenes, the particle is used to compare the entirety of the two scenes / images being put into relation.

– Interrogative word: Odakle? (From what point? – line 3, Table 1)

(13) *Ivan je   stigao   iz   Dubrovnika, odakle   i   Marko.*
John be-AUX.   arrive-PST. from Dubrovnik-   where-ADV and Mark
      PRS.3SG   PTCP.SG.M.   GEN.M
John is   arrived   from Dubrovnik   where   and Mark

'John has arrived from Dubrovnik, from where Mark has arrived too.'

(14) *Ivan je   stigao   iz   Dubrovnika, kao i   Marko.*
John be-AUX.   arrive-PST. from Dubrovnik-   as   and Mark
      PRS.3SG   PTCP.SG.M   GEN.M
John is   arrived   from Dubrovnik   as   and Mark

'John has arrived from Dubrovnik, as has Mark / and so has Mark.'

In example (13), once again, we see the same mechanism at play: the relativizer 'odakle' refers to the adverbial circumstance of place (which can be described as a source point of a motion) expressed in the main clause. When 'odakle' is replaced by the particle 'kao' (14), the source point of motion information loses prominence, is in terms of prominence equated with all other informative components expressed in the sentence, and the relativizes 'kao' shifts the focus on the overall parallel i.e. on everything that the two scenes illustrated by the sentence share.

– Interrogative word: Kuda? (Which way? – line 4, Table 1)

(15) *Ivan je   vozio   cestom   uz more,*
John be-AUX.PRS.3SG drive-PST.PTCP.SG.M road-INS.SG.F by sea-ACC.SG.N
John is   driven   road   by sea,

'John has taken the road by the sea,

kuda   i   Marko.
where-ADV and Mark
where   and Mark

(which is) where Mark has driven too.'

(16)   *Ivan   je   vozio   cestom   uz more,*

John	be-AUX.PRS.3SG	drive-PST.PTCP.SG.M	road-INS.SG.F	by	sea-ACC.SG.N
John	is	driven	road	by	sea,

'John has taken the road by the sea,

kao i   Marko.

as	and	Mark
as	and	Mark

as has Mark.'

The relativizer 'kuda' (15) refers to the adverbial circumstance of place – more precisely the path followed (drawn) by the verbal action – expressed in the main clause. Replacing 'kuda' by the simile particle 'kao' (16), once again the information in the focus is that relative to the similarity of the two actions (Ivan's driving and Marko's driving), while the identity of "paths" is no longer prominent with respect to all other informative elements expressed in the sentence.

– Interrogative word: Dokle? (To what point? – line 5, Table 1)

(17)   *Ivan   je   pročitao   knjigu   do 70. stranice,*

John	be-AUX.PRS.3SG	read-PST. PTCP.SG.M	book-ACC.SG.F	up	70th	page-GEN.SG.F
John	is	read	book	up	70th	page,

'John has read the book up to page 70,

dokle   i   Marko.

where-ADV	and	Mark
where	and	Mark

(which is) where Mark has (read it) too.'

(18)   *Ivan je   pročitao knjigu   do 70. stranice, kao i   Marko.*[16]

John	be-AUX. PRS.3SG	read-PST. PTCP.SG.M	book- ACC.SG.F	up	70th	page- GEN.SG.F	as	and	Mark
John	is	read	book	up	70th	page,	as	and	Mark

'John has read the book up to page 70, as has Mark.'

---

[16]   However, if we were not to specify the page number, using 'dokle' (Ivan je pročitao knjigu dokle i Marko) has the reading of: John has read the book to the same point to which

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

403

The relativizer 'dokle' (17) refers to the adverbial circumstances of place (more specifically to the end-point of the verbal action). Replacing 'dokle' by the simile particle 'kao' (18), makes the similarity component between the two actions (one performed by John and the other by Mark) the most prominent one, i.e. it makes it more focal over all other information expressed, including the information about the end-point of the verbal action).

– Interrogative word: Otkud(a)? (From what point? – line 6, Table 1)

In everyday usage (and increasingly also in Croatian normative literature) 'otkud(a)' is used interchangeably with 'odakle', so the same examples can be used for both categories 3 and 6 shown in Table 1 (with the same semantic readings and optionality patterns applying).

– Interrogative words: Koji? Tko? Što? (Which/ Who/What – line 7, Table 1)[17]

(19) *Ivan   poznaje   Luku,   koga*[18] *poznaje   i   Marko.*
　　 John   know-PRS.3SG Luke-ACC, who-GEN   know-PRS.3SG and Mark
　　 John   knows   Luke,   whom   knows   and Mark

'John knows Luke, whom Mark knows as well.'

Mark has read it, whereas the construction 'Ivan je pročitao knjigu kao i Marko' only has the reading of: both John and Mark have read the (entire) book.

[17]　We treat the demonstrative 'koji' and the interrogative words for the nominative noun 'tko' (who) and 'što' (what) in the same category, while being fully aware that the latter two refer to (pro)nouns i.e. have a different syntactic and semantic qualification. However, they have developed from the demonstrative in this category, which is why we retain them here. Still, it is worth pointing out that two sentences 'Ivan jede jabuku, što jede i Marko' (John + eat + apple + what + eat + and + Marko), and 'Ivan jede jabuku koju jede i Marko' (John + eat + apple + which one + eat + and + Mark) express two different meanings; the first one lexicalizes that John and Mark are both eating an apple, whereas the second lexicalizes the situation where John and Mark are both eating the same apple (not as in type of fruit, but rather the same object).

[18]　'Koga' is the oblique, accusative form of the interrogative 'tko'. Interestingly, the sentence 'Ivan jede jabuku, što jede i Marko' (John is eating an apple, like Mark is), does not function in the same way. In fact, the reading is that both John and Mark are eating an apple, but probably not the same one (native speakers disagree on this latter fact, probably due to the pragmatic improbability of this latter eating). If we wanted to disambiguate the sentence, and express the latter reading – i.e. both John and Mark eating the same apple – we would need to say 'Ivan jede jabuku, koju jede i Marko', i.e. use the accusative feminine of the interrogative 'koji'.

(20) *Ivan   poznaje   Luku,   kao i   Marko.*

John	know-PRS.3SG	Luke-ACC	as	and	Mark
John	knows	Luke	as	and	Mark

'John knows Luke, as does Mark.'

The relativizer 'koga' (19) refers to the direct object (the person whose name is *Luke*). Replacing the relativizer with the simile particle 'kao' (20), similarity becomes the focal trait being expressed and what is prominent is the whole situation (the entire scene/image), rather than one of its properties or components. While in (19) we have the schema "*A knows B, and B is known to C*", the schema in (20) is "*A knows B, and C, too, knows B*". These two schemata differ in terms of how B is focalized; while in (19) B remains in focus all the time, in (20) B very briefly slips out of focus, just to return as the focal element.

We could add that the schema expressed in (20) fits better with the logical schema involved in similarity based classification: we depart from some pre-set classes, which et 'filled' by (matched to) candidates that have been weighed again possible classes and are then paired with the 'best match'. For example, in the latter sentence we would have two classes – 'those who know Luke' and 'those who do not know Luke' – and the individual that need to be matched (categorized) is Mark. The main clause in (20) tell us that it is the former, rather than the latter class, which is the best match, i.e. the referential class for Mark.

– Interrogative word: Kolik? (Of which size? – line 8, Table 1)[19]

(21) *Ivan je   visok   185 cm, koliko   i   Marko.*

John	be- AUX PRS.3SG	tall-ADJ.NOM. SG.M	185 cm	how much-ADV	and	Mark
John	is	tall	185 cm	how much	and	Mark

John is 185 cm tall, and Mark is this/that tall too.

---

[19] Only the feature of size as pertaining to objects (object property) yields four possibilities which allow for optionality where the semantic readings do not change. In all other cases, leaving out the specification (which, with verbs, is expressed in the adverbial phrase), changes the semantic reading if, rather than using the interrogative word, we use the simile particle 'kao'.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian…*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

405

(22) | *Ivan* | *je* | | *visok* | *185 cm,* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be- AUX PRS.3SG | | tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M | 185 cm | as | and | Mark |
| John | is | | tall | 185 cm | as | and | Mark |

John is 185 cm tall, as is Mark.

The same alternation is possible for both the scalar reading (sentences 21 and 22 above), as well as the additive one (sentences 23 and 24):

(23) | *Ivan* | *je* | | *visok* | *koliko* | | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be- AUX PRS.3SG | | tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M | how much-ADV | | and | Mark |
| John | is | | tall | how much | | and | Mark |

'John is as tall as much as Mark is.'

(24) | *Ivan* | *je* | | *visok* | *kao* | *(i)* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be- AUX PRS.3SG | | tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M | as | and | Mark |
| John | is | | tall | as | and | Mark |

'John is as tall as Mark.'

All four sentences above (21-24) express that John and Mark have exactly the same height.[20]

(25) | *Ivan* | *je* | | *visok,* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be- AUX PRS.3SG | | tall-ADJ.NOM.SG.M | as | and | Mark |
| John | is | | tall | as | and | Mark |

'John is as tall as Mark is.'[20]

Only this last sentence means that both are tall, not necessarily of the same size.

Once again we have the relativizer 'koliko' (21, 23) that expresses or, more precisely, refers to (selects a certain amount of) quantity. Replacing the relativizer 'koliko' with the simile particle 'kao' (22, 24, 25), similarity becomes the prominent and quantity the background element expressed by the sentence.

---

[20] It is possible that the comma is used to introduce another clause: John is tall in one way, and Mark is tall in another. This is why the resulting reading is that they are both tall, but not necessarily of the same height.

– Interrogative word: Kakav? (Of which type? – line 9, Table 1)

(26) | *Ivan* | *je* | *kupio* | *auto* | *kakav* | | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be-AUX. | buy-PST. | car-ACC.SG.M | of which type-ADJ. | | and | Mark |
| | PRS.3SG | PTCP.SG.M | | NOM.SG.M | | | |
| John | is | bought | car | of which type | | and | Mark |

'John has bought a car like Mark / like Mark's.'

Reading: The two cars are equated, they are of the same kind, i.e. the interrogative word 'kakav' – connecting the main clause with the attributive one – relates to the entirety of the car rather than selecting a feature among all the properties of the car; the cars are equated.

(27) | *Ivan* | *je* | *kupio* | *auto,* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be-AUX.PRS.3SG | buy-PST.PTCP.SG.M | car-ACC.SG.M | as | and | Mark |
| John | is | bought | car, | as | and | Mark |

'John has bought a car as has Mark.'

Reading: Both John and Mark have bought a car (the two cars need not be identical, what is compared i.e. equated is the act of buying). Interestingly, if in the main clause some feature of the car is expressed (e.g. its color), then it is questionable whether the question word 'kakav' can be used in the simile construction, while 'kao' seems to be the required form:

(28)*?	*Ivan*	*je*	*kupio*	*plavi*	*auto,*
John	be-AUX.PRS.3SG	buy-PST.PTCP.SG.M	blue-ADJ.ACC.SG.M	car-ACC.SG.M
John	is	bought	blue	car,

'John has bought a blue car

kakav		*i*	*Marko.*
of which type-ADJ.NOM,SG.M	and	Mark	
of which type		and	Mark

like Mark / like Mark's.'

(29) | *Ivan* | *je* | *kupio* | *plavi* | *auto,* | *kao* | *i* | *Marko.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | be-AUX. | buy-PST. | blue-ADJ. | car-ACC. | as | and | Mark |
| | PRS.3SG | PTCP.SG.M | ACC.SG.M | SG.M | | | |
| John | is | bought | blue | car, | as | and | Mark |

'John has bought a blue car as has Mark.'

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416
407

The reason why sentence (28) does not work is the fact that the interrogative word 'kakav' – as already pointed out above – selects i.e. refers to the car in its entirety, while the specification of the color in the first part of the sentence contrasts with the 'totality' relation introduced by 'kakav'.

The relativizer 'kakav' (26) has attributive meaning, and it describes the qualities of the direct object of the sentence. Replacing 'kakav' by the simile particle 'kao' (27, 29), shifts the expressive focus towards the similarity component. What needs to be noted here, and is somewhat different with respect to all the previous examples, is the fact that in (27) the quality component (of – in this case – the car) moves out of focus, and the focal role is taken up by the verbal activity (the purchase of the car).

Quality shifts back into focus by means of attributive specification of the object (the colour adjective in 29). If we compare and contrast this with other examples where quality was specified namely sentences (26), where the relative close is attributive, and (29), where the simile construction explicates the attribute – on the one hand, and, on the other hand, sentences (27) and (29), we note that simply replacing the relativizer with 'kao' results in deletion of attributivity relative to the scenes / images being put into relation. The same does not happen with adverbiality, which does not get deleted – see sentences (10), (12), (14), (16), (20), (22), (24), (25).

– Interrogative word: Kada? (When? – line 10, Table 1)

(30) *Ivan je stigao u 7 sati navečer,*
John be-AUX.PRS.3SG arrive-PST. in 7 hour-GEN.PL.F in the evening-ADV
 PTCP.SG.M
John is arrived in 7 hours in the evening
'John has arrived at 7pm,

kada i Marko.
when-ADV and Mark
when and Mark
when Mark has arrived too.'

(31) *Ivan je stigao u 7 sati navečer, kao i Marko.*
John be-AUX. arrive-PST. in 7 hour- in the like and Mark
 PRS.3SG PTCP.SG.M GEN.PL.F evening-ADV
John is arrived in 7 hours in the like and Mark
 evening
'John has arrived at 7pm, like Mark.'

The relativizer 'kada' (30) introduces the temporal clause. Replacing this relativizer with the simile particle 'kao' (31), once again similarity becomes the focal component, whereas the temporal component shifts out of focus. As we are looking at an adverbial construction, once again – as was the case with previous adverbial constructions – the temporal component remains built into the remaining information components that make up the overall image / schema expressed by the sentence.

– Interrogative word: Koliko (dugo)? (How long / how much ? – line 11, Table 1)

(32)   *Ivan   je   na godišnjem odmoru   već   tri   tjedna,*
       John   be-AUX.   on yearly-ADJ. vacation- already-ADV three week-GEN.
              PRS.3SG   LOC.SG.M   LOC.SG.M   DU.M
       John   is   on yearly   vacation already   three weeks
       'John has been on holiday for three weeks already,

       koliko   i   Marko.
       how much-ADV and Mark
       how much   and Mark
       as (much as) Mark has.'

(33)   *Ivan   je   na godišnjem odmoru   već   tri   tjedna,*
       John   be-AUX.   on yearly-ADJ. vacation- already-ADV three week-GEN.
              PRS.3SG   LOC.SG.M   LOC.SG.M   DU.M
       John   is   on yearly   vacation already   three weeks
       'John has been on holiday for three weeks already,

       kao i   Marko.
       as   and Mark
       as   and Mark
       like Mark.'

The relativizer 'koliko' (32) introduces the quantity clause. Replacing this relativizer with the simile particle 'kao' (33), similarity becomes the focal component, where the component relative to quantity (in this case temporal quantity, i.e. duration) is no longer in focus. As this is another example of attributive construction, once again the quantity component stays built into the remaining information components that make up the overall image / schema expressed by the sentence.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

409

– Interrogative word: Kako? (How, in which way? – line 12, Table 1)

(34)* *Ivan* *pliva* *prsnim* *stilom,* *kako* *i* *Marko.*
  John swim- chest-ADJ. style-INS.SG.M how-ADV and Mark
    PRS.3SG INS.SG.M

  John swims chest style, how and Mark

  'When John swims he swims a breaststroke style, as does Mark.'

In (34) the interrogative word 'kako' is unacceptable in Standard Croatian. It is also unacceptable in the construction where manner is not expressed:

(35)* *Ivan* *pliva* *kako* *i* *Marko.*
  John swim-PRS.3SG how-ADV and Mark

  John swims how and Mark

  John swims like Mark.

In both cases similarity can only be expressed with 'kao':

(36) *Ivan* *pliva* *(prsnim* *stilom),* *kao* *i* *Marko.*
  John swim-PRS.3SG chest-ADJ. style-INS.SG.M as/like and Mark
    INS.SG.M

  John swims chest style, as/like and Mark

  'John swims (a breaststroke style) as does Mark.'

However, the question word 'kako' becomes acceptable in its simile usage in construction where for each of the two clauses being compared the verb is explicated, as in:

(37) *Ivan* *pliva* *kako* *pliva* *i* *Marko.*
  John swim-PRS.3SG how-ADV swim-PRS.3SG and Mark

  John swims how swims and Mark

  John swims as Mark swims.

The sentences that contain the relativizer 'kako' (34, 35) do not fit into the pattern described for other adverbial sentences. In fact, it is only by exchanging the relativizer with the simile particle 'kao' (36), that we have what is a grammatically acceptable sentence. The expression of similarity is the dominant trait, and it gets conflated with manner.

3.3. Discussion

The analysis presented above strongly supports Diessel's (2003) parallelism between demonstratives and interrogatives. The upshot is that Croatian similes encode several different domains of quantity and quality in parallel with the 'ordinary' demonstratives presented in Table 1. It should be noted that while for most interrogatives we have the optionality pattern – where the interrogative can be alternated with the simile particle 'kao' – this does not seem to be the case for the manner interrogative 'kako' (for exceptions see (34) and (35)). This observation represents another argument in favor of the claim that quantity (including degree) falls into one category, while manner should be treated separately (as a subclass of quality).

The single domain hypothesis that was put forward by Gärdenfors (2014) says that for all word classes, except for nouns (and pronouns), the meaning of a word is determined by a region in a single semantic domain, such as space, time, size, shape, weight, color, etc. For some languages the demonstratives cover only the spatial domain ('here', 'there'), for others they include objects ('this', 'that'), but Croatian demonstratives involves several kinds of domains as shown in Table 1. The fact that our investigation shows that there is a complete parallelism between the interrogatives/simile demonstratives and the domains identified in Table 1 provides further support to the domain hypothesis for yet another class of words.

Before moving on, a final question still needs to be addressed: What is the pragmatic function of the simile particle 'kao'? Given the optionality possibilities for expressing simile constructions by either the interrogative word or a simile particle 'kao', one can ask what differences exist between the two constructions. It appears that the interrogative, when functioning as simile, still contains the semantic feature associated with the demonstrative (one of the 12 categories in Table 1) whereas 'kao' functions exclusively as a simile particle, thus having a semantically less specified meaning in terms of specific feature identification, but – at the same time – having a more 'powerful' role in establishing similarity relations (selecting comparable features between referents). When 'kao' is used the message of sameness, or similarity, is established more directly and more generally (without relating to a specific feature) than with the usage of the interrogative words. Possibly, the genericity of 'kao' – in its not selecting a specific feature – allows also for a simpler establishment of a similarity relation, which would justify the appearance of 'kao' in the lexicon.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

411

An interesting parallel can be drawn between the results reported in this study and the issue of relativization strategy[21]. In a study of relativization strategy in Croatian, Polančec and Mihaljević (2016) conclude that the Croatian Standard language prefers relative pronoun strategy as opposed to the strategy of an invariant relativizer, a phenomenon noted in other European standard languages as well. In other words, we are looking at the introduction of a relative clause by means of relative pronouns:

(37a) *Sjećaš*   *li se*   *pisma*   ***koje***
       remember-PRES.2.SG Q REFL letter-GEN.SG.N which-ACC.SG.N
       remember   letter   which
       'Do you remember the letter which

       sam   *ti*   *poslala?*
       be-AUX.PRS.1.SG you-DAT.SG send-PAST.PTCP.SG.F
       am   you   sent
       I have sent you?'

The same can be achieved by means of an invariant relativizer:

(37b) *Sjećaš*   *li se*   *pisma*   ***što***
       remember-PRES.2.SG Q REFL letter-GEN.SG.N what-INVREL[22]
       remember   letter   what
       'Can you remember the letter which

       sam   *ti*   *poslala?*
       be-AUX.PRS.1.SG you-DAT.SG send-PAST.PTCP.SG.F
       am   you   sent
       I have sent you?'

---

[21] For this insightful suggestion we wish to thank an anonymous reviewer who has drawn our attention to the above.

[22] Although this is not a standard glossing abbreviation, we are using it following Polančec and Mihaljević (2016).

412

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

The same can be achieved also by means of an invariant relativizer and a resumptive pronoun:

(37c) *Sjećaš*   *li* *se* *pisma*   **što**   *sam*
       remember-PRES.2.SG   Q   REFL   letter-GEN.SG.N   what-InvRel   be-AUX.PRS.1.SG
       remember   letter   what   am
       'Can you remember the letter which

       ti   **ga**   *poslala?*
       you-DAT.SG   it-ACC.SG.N   send-PAST.PTCP.SG.F
       you   sent
       I have sent you?'

A clear normative preference for 37a over 37b and 37c can be explained by certain principles that apply to a number of standard European languages, with the aim of achieving a perfect balance between message accuracy and cognitive (language) processing or, in Murelli's terms (2011, 259ff, in Polančec and Mihaljević, 2016: 435) between compactness and explicitness. Similar to this, structures with the particle 'kao' may be less precise in terms of identifying a specific feature, as opposed to those with the demonstrative, but can put in the spotlight the similarity relations in a more clear and effective way.

In Section 2.1. we mentioned another interesting distinction between 'kolik' in category 8 (being the interrogative word yielding the adjectival demonstratives 'ovolik', 'tolik', 'onolik' referring to size i.e. quantity as the property in object or noun category) and the adverbial interrogative word 'koliko' (how long, how much – relative to the duration of an activity, i.e. quantity in the activity or verbal category), which can be answered with the demonstratives 'ovoliko', 'toliko', 'onoliko' (category 11 in Table 1). This distinction seems to be particularly relevant for clarifying the possible difference between the notions of quantity and degree. Consider the following Croatian sentences:

(38a) *Koliko*   *si*   *polje*   *prehodala!*
       which size-ADJ.ACC.SG.N   be-AUX.PRS.2SG   field-ACC.SG.N   walk across-PST.
                                                      PTCP.SG.F
       which size   are   field   walked across
       What a field you walked!

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

413

(38b) *Koliko   si   polja   prehodala?*
which size-ADV be-AUX.PRS.2SG field-GEN.SG.N walk across-PST.PTCP.SG.F
which size   are   field   walked across

Which part/portion of the field have you walked?

Consider also:

(39a) *Kolike   si   ljude   pozvala!*
how many-ADJ.   be-AUX.PRS.2SG people-ACC.PL.M invited-PST.PTCP.SG.F
ACC.PL.M.
how many   are   people   invited

What a lot of people you have invited!

vs.

(39b) *Koliko   si   ljudi   pozvala?*
how many-ADV   be-AUX.PRS.2SG people-GEN.PL.M. invited-PST.PTCP.SG.F
how many   are   people   invited

How many people have you invited?

In constructions (38a) and (39a) we see that the noun is in the accusative case, and the interrogative word 'koliko' has the role of an adjectival interrogative word (classified as adjectival pronoun in Standard Croatian grammars). Conversely, in constructions (38b) and (39b) the noun is in the genitive case, and the interrogative word 'koliko' has the role of an adverb[23]. Consequently, the two constructions express two fundamentally different meanings:

–   In (38a) and (39a) the lexical item 'koliko' refers to the total amount of the object (a given quantity, i.e. static property of object, and not dynamic, i.e. property of action);

–   On the other hand, in (38b) and (39b) the lexical item 'koliko' refers to the state, or rather, degree reached with an action (degree being the consequence of the dynamicity of the verb, where the action could continue and bring about a change in degree).

---

[23]   For more syntactic aspects of adverbial subordination in this context see Kortmann, 1997.

We see these two differences above between the a) and b) cases as the key to understanding the difference between quantity and degree (and possibly why quantity is cognitively more salient than degree).

4. Conclusion

In this article we have investigated a series of lexical options available in Croatian to express simile relations, from interrogatives, via demonstratives to similes. Our main result is that all of the twelve interrogatives in Table 1 (that correspond to different kinds of demonstratives) can also be used as similes. The pragmatic function of these words is to draw the addressee's attention to some kind of similarity. What distinguishes Croatian from most other languages is that the rich set of interrogatives makes it possible to focus on similarities regarding an extensive set of semantic features (presented in the second column of Table 1). While the set of features identified extends the list presented by Diessel (2003), the strong parallelism between demonstratives and interrogatives pointed out by Diessel (ibid.) is strongly supported. Furthermore, the simile demonstratives still conform to the version of the single domain thesis that was presented in Gärdenfors and Brala-Vuković (2018).

Acknowledgments

References

Budmani, Pero, ed. (1892–1897) *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika: dio IV* [*Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian: vol. IV*], Zagreb: JAZU.

Bühler, Karl (1934) *Sprachtheorie*, Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.

Diessel, Holger (1999) *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Diessel, Holger (2003) "The relationship between demonstratives and interrogatives", *Studies in Language*, 27, 3, 635–655.

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

415

Gärdenfors, Peter (2014) *Geometry of Meaning: Semantics Based on Conceptual Spaces*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gärdenfors, Peter; Brala-Vukanović, Maja (2018) "Semantic domains of demonstratives and articles: A view of deictic referentiality explored on the paradigm of Croatian demonstratives", *Lingua*, 201, 102–118.

Haspelmath, Martin; Bucholz, Oda (1998) "Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe", Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe, ed. J. Auwera, Berlin, New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 277–334.

Jedvaj, Josip et al., (eds.) (1959–1962) *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika: dio XVII* [*Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian: vol. XVII*]. Zagreb, JAZU.

König, Eckhardt; Vezzosi, Letizia (in press) "On the development of OE *swā* to ModE *so* and related changes in an atypical group of demonstratives", to appear in *English Historical Linguistics*, Benjamins, CILT series.

König, Eckhardt; Umbach, Carla (2018) "Demonstratives of manner, of quality and of degree", *Atypical Demonstratives: Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*, eds. M. Coniglio, A. Murphy, E. Schlachter, T. Veenstra, Amsterdam, De Gruyter, 285–328.

Kortmann, Bernd (1997) "Adverbial subordinators in the languages of Europe", *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe*, ed. Johan Auwera, Berlin, New York, De Gruyter Mouton, 457–562.

Murelli, Adriano (2011) *Relative constructions in European non-standard varieties*, Berlin, De Gruyter Mouton.

Polančec, Jurica; Mihaljević, Ana (2016) Croatian non-standard invariant relativizers in European perspective, *Jezikoslovlje*, 17 (1–2), 429–451.

Pranjković, Ivo (2013) *Gramatička značenja*, Zagreb, Matica hrvatska.

Rett, Jessica (2020) "Separate but equal: a typology of equative constructions", *Degree and quantification*, ed. P. Hallman, Brill, 163–204.

Silić, Josip; Pranjković, Ivo (2005) *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika: za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*, Zagreb, Školska knjiga.

Treis, Yvonne; Vanhove, Martine (eds.) (2017) *Similative and Equative Constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, John Benjamins.

Treis, Yvonne; Wojtylak, Katarzyna Izabela (eds.) (2018) *On the expression of comparison: Contributions to the typology of comparative constructions*

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić, *Simile demonstratives in Croatian...*
FLUMINENSIA, god. 33 (2021), br. 2, str. 387-416

416

from lesser-known languages – special issue of Linguistic Discovery, Volume 16, Issue 1.

Umbach, Carla (2012) "Strategies of additivity: German additive *noch* compared to *auch*." *Lingua*, 122, 15, 1843–1863.

Umbach, Carla; Gust, Helmar (2014) "Similarity demonstratives", *Lingua*, 149, 74–95.

SAŽETAK

Maja Brala-Vukanović, Peter Gärdenfors, Mihaela Matešić

SLIČNOST ISKAZANA ZAMJENICAMA I ZAMJENIČKIM PRILOZIMA U HRVATSKOME JEZIKU: KVALITATIVNE, KVANTITATIVNE I INE ODREDNICE

U radu se istražuje posebna potkategorija značenjskih obilježja zamjenica i zamjeničkih priloga kojima se u hrvatskome jeziku izražavaju količinska i kvalitativna značenja – uzimajući pritom u obzir osobito upitne (tj. upitno-odnosne) zamjenice i priloge. Analizira se lingvistička uloga tih leksičkih jedinica u konstrukcijama za izražavanje sličnosti u hrvatskome jeziku. Rezultati semantičke analize pokazuju da se značenjska obilježja koja se aktiviraju u takvim konstrukcijama podudaraju s onima koja karakteriziraju sustav hrvatskih demonstrativa u cjelini. Posebno je pritom zanimljivo to što se unatoč tome što bi se izborom odgovarajuće zamjenice, odnosno zamjeničkoga priloga umjesto čestice „kao" precizno uputilo na pojedino semantičko obilježje, ipak, kada je riječ o konstrukcijama za iskazivanje sličnosti, u uporabi ponajviše poseže za općom česticom za iskazivanje sličnosti „kao".

Ključne riječi: *zamjenice; zamjenički prilozi; čestica za iskazivanje sličnosti; hrvatski jezik; značenjska obilježja; značenjska domena*