

Contents lists available at [ScienceDirect](#)

Language Sciences

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/langsci*Such* similatives: a cross-linguistic reconnaissanceJohan van der Auwera^{a,*}, Kalyanamalini Sahoo^b^a University of Antwerp, Belgium^b University of Lille, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Available online xxx

Keywords:
Simulative
Demonstrative
Interrogative
Relative
Indefinite
Language-specific
Cross-linguistic

ABSTRACT

This paper is a preliminary exploration of the semantic and formal properties of the English word *such* and some of its counterparts in other languages. The proposal is that *such* words are 'demonstrative similatives' (or, equivalently, 'similative demonstratives'), i.e., their meanings lie at the intersection of the semantic dimensions of similarity and demonstration. We show that this kind of classification is straightforward for languages like Latin and Sanskrit, in which the counterparts to *such* occur in both similative and demonstrative paradigms. In these so-called 'correlative' paradigms the demonstrative similatives occur in systems with both non-demonstrative similatives and non-similative demonstratives. English *such* and French *tel* do not occur in correlative systems, and the treatments of *such* and *tel* in their respective traditions show a great amount of confusion, in part as a result of the absence of these paradigms, and also because both elements differ strongly from ordinary demonstratives. We also show how the Sanskrit similative paradigm (and that of Kannada) extends the one of Latin in allowing similatives to encode similarity with the speaker and the hearer(s). The paper ends with the methodological point: if more than one language-specific category can do justice to the specifics of one language, the better category is the one that does double duty as a cross-linguistic category.

© 2018 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The term 'similative' was probably introduced by [Haspelmath and Buchholz \(1998: 277–278\)](#) and it was used for adverbial constructions expressing similarity such as *like a nightingale* in (1).

(1) Fatmir sings *like a nightingale*

This is also the sense in which the term was used in the more general, cognitive study of 'similitude' by [Fortescue \(2010\)](#) and in the cross-linguistic survey by [Treis & Vanhove \(eds.\) \(2017\)](#). In [Owen-Smith \(2013\)](#), [van der Auwera and Sahoo \(2015\)](#) and [van der Auwera and Coussé \(2016\)](#), however, the term 'similative' referred to expressions of similarity in the nominal realm, more particularly to adnominal and pronominal uses of *such* in (2).

(2) a. I want *such* a cat
b. There you can buy bags, scarves and *such*

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: johan.vanderauwera@uantwerpen.be (J. van der Auwera), kalyani.efl@gmail.com (K. Sahoo).

This paper continues the analysis of the adnominal and pronominal similatives and, for simplicity's sake, these will initially be called 'similatives', without the adjectives 'adnominal' and 'pronominal'. In Section 2 we show that the main function of *such* is to create *ad hoc* categories in discourse. The remaining sections focus on the status of similatives in grammar. We first do this for English (Section 3), the main reason being that it is the language for which similatives have been studied best. We will remind the reader that despite the rich grammatical tradition, English grammarians do not know what to do with *such*, that it does not fit any category easily and that for many speakers it is the sole member of what can thus be called an *ad hoc* category, to wit, the 'similative'. Then comes French (Section 4) with *tel* as the counterpart of *such*. French also has a rich grammatical tradition, and though the relevant facts of English *such* and French *tel* are very similar, the accounts differ strongly and there is no less confusion than for English *such*. From a cross-linguistic point of view, this is an unsatisfactory situation. The relief comes from Latin *talis*, the ancestor of *tel*. Here the treatment is more satisfactory and we can at least partially understand why grammarians of English and French have a hard time with *such* and *tel*. In Latin *talis* is part of a grammatical system, called 'correlative', with four similatives, viz. a demonstrative *talis*, an interrogative *qualis*, a relative *qualis* and a relative indefinite *qualiscumque*. In Romance this system broke down, leaving *tel* as a relic (Section 6) and English *such* is bound to have suffered a similar fate. Because Latin similatives are embedded in the wider correlative system, we also become aware of some of the parameters of variation. We then have a brief look at Sanskrit and Kannada (Section 7), which treat their similatives very much like Latin, but which extend the system along yet another parameter. Whereas English, French and Latin similatives express similarity to a third person entity (with e.g. *such a cat* in (2a) referring to a cat that is similar to another cat, both third person entities), Sanskrit and Kannada similatives can express similarity to the speaker and the hearer(s). The last section summarizes the paper and issues a methodological point.

2. *such* makes an *ad hoc* category

The speaker of (2a) who wants *such a cat* might well stand in front of a cat and point at it. The cat which (s)he wants needn't be and normally isn't the cat that (s)he is looking at, but it has to be similar to it. Perhaps the cat has distinctive green eyes and green spots both on the back and on the belly. These are not the distinctive features of any race: the cat is not categorizable as a Siamese, Persian or Maine Coon by virtue of the green eyes and the green spots. There is no established 'cat with green eyes and green spots' category and there is no word or conventionalized phrase for it. The speaker has just created an *ad hoc* category and the cat that (s)he wants is an indefinite exemplar of this new category. In (2b) *such* refers to an *ad hoc* category too: it is the category of things like bags and scarves. The speaker seems to refer to things that one can wear on one's body when one is out on the street that are not clothes. Once again, there is no ready-made concept for this, no word, no conventionalized phrase – hence (s)he uses the word *such*.

The word *such* occurs in other contexts and in nearly all of them it expresses similarity and is thus involved in creating a similarity based *ad hoc* category. Consider the examples in (3) to (7). In 1961 John F. Kennedy addressed the American Congress and his message included sentence (3), in which *such* is adnominal as in (2a), but is not pronominal but postnominal and it collocates with *as*.

- (3) Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed *such* as ours can endure.
(<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=8045>, accessed on February 29 2017)

The *ad hoc* category is that of nations that are organized and governed like the US in 1961. In (4) *such as* reappears, but now the noun is in between *such* and *as*.

- (4) I like reading *such* books as *Alice in Wonderland*

There are established categories of books such as biographies, autobiographies and detective stories, but the speaker of (4) does not have a category available for the kinds of books (s)he likes: the *ad hoc* category is that of books like *Alice in Wonderland*.

Consider now the very peculiar *such and such* use in (5): *such* is pronominal again, but it is doubled.

- (5) To be a true Parisian, you have to go to *such and such* restaurants

(5) has 2 readings. In one reading the reader points to two types of restaurants, both of which are *ad hoc*. But there is also a special reading, in which reference is made only to one type of restaurant, viz., that of the true Parisian. There is once again no ready category, no word or conventionalized phrase.

A further example of *ad hoc* category formation is illustrated in (6). Different from the preceding instances, the nominal *such* occurs in a definite noun phrase. A 2013 web posting on the best towns in Mississippi for young families gives the advice in (6).

- (6) We wanted to identify the communities with the best *such* opportunities in Mississippi
(<https://www.nerdwallet.com/blog/mortgages/best-towns-mississippi-young-families/>, accessed on February 28, 2017)

The context makes clear that the *ad hoc* category is that of the opportunities that have to be like the ideal opportunities in terms of at least jobs and schools.

(7) is another example which invokes *ad hocness*. In (7) *such* is not attributive, but predicative. Life is predicated to be of a certain kind, but it is not clear what kind. Perhaps the context shows that *such* here 'means' 'full of pleasant surprises' or perhaps 'full of bad surprises'.

(7) *Such* is life

With these 7 examples we do not wish to imply that all uses of *such* invoke an *ad hoc* category. In its default reading the use in (8) does not.

(8) It was *such* a beautiful day

In (8) *such* does not normally involve a particular type of beautiful day. It does not then mean that it was a beautiful day of this one type rather than of another type. In (8) *such* normally has what has been called an 'intensifying' use (Ghesquière and Van de Velde, 2011), making (8) near-synonymous with (9).

(9) It was a very beautiful day

Diachronically, the intensifying use developed from the similitive use with the intensifying character deriving from a similarity not just to other beautiful days but to the best exemplars of the category of beautiful days.

3. *such* as an *ad hoc* category in grammar

A question arises – what kind of word is the English word *such*? Is it an adjective, a pronoun or a determiner? Is it a demonstrative (pronoun or determiner)? Or is it more than one thing? In van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015) it was shown that there is absolutely no consensus on this issue. This can be illustrated with their Table 1.

Table 1

Some of the categorizations for *such* found in the literature.

<i>such</i>	pre-determiner	determiner	semi-determiner	pronoun	adjective	post-modifier post-determiner	part of a complex preposition	part of a complex subordinator
Poutsma (1916)				✓				
Quirk et al. (1985)	✓			✓		✓		
Declerck (1991)	✓	✓				✓		
Greenbaum (1996)	✓	✓		✓				
Biber et al. (1999)			✓				✓	✓
Collins Cobuild (1990–1992)	✓	✓			✓			
Wood (2002)		✓			✓			
Ghesquière and Van de Velde (2011)	✓	✓			✓			

Several things can be noted. First, there are both classical categories like 'pronoun' or 'adjective' and non-classical ones like 'semi-determiner' or 'part of a complex subordinator'. Second, nearly everybody claims that *such* is polycategorical, i.e., that it is a member of more than one category, but within this agreement there is disagreement as to which categories define the profile of this polycategorical element. Wood (2002: 91) summarizes the confusion as follows:

The word *such* causes confusion and disagreement, and stipulations about its category often vacillate between hedges and contradictions. (Wood, 2002: 91)

One reason for this is probably that *such* is actually, as has been claimed in van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015), truly unique. Another one is no doubt that not every linguist cares to take account of all the uses of *such*.

In recent work *such* is considered to be a demonstrative, as in Umbach and Gust (2014), König & Umbach (in print), and König (2017: 146–147), but earlier already Mackenzie (1997: 99). This will also be close to our position, but our argumentation will be crucially cross-linguistic. Even language-specifically, it is indeed true that similitives contain a demonstrative component. The speaker who sees a cat and who wants such a cat in (2a) could also say that she wants a cat like this one or like that one. But the similarity component makes the similitive also different from demonstratives or, least, from the ordinary demonstratives (i.e. *this* and *that*). This point is made at length in van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015). Here we will just illustrate this point. In (10) we present the counterparts to (2) to (7) with demonstratives like *this*, *these*, *that* or *those* instead of *such*.

- (10)
- *I want *that* a cat
 - *There you can buy bags, scarves and *these*
 - *Before my term has ended, we shall have to test anew whether a nation organized and governed *that* as ours can endure
 - *I like readings *these* books as *Alice in Wonderland*
 - ±To be a true Parisian, you have to go to *these and these* restaurants.
 - *We wanted to identify the communities with the best *these* opportunities in Mississippi
 - That* is life

Only for one of these sentences is there a clear grammatical counterpart, viz. sentence (10g). Sentence (10e) is grammatical but only in a reading that refers to two sets of restaurants. van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015) considered 31 properties of English *such* and it is only for 8 properties that *such* behaves in the same way as the demonstratives *this* and *that*. So if one wants to call *such* a demonstrative, one will have to admit that it is a very special one. This is only a little bit better than calling *such* a very special determiner or adjective for *such* is like the ordinary determiner *the* and *a* for 7 properties and like an ordinary adjective for 5 properties. For these reasons van der Auwera & Sahoo settled for simply calling *such* a 'similative', without the addition of term like 'demonstrative', 'determiner' or 'adjective'. Either way, the similative or the similative demonstrative or determiner is English-specifically a peculiar category, since this category (in the sense explained earlier of 'ad/pronomal similative') very nearly only has one member.¹ To that extent, 'similative' is truly an *ad hoc* category: we need it only for *such*. But, so van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015) argued, positing this category makes sense from a cross-linguistic point of view. *such* is not just an accident of English. Other languages may have these strange words too, and sometimes more than one. Dutch, for instance, has at least three similatives, viz. *zulk*, the etymological counterpart to *such*, *zo'n*,² literally 'so a', which is gradually replacing *zulk*, and also an adjectival *dergelijke*.

- (11) Ik wil zulk een / zo'n / een dergelijke kat
I want such a such a such cat
'I want such a cat'

Note that the existence of three 'similatives' does not settle the issue of whether the similative is more appropriately called 'similative demonstrative' or 'demonstrative similative'. *zo'n*, *zulk* and *dergelijk* have the same demonstrative and similative ingredients as *such*. In the sections on Latin and Sanskrit we will see languages in which the counterparts to *such* lie at the intersection of demonstratives and similatives. In other words, these languages have demonstratives that are not similative (the counterparts to *this* and *that*), similatives that are not demonstrative (e.g. interrogative), but there are also forms that are both similative and demonstrative. 'Similative demonstrative' or 'demonstrative similative' thus make good sense from the Latin or Sanskrit point of view, and since we are aiming for a general typology, also from a typological perspective. But first we look at French, a language like English with just one similative.

4. French

As has already been remarked by Van Peteghem (2000: 196), French has a word with very similar properties and uses, both similative and intensifying, to the English word *such*. This word is *tel*.

- (12) Je veux un *tel* chapeau.
I want a such hat
'I want such a hat'
- (13) J' ai une *telle* envie de te revoir.
I have a such desire of you see.again
'I have a strong desire to see you again'
(Van Peteghem, 2000: 176)

Classifying *tel* as a French similative does not mean that the properties of *such* and *tel* are identical though (neither are the ones of English *such* and Dutch *zulk* and *zo'n* – van der Auwera and Sahoo (2015) – or the ones of English *such* and Swedish *sådan* – van der Auwera and Coussé (2016), Thus, whereas *such* precedes the indefinite article, *tel* follows it. And French *tel* also does not allow the definite use.

- (14) *les *meilleures telles* opportunités
the best such opportunities
'the best such opportunities'

¹ Next to *such* there is also *suchlike* or *such like*. It is archaic or regional (Northern England? Maggie Tallerman p.c.). In a search with the Ngram viewer on Google books (<https://books.google.com/ngrams>, May 21 2018) for 1999–2000 *such* has a frequency of 1 in a thousand words and *suchlike* and *such like* 2 to 3 in 10 million words. There are, of course, also multiword constructions such as *this kind of* and *that kind of* and when can express similarity and demonstration separately.

(1') I want that kind of cat

(1'') Look at that cat, I want a similar one

² *zo'n* is really one word, but the orthography still reflects its origin 'so a'. Also, the former singular indefinite article 'n does not convey number any more– it can thus combine with plural nouns, especially in Dutch speaking Belgium.

How has French grammar dealt with *tel*? For one thing, French grammarians have struggled with the question as to whether or not *tel* is a determiner or pronoun or yet something else (like e.g. 'pro-adjectif', Arrivé et al., 1986: 332). A table much like the one shown for *such* (Table 1) could also be drawn up for *tel*. However, what dominates French scholarship is the question of how *tel* fits into a category of indefinites. More often than not, *tel* is put in a subcategory of indefinites together with *même* 'same' and *autre* 'different' (e.g. Chevalier et al., 1971: 265, Arrivé et al., 1986: 325. Van Peteghem, 2000: 120–122), a view that has also been adopted for Old French (Buridant, 2000: 184–196).

- (15)
- a. Je veux un *tel* chapeau
I want a such hat
'I want such a hat'
 - b. Nous vivons sous un *même* ciel
we live under a same sky
'We live under an identical sky'
 - c. Je rêvais d' un *autre* monde
I dreamt of an other world
'I dreamt about another world'

What is it that unites these three indefinites? Semantically, it seems clear enough: put negatively, they are not quantifiers and, put positively, they serve to identify an entity along a dimension of similarity, with *même* for identity, *autre* for difference and *tel* for the intermediate value of similarity as such. This is in essence the view in Chevalier et al. (1971: 265) and Arrivé et al. (1986: 325). Van Peteghem (2000: 120–122) argues that this view is too simple but she retains the idea that all three crucially relate one entity to another one, a landmark (*repère*), and this is reflected in that all three allow what she calls a 'correlative' use, illustrated in (16) (Van Peteghem, 2000: 120).

- (16)
- a. Un élève *tel que* Pierre est le bienvenu
a pupil such as Pierre is the welcome
'A pupil such as Pierre is welcome'
 - b. Philippe veut la *même* voiture *que* Jean
Philippe wants the same car as Jean
'Philippe wants the same car as Jean'
 - c. Alex a vu un *autre* film *que* *Underground*
Alex has seen an other film than *Underground*
'Alex has seen another film than *Underground*'

Van Peteghem (2000: 122–146) also shows that the details are different, e.g. in the nature of the correlated noun. For *tel* the landmark has to refer to the same type entity as the noun following *tel*. For *même* it is the other way around, and *autre* allows both construals.

- (17)
- a. *Pierre aime un film *tel que* Paul
Pierre like a film such as Paul
**Pierre likes a film such as Paul'
 - b. *Philippe veut la *même* voiture *qu'* un Citroën
Philippe wants the same car as a Citroën'
**Philippe want the same car as a Citroën'
 - c. Pierre a vu un *autre* film *que* Paul
Pierre has seen an other film than Paul
'Pierre has seen another film than Paul'

There are differences in other respects too. All three combine with indefinite articles (as in (16)), but whereas *autre* and *même* can also combine with definite articles, *tel* cannot.³

³ That *autre* and *même* can occur with a definite article should cast doubt on the traditional account of them as indefinites. Note also the English translation of (18a) is ungrammatical, for the combinability of *such* with the definite article, illustrated in (6) is very restricted). It is not unique to English though: we find it in e.g. Dutch and Swedish too (van der Auwera and Sahoo, 2015: 146, 157; van der Auwera and Coussé, 2016: 18–19).

- (18) a. Pierre a vu un/*le *tel* film
 Pierre has seen a/the such film
 'Pierre has seen such a/*the film'
- b. Pierre a vu un/le *même* film
 Pierre has seen a/the same film
 'Pierre has seen an identical/the same film'
- c. Pierre a vu un/l' *autre* film
 Pierre has seen a/the other film
 'Pierre has seen another/the other film'

All have nominal uses, but in these uses *tel* only combines with an indefinite article, *même* with definite articles, and *autre* with both.

- (19) a. Un/*le *tel* me l' a dit
 a/the such me it has said
 'Somebody has said it to me'
- b. Le tarif est le/*un *même*
 the cost is the/a same
 'The price is the/*a same'
- c. Je prends un/l' *autre*
 I take an/the other
 'I taken another one/the other one'

Furthermore, only *tel* can be used in the singular without article and thus assume the role of determiner.

- (20) Elle a parlé avec *tel/*autre/même* professeur
 she has spoken with such/other/same professor
 'She has spoken with a such a /*other/*same professor'

Probably *tel* is the most complex of the three (Van Peteghem, 2000: 195), but at least in one respect *même* is special in that it has an adverbial use, in which it means 'even'.

- (21) *Même* Jean l' a compris
 even Jean it has understood
 'Even Jean has understood it'

This comparison is by no means complete, in part also because one should compare *tel*, *même* and *autre* with other expressions, esp. if one puts the three of them in a subcategory with yet other indefinites, e.g. with *certain* 'certain', *tout* 'whole, all', *aucun* 'none', *nul* 'none' and *plusieurs* 'several' as in Dethloff and Wagner (2002: 578) or when one splits them up in different categories as when Sandfeld (1970: 349–351, 427–454) separates *tel* from *même* et *autre* and groups it with other indefinites. In such accounts there will be other differences but also similarities. The result is that the traditional French category of indefinites is 'extremely heterogeneous' (Van Peteghem, 2000: 117), that the category is a catch-all (*four-tout*) category (Flaux and De Mulder, 1997: 3; Mosegaard Hansen, 2016: 267) and that we are in a *flou classificatoire* (Schneidecker, 2016: 342). Interestingly, Schneidecker (2016) sets it as a goal to show that the category of indefinites is not as incoherent as traditional grammarians would make it seem. However, in this attempt she excludes *tel* – as well as *même* – and for *autre* she only includes the pronominal form *autrui* 'somebody else'. What is also interesting is that Schneidecker's introduction mentions Riegel et al. (2009) as an example of a traditional grammar. In her classification based on Riegel et al. (2009) Schneidecker has a place for *autre* and *même*, but not for *tel*, suggesting that there is a problem with *tel*. And, indeed, in the Riegel grammar only the 'pronominal' use of *tel*, as in (12) to (19), is classified as 'indefinite' (Riegel et al., 2009: 382); the determiner use, as in (20), is not. The latter is listed as 'another' determiner type (Riegel et al., 2009: 302), neither definite nor indefinite.

We conclude that the treatment of *tel* has been as unsatisfactory as that of *such*. Pushing *tel* into a category with other members shows family resemblances but no less so that *tel* is unique. Interestingly, what is entirely missing in the French tradition is the claim that *tel* is a demonstrative,⁴ although one finds remarks about a partial similarity between demonstratives and *tel* (Muller, 1996: 152; Van Peteghem, 1995: 11–14, 2000: 122, 172). What is not missing, however, is the claim that the ancestor of *tel* is a demonstrative, viz. Latin *talis* (Gamillscheg, 1957: 155, Sandfeld, 1970: 349). It is also interesting that the 'other determiner' subcategory of Riegel et al. (2009) accepts *tel* together with the interrogative and relative *quel* (Riegel et al., 2009: 303–304). We will see that such a characterization makes perfect sense for Latin *talis* and *qualis*, the ancestors of *tel* and *quel*.

5. Latin

Like for French and English, there is no agreement as to what classical part of speech *talis* falls under. It is a pronoun for e.g. Rubenhauer and Hofmann (1975: 58) or Kühner and Holzweissig (1978: 628), but an adjective for Pinkster (2015) or Touratier

⁴ This may well hold for all of Romance linguistics. In the Jungbluth & Da Milano manual on deixis in Romance languages (2015), similatives are entirely absent. They are no less absent in most of the typological literature on deixis (e.g. Diessel, 1999).

(1994: 642) and a 'pronominal adjective' for Greenough et al. (1903: 71).⁵ The 'French' approach of treating the similitive as an indefinite is represented by Ernout and Thomas (1972: 199). But what is striking is the unanimity on two matters. First, demonstrative *talis* occurs in a series of partially similar forms, be they pronouns of adjectives or 'pronominal adjectives', and, second, there are more such series, i.e., other than the *talis* series, in the domain of pronouns (such as *is* 'that'), adjectives (such as *tantus* 'so great') and adverbs (such as *ibi* 'there'). Table 2 shows what *talis* relates to and it also lists a selection of *talis*-like elements, according to Greenough et al. (1903: 71). The translations are theirs too. The first column is ours. For items that show gender, number and case distinctions, we only list the nominative masculine singular.⁶ These series are sometimes called 'correlative', as in Greenough et al. (1903: 71) or, more recently, Lavency (1997: 68) and Panhuis (2012: 40).

Table 2
Latin 'correlatives'.

	Demonstrative	Interrogative	Relative	Indefinite	Relative indefinite
Identity	<i>is</i> 'that'	<i>quis</i> 'who?'	<i>qui</i> 'who'	<i>aliquis</i> 'someone'	<i>quisquis</i> 'whoever'
Similarity	<i>talis</i> 'such'	<i>qualis</i> 'of what sort?'	<i>qualis</i> 'as'	–	<i>qualiscumque</i> 'of whatever kind'
Size	<i>tantus</i> 'so great'	<i>quantus</i> 'how great?'	<i>quantus</i> 'how (as) great'	<i>aliquantus</i> 'some'	<i>quantuscumque</i> 'however great'
Location	<i>ibi</i> 'there'	<i>ubi</i> 'where'	<i>ubi</i> 'where'	<i>alicubi</i> 'somewhere'	<i>ubiubi</i> 'wherever'
Quantity	<i>tot</i> 'so many'	<i>quot</i> 'how many?'	<i>quot</i> 'as'	<i>aliquot</i> 'some, several'	<i>quotquot</i> 'however many'

Semantically, the tabulation is very systematic: there are two cross-cutting parameters and both are semantic. The parameter in the left-hand column could be called 'ontological': it deals with properties of what is demonstrated, questioned, relativized, presented as indefinite or relativized as an indefinite. The parameter on the top row may defy a neat label, but it concerns 'operations' of demonstrating, questioning, relativizing and presenting as indefinite.⁷ The crosscutting of the parameters defines 5×5 cells and nearly every cell is filled. There is also a morphological systematicity, especially for the demonstrative, interrogative, relative and indefinite cells. For three of the five words the demonstratives start with *t-*, interrogatives and relatives with *qu-*, and the indefinite with *aliqu-*. The *t-* vs. *qu-* alternation goes back to Proto-Indo-European. So does the *qu-* of the Latin interrogative *quis* and the relative *qui*; there 'should have been' a *t-* form for the demonstrative, but Latin has renewed this cell. For location Latin probably renewed the entire row, based on the *i-* root of *is*. Finally, there is a syntactic systematicity: three of each five forms occur in pairs with the demonstrative and either the relative or the relative indefinite in a special bipartite construction.⁸ We illustrate this construction in (22).

- (22) a. *Quos ferro trucidari oportebat, eos nondum uoce uolnero*
 who iron kill was.necessary them not.yet voice bless
 'Those for whom it was necessary to kill them with iron, I don't bless them yet with my voice'
 (Cicero, Fruyt, 2005: 26)
- b. *Quot homines, tot sententiae*
 how.many people that.many opinions
 'There are as many opinions as there are people'
 (Terentius, Fry, 2005: 263)

In this context, the adjective 'correlative' is used again, and even in two ways and both are different from the use that refers to the paradigmatic rows of Table 2. First, the construction is called 'correlative' (e.g. Haudry, 1973; Downing, 1978⁹) but, second, sometimes the non-relative form correlating with the relative form is called 'correlative' (e.g. Hofmann and Rubenhauer, 1963: 52; Touratier, 1994: 639). The first use is not too problematic for it applies to syntax and not the grammatical formatives listed in Table 2.¹⁰ The second use is problematic, however, in the sense that it cannot be upheld at the same time as the use illustrated with Table 2. Both uses concern formatives, but whereas the use illustrated in Table 2

⁵ Pinkster (2015) does not discuss *talis* itself, but its 'correlative' (see below) *qualis* is considered to be an adjective (Pinkster, 2015: 336). In Greenough et al. (1903: 82) *talis* is listed as one of the 'correlative pronouns, pronominal adjectives and adverbs'. *talis* definitely is not an adverb, it is not listed as a pronoun, so it must be a 'pronominal adjective', even though this subcategory is not provided for in the section of adjectives.

⁶ Note that for similarity, size, location and quantity the forms for interrogative and relative are the same and even for identity they are very similar. One could suffice with one column with an 'Interrogative-Relative' heading, meaning that the forms have both interrogative and relative uses (e.g. Ernout, 1953: 84–85). The 'Relative indefinite' forms also have non-relative indefinite uses (Haspelmath, 1997: 253), so a better heading could be '(Relative) Indefinite'.

⁷ The two parameters are not entirely independent, for similarity is strongly indefinite, witness the standard approach in French linguistics. This helps explain why the cell with horizontal indefinite and vertical similarity is empty. The link between indefiniteness and similarity is not 100%, as shown with the English example (6), and as mentioned below, not every Latin grammarian leaves the indefiniteness – similarity cell empty.

⁸ The bipartite structure is well rendered with the term 'dyptich', due to Minard (1936) and spread by Haudry (1973).

⁹ It may have been Downing (1973) who introduced the term 'correlative' – with one 'r'. The idea was probably not so much that certain forms are correlated, but that the construction is a kind of relative clause. It might also have been a mistake, for Downing (1978) reintroduces the second 'r', and misquotes his own 1973 paper with 'correlatives' instead of 'correlatives', but the single 'r' use was to live a life of its own, until today (e.g. Hook and Pardeshi, 2017).

¹⁰ It is nevertheless cleaner to have different terms. Thus, in the context of a comparison between Sanskrit and Hindi, Davison (2009: 223) uses 'correlative' for the syntactic construction but 'correlate' for the demonstrative of this construction.

concerns 4 or 5 formations for each row, the use just mentioned only concerns, for each row, one of the formatives, viz. the demonstrative one.¹¹

Another problem is that when one compares grammars, there is a divergence of opinion on how many series the grammarians find worthy of listing. There are 10 for Greenough et al. (1903: 71), but 17 for Kühner and Holzweissig (1978: 627–628). There is also divergence as to what goes into each cell. For instance, in the tables in Kühner and Holzweissig (1978: 627–628), the indefinite cell for *talis* does have a form, viz. *qualislibet*, and the indefinite cell for *tantus* does not only list *aliquantus* but also *quantuslibet* and *quantusvis*. To some extent this might relate to the kind of Latin that is tabulated: there is at least earlier and later Latin. The most interesting divergence concerns the demonstrative cell. An important parameter for demonstratives is the distance contrast. For the identificational series Greenough et al. (1903: 71) only list the somewhat special (usually called 'anaphoric') *is* and not the proximal *hic*, the medial *ille* or the distal *iste*, but Kühner and Holzweissig (1978: 627–628) list all four and Lavency (1997: 68–69) supplies two tables, one with just *is* and the other with all four. For place, both Greenough et al. (1903: 71) and Kühner and Holzweissig (1978: 627–628) only list the distal *ibi* and not the proximal *hic*, yet Lavency (1997: 68–69) lists both. But then for similarity, size and quantity this parameter is not relevant. Thus there is only one demonstrative similative: there is nothing that corresponds to the *hic – ille – iste* differentiation for *talis*.

Conclusion: the description of *talis* in Latin grammars is not without problems, but there is a clear analysis of *talis*: it is the demonstrative member of set of similatives or, equivalently, it is the similative member of a set of demonstratives.

6. Latin and French compared

Why don't French grammarians consider *tel* to be a similative demonstrative or a demonstrative similative? The reason, we propose, is that the Latin correlative system, illustrated for *talis* in (23), has not been preserved.

- (23) Socrates affirmabat *qualis* homo ipse esset, *talem* eius
 Socrates said of.what.kind man himself would.be such of.him
 esse orationem
 be speech
 'Socrates said that the speech of man is like the man himself'
 (Rubenhauer and Hofmann, 1975: 295)

That does not mean that correlation in a more general sense disappeared. As mentioned above, Van Peteghem proposed to treat *tel* together with *autre* and *même* precisely because they have correlative uses. The correlative use of *tel* illustrated in (16a) was one in which the correlate of *tel* was a noun, but clauses like Latin (23) are also acceptable. These clauses are normally introduced by *que*.

- (24) Prenons notre époque *telle* qu' elle est
 let's.take our period such as she is
 'Let's take the times that we live in as they are'

There is also a consecutive variant, which already existed in Late Latin (Gallego, 2012). The consecutive variant often has an intensive value (Van Peteghem, 2000: 138–139).

- (25) Il est d' une paresse *telle* qu' il a été refusé [...]
 he is of a laziness such that he has been refused
 'He is so lazy that he has been refused ...'

Occasionally, the non-consecutive variant has two occurrences of *tel*.¹²

- (26) *Tels* ils étaient alors, *tels* je les vois aujourd'hui
 such they were then such I them see today
 'I see them now as they were then'
 (Grevisse, 1980: 519)

But the point is that modern French never has *quel ... tel* or *tel ... quel*, although *tel quel* survives in a relic phrase, meaning 'as it is'.

¹¹ According to Marouzeau (1961: 63–64), there is yet another usage, in which both the relative formative and the correlative one, in the restricted sense just sketched, are called 'correlative'. Cp. also Mignon (2009).

¹² As a reviewer points out, this doubling structure is found for other correlatives too (e.g. *Plus il mange, plus il a faim* 'the more he eats, the more he is hungry') and it sets French apart from the other Romance languages.

- (27) Je vous rends vos livres tels quels
 I you return your books such as
 'I return the books to you the way they are'
 (Grevisse, 1980: 519)

The disappearance of the *tel ... quel* correlative structure also does not mean that of the four Latin similatives only *tel* survives.¹³ There is an element *quelconque*, which may or may not derive directly from Latin *qualiscumque* (Haspelmath, 1997: 260). Though it does not have a relative use, it has an indefinite use, and then it may express similarity.

- (28) Si vous avez un *quelconque* besoin, n' hésitez pas à nous contacter.
 if you have a any.kind.of need not hesitate not to us contact
 'If you have any kind of need, don't hesitate to contact us'

However, instead of the 'any kind' translation, simply 'any' or 'no matter which' would be good too, and then the domain is not similarity but identity. But the 'no matter which' paraphrase is also what one finds in Grevisse (1980: 487). Most importantly, though *quel*, the successor to *qualis*, is much more prominent in modern French than *tel*, it no longer uniquely conveys similarity. In (29) we see the similarity sense, but in (30) the speaker does not want to know what kind of book the addressee has read.

- (29) *Quel* homme est fait pour vous?
 what man is made for you
 'What man is made for you?'
- (30) *Quel* livre as-tu lu?
 which book have-you read
 'Which book have you read?'

Quel also entered into various compounds and here too the similarity sense is lost.

- (31) *Lequel* des deux est mieux?
 which of.the two is better
 'Which of the two is better?'
- (32) Le monde dans *lequel* nous vivons ...
 the world in which we live
 'The world in which we live ...'
- (33) Il a publié *quelques* livres
 he has published some books
 'He has published some books'
- (34) Faites-vous accompagner par *quelqu'un*
 make-yourself accompany by someone
 'Let someone accompany you'

If some words disappeared either completely (e.g. *is*) or acquired a new function (e.g. *qualis*), it does not follow that the language did not fill some of the cells with other words or constructions. Much like renewal is visible in Latin when compared to the hypothesized Proto-Indo-European, it is also visible in Romance when compared to Latin. In the demonstrative series proximal *hic*, medial *ille* and distal *ipse* got replaced by proximal *celui-ci* and distal *celui-là*, for example, and proximal *hic* and distal *ibi* by *ici* and *là*, but *talis* stayed in its place.

To conclude, *talis* finds a natural place in Latin grammar, it occurs at the intersection of 'demonstrative' and 'similative'. As a similative it is related to non-demonstrative similatives and as a demonstrative it is related to non-similative demonstratives. When we go to French, we recognize it as the sole survivor of a category of similatives in Latin that had at least four members. Its closest family member *quel* is still around, very much so, but it is fulfilling different functions. In French grammar *tel* may be argued to have 'acquired a new family', one with *autre* and *même* and the category is now 'indefinite'. Similarities with *autre* and *même* exist, but, as we have seen in the preceding section, the differences are more pronounced and non-systematic. We therefore propose that the better strategy is to call *tel* a 'similative demonstrative'. From a language-specific, i.e. French, point of view, this categorization is not necessary and, indeed, to our knowledge, no French grammarian has proposed it. But from a typological point of view, it is to be preferred. One wants to compare languages, and considering both *talis* and *tel* similative demonstratives makes for the better comparison, for it captures the strong similarity. There are, of course, differences between *talis* and *tel*, but the main difference is that *tel* lost its correlative 'cell mates'.

¹³ It also does not exclude that there are other remnants of the Latin correlative like *tant* from *tantus*. We are thankful to a reviewer for making this point.

7. Personal similatives

Can there be similatives other than the ones included in the morphological paradigm of Latin? The answer is positive. It is shown in Sanskrit. Sanskrit has both a morphological and a syntactic correlativity that is similar to that of Latin. Sanskrit grammarians do not normally tabulate them the way their Latinist colleagues do, but we get a sense of the similarity by looking at the table provided by Bhat (2004: 181) (Table 3).

Table 3
Sanskrit correlatives.

	Demonstrative		Interrogative	Relative
	Proximal	Distal		
Identity	<i>ayam</i> 'this'	<i>saḥ</i> 'that'	<i>kaḥ</i> 'who?'	<i>yaḥ</i> 'who'
Similarity	<i>i:dṛṣaḥ</i> 'such'	<i>ta:dṛṣaḥ</i> 'such'	<i>ki:dṛṣaḥ</i> 'of what kind?'	<i>ya:dṛṣaḥ</i> 'of what kind'
Size	<i>iyat</i> 'this much'	<i>ta:vat</i> 'that much'	<i>kiyat</i> 'how much?'	<i>ya:vat</i> 'how much?'
Location	<i>atra</i> 'here'	<i>tatra</i> 'there'	<i>kutra</i> 'where?'	<i>yatra</i> 'where'
Quantity	–	<i>tati</i> 'that many'	<i>kati</i> 'how many?'	<i>yati</i> 'how many'

Like the Latin table, the Sanskrit table is a simplification, probably even more so than the Latin one. Also, the table does not show indefinites nor relative indefinites. This does not mean that they don't exist. At least for the identity series, the indefinite either just uses the interrogative by itself or in combination with a particle *cit* (Thumb, 1959: 150–151) and the relative indefinite either uses the relative followed by the indefinite with *cit* or it doubles the relative (Thumb, 1959: 149). Compared to the Latin table, the apparently biggest difference is that the demonstratives split up into proximal and distal forms. However, we pointed out that this could have been done for Latin for identity and location too, but in Sanskrit the split up is relevant for similarity and size as well. There are, in other words, two *such* words, one means 'like this' and the other 'like that'.¹⁴ But – and this is the point of this section – Sanskrit does not only have more demonstrative similatives but also more non-demonstrative ones. The morpheme *dṛṣ*, originally meaning 'look' (Whitney, 1993: 198; Thumb, 1959: 123), which is responsible for the correlative similatives, also combines with 1st and 2nd person pronouns. We thus have what could be called 'personal similatives', with e.g. a first person singular similative meaning 'somebody of my sort' (Whitney, 1993: 198; Speijer, 1998: 221).

The personal similatives thus step outside of the bounds of the correlative domain but the link is the distal similative, which can be looked upon as a third person similative (Table 4).

Table 4
The intertwining of correlative and personal similatives

proximal similative	1 st person similative 2 nd person similative 3 rd person similative distal similative	interrogative similative	relative similative
---------------------	--	--------------------------	---------------------

This is not that peculiar. In Sanskrit the distal demonstratives do double duty as third person personal pronouns. The forms thus appear in two paradigms and here too we see pronouns stepping out of the correlative system (Table 5).

Table 5
The intertwining of correlative identificational and personal pronouns.

proximal identificational	1 st person personal 2 nd person personal 3 rd person personal distal identificational	interrogative identificational	relative identificational
---------------------------	--	--------------------------------	---------------------------

Sanskrit personal similatives may have been a marginal phenomenon, good for a just a few lines in Sanskrit grammars and there is no evidence that they survived into New Indo-Aryan, although the latter do have both correlative morphology

¹⁴ Compare König & Umbach (in print) on a wider survey of deixis in similative demonstratives.

and syntax.¹⁵ Yet personal similatives are not unique to Sanskrit. We have found them in Dravidian languages like Kannada and Telugu, though they seem to stay under the radar of the grammars that we had access to (Kannada: Schiffman, 1983; Sridhar, 1990; Kittel, 1985; Spencer, 1985¹⁶; Telugu: Lisker, 1963, Krishnamurti and Gwynn, 1985). Kannada and Telugu both have correlative morphology and syntax¹⁷ and their personal similatives are related to distal demonstratives, like in Sanskrit. In Telugu the formation of the personal similatives is very much like that of Sanskrit. For both demonstratives (e.g. proximal *iṭuvanṭiva:ḍu* and distal *aṭuvanṭiva:ḍu*) and personal similatives (e.g. 2nd person singular *ni:vanṭiva:ḍu* 'someone like you'), similarity is expressed by the morpheme *-vanṭi-*. It is followed by gender, number and honorific suffixes. What precedes are the proximal and distal stems or the oblique forms of the personal pronouns. In Kannada the system is different: the personal similative starts with a genitive of the personal pronoun and then we get the entire distal demonstrative. Thus *nannantahavanu* 'someone like me' starts with a first person singular genitive *nanna* and *antahavanu* is a full distal similative. In one way, however, both Telugu and Kannada are different from Sanskrit. They not only make similatives from the 1st and 2nd persons, but also from the third person. (35) is an example from Kannada, with both a normal distal similative and a third person personal similative.¹⁸

(35)	<i>antahavanu/avanantahavanu</i>	<i>elle:</i>	<i>a:daru</i>
	SIM.DIST.PRO.SG.M/DEM.PRO.DIST.SG.M, GEN-SIM.DIST.PRO.SG.M	wherever	be
	<i>gedde: barutta:ne</i>		
	win come		
	'Someone like him would win, wherever he goes'		

We are not aware of any semantic difference between the two forms. However, the topic of 'personal similatives' awaits a focused study. We have here done no more than to put the topic on the agenda.

8. Conclusion and postscript

The English and French similatives *such* and *tel* make *ad hoc* categories in discourse and they are *ad hoc* in grammar too. Their *ad hoc*-ness in grammar shows in the extreme confusion and this may be due to the fact that *such* and *tel* are the only survivors of a bigger category in the older stages of the languages, a category which was integrated in a prominent system of morphological and syntactic correlativity. We have shown this in this paper for French and for English it is clear that the ancestor of *such* was associated with at least one other word, viz. the ancestor of *which*. For French we have argued that *tel* is best regarded as a 'demonstrative similative' or a 'similative demonstrative'. From a strictly language-specific point of view, this double-barreled category is not necessary, but it makes for the better typology. Exactly the same argument holds for English *such*.

We have also shown that similatives come in more varieties than demonstrative, relative, interrogative, indefinite and indefinite relative forms. For one thing, demonstrative similatives can come in 2 versions, proximal and distal.¹⁹ For another thing, similatives can escape from the third person realm and 'embrace' personal pronouns. No doubt future typological work will discover more dimensions of variation.

We have seen that Latin, Sanskrit, Telugu and Kannada similatives are better integrated in the grammar than French *tel* or English *such* in that the latter are essentially one-member categories. Of course, the grammars of English and French host other idiosyncratic words besides similatives, e.g. the English word *half* (Jansen, 2014). Judging from the breakdown of the Latin similatives in their transition to French, one might be inclined to think that the similative is not a very robust category. But this impression might be mistaken. For one thing, in Indo-Aryan, the similative stayed put.²⁰ For another thing, when one compares the demonstrative *is*, the locative *ibi* and the similative *talis*, we see that the only one that survived with basically the same meaning is *talis*, for *is* and *ibi* were replaced. And this persistence was not hampered by the fact that *talis* 'got betrayed' by *qualis*, which went off to do other things. The same persistence is a feature of English *such*, Dutch *zulk* or German

¹⁵ The New Indo-Aryan morphology and syntax very much derive from Old Indo-Aryan, but like we have seen in Latin, there is novelty in both. Thus the referential series in Oriya derives from Old Indo-Aryan, but the similative series does not: the similarity is not expressed by a morpheme that derives from *dṛś* but from *manta*, a polyfunctional element whose semantic range includes similarity and possession (Misra, 1975: 100; Bender, 1910: 69–70; cp. also Chatterji, 1926: 851–854) (thanks are due to Uma Pappuswamy (Mysore), Probal Dasgupta (Kolkata), Abhijit Majumdar (Kolkata) for clarifying this point). For some differences in the correlative syntax see Masica (1991: 253, 410–415) and Davison (2009).

¹⁶ Spencer (1985: 156), however, writes that *'antha* and its compounds when attached to genitive forms give the meaning "like"; as *nammanthavaru* people like ourselves and *kallinantha haNNU* a fruit like a stone' (transliteration ours). The first form qualifies as a pronominal similative.

¹⁷ The correlative morphology is a little different: there are no separate relative forms (different from Indo-Aryan, yet rather like Latin). As to correlative syntax, Dravidian also uses participial rather than correlative syntax and there is a debate as to whether the latter is borrowed from Indo-Aryan (see Hock, 2016: 56 for references). For native competence help on Kannada and Telugu we are grateful to Satish Kumar Nadimpalli, Rajashekhar Shabadi, Srinu Bookya, Anuradha Rao, and Sunita Chintada.

¹⁸ Note that the third person pronoun in (35) is actually a distal demonstrative and the form *avanantahavanu* thus contains two distal forms.

¹⁹ The widespread interest in deictic distinctions for identificational demonstratives has not led to the same kind of work for similatives. In Indo-Aryan and Dravidian similatives we see the proximal distal contrast, but there will be languages with more distinctions. Thus the Tibeto-Burman Tamang identificational demonstratives have 5 types, and similative demonstratives have them too (Owen-Smith, 2013).

²⁰ This may not be related to the strength of the similative as such, but to that of the correlative morphology and syntax, which strongly contrasts with what we see in Romance (Lehmann, 1984: 132).

solcher. And here too there are words that betrayed them for a different future, viz. English *which*, Dutch *welk* and German *welcher*.²¹

The paper also makes a methodological point. In typology one compares languages and one can only do this when the languages are analysed in the same way. This is a recurrent point of discussion (see e.g. van der Auwera and Gast, 2011). In a recent important paper Haspelmath (2010) argues that language-specific and cross-linguistic categories are truly different things. This paper (as well as van der Auwera and Sahoo, 2015) goes against this idea. While we agree that the top priority for a language-specific category is that it makes sense for this one language, we have here argued that language-specifically there may not be good reasons for preferring one category to another and that, in that case, the better language-specific category is the one that doubles up a cross-linguistic one. To repeat, French grammar has every right to continue treating *tel* as an indefinite, but treating it as a 'demonstrative similative' or 'similativer demonstrative' is better.

References

- Arrivé, Michel, Gadet, Françoise, Galmiche, Michel, 1986. La grammaire d'aujourd'hui. Guide alphabétique de linguistique française. Flammarion, Paris.
- Bender, Harold H., 1910. *The suffixes mant and vant in Sanskrit and Avestan*. J.H. Furst Company, Baltimore.
- Bhat, D.N.S., 2004. Pronouns. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Biber, Douglas, Johanson, Stig, Leech, Geoffrey, Conrad, Susan, Finnegan, Edward, 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Longman, London.
- Buridant, Claude, 2000. Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français. Sedes.
- Chatterji, Suniti Kumar, 1926. The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language. Calcutta University Press, Calcutta.
- Chevalier, Jean-Claude, Blanche-Benveniste, Claire, Arrivé, Michel, Jean, Peytard, 1971. Grammaire Larousse du français contemporain. Larousse, Paris.
- Collins Cobuild, 1990–1992. English Grammar. Collins, London.
- Davison, Alice, 2009. Adjunction, features and locality in Sanskrit and Hindi/Urdu correlatives. In: Liptak, Anikó (Ed.), Correlatives Cross-linguistically. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 223–262.
- Declerck, Renaat, 1991. A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English. Kaitahusha, Tokyo.
- Dethloff, Uwe, Wagner, Horst, 2002. Die französische Grammatik. Francke, Tübingen.
- Diessel, Holger, 1999. Demonstratives. Form, Function, and Grammaticalization. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Downing, Bruce T., 1973. Correlative relative structures in universal grammar. Minnesota Working Papers in Linguistics and Philosophy of Grammar 2, 1–17.
- Downing, Bruce T., 1978. Some universals of relative clause structure. In: Greenberg, Joseph H., Ferguson, Charles A., Moravcsik, Edith A. (Eds.), Universals of human grammar, vol. 4. Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 357–418.
- Ernout, A., 1953. Morphologie historique du latin. Klincksieck, Paris.
- Ernout, Alfred, Thomas, François, 1972. Syntaxe Latine. Klincksieck, Paris.
- Flaux, Nelly, De Mulder, Walter, 1997. Indéfinis et référence: Introduction. Language française 116, 3–7.
- Fortescue, Michael, 2010. Similitude: a conceptual category. Acta Linguist. Hafniensia 42, 117–142.
- Fruyt, Michèle, 2005. La corrélation en latin: définition et description. In: De Carvalho, Paulo, Lambert, Frédéric (Eds.), Structures parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin. Université de Saint-Étienne, Saint-Étienne, pp. 17–44.
- Fry, Carole, 2005. Corrélatifs catégoriels et cognition: talis ... qualis et les autres. In: De Carvalho, Paulo, Lambert, Frédéric (Eds.), Structures parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin. Université de Saint-Étienne, Saint-Étienne, pp. 255–266.
- Gallego, Julie, 2012. De *talis* à *tel*: évolution d'un corrélatif consécutif. In: Latin vulgaire – Latin tardif IX. Actes de IXe colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Lyon 2–6 septembre. Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, Lyon, pp. 323–334.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst, 1957. Historische Französische Syntax. Niemeyer, Tübingen.
- Ghesquière, Lobke, Van de Velde, Freek, 2011. A corpus-based account of the development of English *such* and Dutch *zulk*: identification, intensification and (inter)subjectivity. Cognit. Ling. 22, 765–797.
- Greenbaum, Sidney, 1996. English Grammar. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Greenough, J.B., Kittredge, G.L., Howard, A.A., Benj, L. D'Ooge, 1903. Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges Founded on Comparative Grammar. Ginn & Co, Boston.
- Grevisse, Maurice, 1980. Le bon usage. Grammaire française avec des Remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui, eleventh ed. Duculot, Paris.
- Haspelmath, Martin, 1997. Indefinite Pronouns. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Haspelmath, Martin, Buchholz, Oda, 1998. Equative and similative constructions in the languages of Europe. In: van der Auwera, Johan, Baoill, Dónall P.Ó. (Eds.), Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 277–334.
- Haspelmath, Martin, 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in cross-linguistic studies. Language 86, 663–687.
- Haudry, Jean, 1973. Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation dans la phrase latine. Bull. Soc. Ling. Paris 68, 147–186.
- Hock, Hans Henrich, 2016. Finite and nonfinite subordination. In: Henrich Hock, Hans, Bashir, Elena (Eds.), The Languages and Linguistics of South Asia. A Comprehensive Guide. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin, pp. 567–584.
- Hofmann, [Johann] [B]aptist, Rubenhauer, [H]ans, 1963. Wörterbuch der grammatischen und metrischen Terminologie, second ed. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Hole, Daniel, Klumpp, Gerson, 2000. Definite type and indefinite token: the article *son* in colloquial German. Linguist. Ber. 182, 232–244.
- Hook, Peter Edwin, Pardeshi, Prashant, 2017. Noun-modifying constructions in Marathi. In: Matsumoto, Yoshiko, Bernard, Comrie, Peter, Sells (Eds.), Noun-modifying Clause Constructions in Language of Eurasia. Rethinking Theoretical and Geographical Boundaries. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 293–329.
- Jansen, Maartin, 2014. *Half* and other unique words. Corpus patterns and lexicalist syntax. In: Simone, Raffaele, Masini, Francesca (Eds.), Word Classes. Nature, Typology and Representations. Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 263–281.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze, Da Milano, Federica (Eds.), 2015. Manuel of Deixis in Romance Languages. De Gruyter, Berlin.
- Kittel, F., 1985. A Grammar of the Kannada Language in English Comprising the Three Dialects of the Language (Ancient, mediaeval, and modern). Basel Mission Book and Tract Depository, Mangalore [Reprint of 1903 original].
- König, Ekkehard, 2017. The deictic identification of similarity. In: Treis, Vanhove (Eds.), pp. 143–164.
- König, Ekkehard, Umbach, Carla, 2018. Demonstratives of manner, of quality and of degree. In: Boef, Eefje, Coniglio, Marco, Schlachter, Eva, Veenstra, Tonjes (Eds.), Demonstratives: Syntax, Semantics and Typology. De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin (in print).
- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju, Gwynn, John Peter Lucisu, 1985. A Grammar of modern Telugu. Oxford University Press, Delhi.
- Kühner, Raphael, Holzweissig, Friedrich, 1978. Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Erster Teil. Elementar-, Formen und Wortlehre. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt.
- Lavency, Marius, 1997. Usus. Grammaire latine. Description du latin classique en vue de la lecture des auteurs, second ed. Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve.

²¹ For interrogative *which* and *welk* the betrayal was even bigger than for interrogative *quel*. Interrogative *quel* may or may not be similative, but *which* and *welk* are only non-similative. Thus *quel* can only be translated by *which* and *welk* in (30) but not in (29). For (29) Dutch and German use the new dedicated similative constructions *wat voor een* / *was für ein*, literally 'what for a'. See also Hole and Klumpp (2000: 241).

- Lehmann, Christian, 1984. Der Relativsatz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium Seiner Grammatik. Narr, Tübingen.
- Lisker, Leigh, 1963. Introduction to Spoken Telugu. American Council of Learned Societies, New York.
- Mackenzie, J. Lachlan, 1997. 'Grammar, discourse and knowledge: the use of *such*'. In: Inge de Mönnick, Jan Aarts, Herman, Wekker (Eds.), *Studies in English Language and Teaching: In Honour of Flor Aarts*. Rodopi, Amsterdam, pp. 85–105.
- Marouzeau, J., 1961. *Lexique de la terminologie linguistique*. Français, allemand, anglais, italien, third ed. Guethner, Paris.
- Masica, Colin P., 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mignon, Françoise, 2009. Histoire du terme *corrélation* dans la grammaire française. *Langages* 174, 13–24.
- Minard, Armand, 1936. *La subordination dans la prose Védique*. Les Belles Lettres, Paris.
- Misra, Haripriya, 1975. Historical Oriya morphology. Bharata Manisha, Varanasi.
- Mosegaard Hansen, Maj-Britt, 2016. *The Structure of Modern Standard French. A Student Grammar*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Muller, Claude, 1996. *La subordination en français. Le schème corrélatif*. Armand Colin, Paris.
- Owen-Smith, Thomas, 2013. Personal and environmental deictic categories in a northern dialect of Tamang. *SOAS Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 215–233.
- Panhuis, Dirk, 2012. *Latin Grammar*. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Pinkster, Harm, 2015. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1. The Simple Clause*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Poutsma, Hendrik, 1916. *A Grammar of Late Modern English for the Use of Continental, Especially Dutch, Students. Part II. The Parts of Speech. Section 1.B. Pronouns and Numerals*. Noordhoff, Groningen.
- Quirk, Randolph, Greenbaum, Sidney, Leech, Geoffrey, Jan, Svartvik, 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Longman, London.
- Riegel, Martin, Pellat, Jean-Christophe, Rioul, René, 2009. *Grammaire méthodique du français*, fourth ed. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Rubenhauer, Hans, Hofmann, Johann B., 1975. *Lateinische Grammatik*. Buchner, Bamberg.
- Sandfeld, Kr, 1970. *Syntaxe du français contemporain. I: Les pronoms*. Champion, Paris.
- Schiffman, Harold F., 1983. *A Reference Grammar of Spoken Kannada*. University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Schnedecker, Catherine, 2016. Les pronoms dit 'indéfinis' référant à la personne humaine: des grammaires à l'usage et réciproquement. *Bull. Soc. Ling. Paris XCI*, 341–389.
- Spencer, Harold, 1985. *A Kannada Grammar with Graduated Exercises*. Asian Educational Services, New Delhi.
- Speijer, J.S., 1998. *Sanskrit Syntax*. Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi.
- Sridhar, S.N., 1990. *Kannada*. Routledge, London.
- Thumb, Albert, 1959. *Handbuch des Sanskrit. Mit Texten und Glossar. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Altindischen. II. Teil: Formenlehre. Dritte stark umgearbeitete Auflage von Richard Hauschild*. Winter, Heidelberg.
- Touratier, Christian, 1994. *Syntaxe Latine*. Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve.
- Treis, Yvonne, Vanhove, Martine (Eds.), 2017. *Similative and Equative Constructions. A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Umbach, Carla, Gust, Helmar, 2014. Similarity demonstratives. *Lingua* 149, 74–93.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Coussé, Evie, 2016. *Such and sådan – the same but different*. *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 15, 15–32.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Gast, V., 2011. Categories and prototypes. In: Song, Jae Jung (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Typology*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 166–189.
- van der Auwera, Johan, Sahoo, Kalyanamalini, 2015. On comparative concepts and descriptive categories, *such* as they are. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 47, 136–173.
- Van Peteghem, Marleen, 1995. *Réflexions sur les emplois anaphoriques de tel*. *Semiotiques* 8, 57–78.
- Van Peteghem, Marleen, 2000. Les indéfinis corrélatifs *autre, même* et *tel*. In: Boseveldt-De Smet, Léonie, Van Peteghem, Marleen, Danièle Van de Velde (Eds.), *De l'indétermination à la qualification. Les indéfinis*. Artois Presses Université, Arras, pp. 117–201.
- Whitney, William Dwight, 1993. *Sanskrit Grammar. Including Both the Classical Language and the Older Dialects of Veda and Brahmaṇa*. Motilal Banarsidass. [Reprint of 1924 edition], Delhi.
- Wood, Johanna L., 2002. Much about *such*. *Stud. Ling.* 56, 91–117.