



HAL
open science

English demonstratives: discourse deixis and anaphora. A discourse-pragmatic account

Francis Cornish

► **To cite this version:**

Francis Cornish. English demonstratives: discourse deixis and anaphora. A discourse-pragmatic account. Interpreting Utterances; Pragmatics and its Interfaces. Essays in Honour of Thorstein Fretheim, 2007. ⟨hal-03782523⟩

HAL Id: hal-03782523

<https://hal.science/hal-03782523v1>

Submitted on 21 Sep 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

**ENGLISH DEMONSTRATIVES: DISCOURSE DEIXIS AND ANAPHORA. A
DISCOURSE-PRAGMATIC ACCOUNT**

Chapter for *Interpreting Utterances; Pragmatics and its Interfaces. Essays in Honour of Thorstein Fretheim* (eds. R. A. Nilsen, N. Aba Appiah Amfo and K. Borthen. Oslo: Novus Press 2007, pp. 147-166)

Francis Cornish,
ERSS, CNRS UMR 5610
and Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail,
5, Allées Antonio Machado,
31058 Toulouse Cedex 09,
France

Telephone: (00 33) 5 61 50 36 10

Fax: (00 33) 5 61 50 46 77

Email: cornish@univ-tlse2.fr

1. Introduction

This chapter aims to determine an effective means of distinguishing between three main uses of demonstrative expressions (whether adverbs, pronouns or NPs with a demonstrative determiner). Here I shall mainly be examining the latter two types. The three uses are the **deictic**, the **anaphoric**, and the **discourse-deictic**, respectively. I will be invoking other types of indexical, such as definite lexical NPs and 3rd person pronouns, in order to bring out the specific features of demonstrative reference by contrast, and will be comparing the behavioural properties of accented as well as weakly-accented demonstratives. My major goal is to provide a principled means of distinguishing between the **anaphoric** and **discourse-deictic** functions of demonstratives, both of which involve reference via the discourse context upstream. I will also attempt to account for the proximal vs. distal contrast in terms of the use made of it in non-situational discourse. For this purpose, I will be using a corpus of mainly written utterances collected principally from the weekly UK magazine *Radio Times*. This magazine provides a rich tapestry of data, since it contains not only TV and Radio programme notes, but also articles, interviews, advertisements, recipes and letters to the Editor.

The structure of the chapter is as follows. Section 2 gives a characterization of the discourse procedures of deixis and anaphora, and details the salient properties of demonstrative-based expressions. Section 3 then pinpoints both the deictic and the anaphoric (or more properly “anadeictic”) functioning of various types of demonstrative expressions; while section 4 distinguishes their more specifically discourse-deictic value. The concluding section 5 proposes a set of generalizations following these distinguishable uses, as well as various criteria making it possible to isolate them.

2. Deixis, anaphora and the demonstratives

Deixis and anaphora are complementary discourse procedures which the user exploits in constructing, modifying and accessing the contents of mental models of an unfolding discourse within the minds of speaker and addressee (or writer and reader in the written form of language). Thus deixis serves prototypically to draw the addressee’s attention focus to a new object of discourse (or to a new aspect of an existing one) that is derived by default via the situational context of utterance – whose center point is the ‘here and now’ of the speaker’s verbal and non-verbal activity. Anaphora, on the other hand, is a signal to continue the existing attention focus established hitherto (or assumed to be so established); thus, the referents of (weakly stressed, phonologically non-prominent) anaphors are presupposed by the speaker to enjoy a relatively high degree of psychological salience or attention focus level for the addressee at the point in the text where these are used. Both anaphora and deixis, then, operate at

presupposed when a token of this expression type is used anaphorically. This characterizing function associated with lexical demonstrative NPs is more evident in the case of proximal determiners (*this/these N(s)*) than in that of distal ones (*that/those N(s)*). As for demonstrative pronouns, these tend to have a generalizing referential effect, a property which is most evident in the case of the unmarked, distal pair *that/those*. Demonstrative pronouns as well as lexical NPs may have referents of all ontological types: first-order (individuals, physical objects), second-order (situations), third-order (concepts and propositions) and (*pace* Dik, 1997) fourth-order entities (illocutionary forces), as well as what Dik calls “zero-order entities” (the denotations of predicates).

3. The deictic vs. anaphoric functioning of demonstrative expressions

3.1 The deictic use

We start by characterizing the more basic deictic use, where the retrieval of an already existing referent available within a psychologically prominent discourse representation is not at issue. Three attested examples are given below.

- (1) “(...) I try not to miss *The World at One* on Radio 4. Nick Clarke has *this deliberately non-combative approach that allows the guests to trip themselves up...*” (“What I’m watching”, Armando Iannucci, *Radio Times* 29/07-4/08/06, p. 31)

The demonstrative NP in (1) could not be replaced by a definite NP introduced by the definite article (*#the deliberately non-combative approach that allows the guests to trip themselves up*), since the proximal demonstrative determiner *this* has the effect of introducing a wholly new, non-shared, specific but indefinite (Maclaran, 1980: 815) referent into the discourse, a referent which is flagged as going to be the subject of several predications in the ensuing discourse. It is a deictic occurrence (a usage known as “presentational-*this*”) in the sense that the writer is conjuring up the referent before the very eyes of the reader by proxy, as it were, the proximal demonstrative determiner inducing an effect of vividness and immediacy. Substitution of the proximal determiner *this* by the distal *that* in (1) would only be possible, characteristically, if the referent corresponded to a recognizable **type** of ‘approach’ to the guests in question. But in (1), the presence of a restrictive relative clause suggests that the approach is not generally recognizable, but requires explaining to the reader.

The proximal demonstrative determiner *this* in (2) below could also not have been substituted by the definite article, signalling either prior familiarity with the referent on the reader’s part, or the fact that the reader can construct a uniquely identifying representation of the intended referent as a result of

processing the NP in question. In spite of the presence of the film's title immediately above this text, this is not an anaphoric occurrence, but a deictic one, serving to introduce it by describing its essential character for the reader. The proximal determiner *this* rather than *that* is used here, since the referent is assumed to be present in the reader's deictic space, but is being pointed towards in order to bring it saliently to the forefront of that space.

- (2) “*This uproarious, if hit-and-miss, sketch show demonstrates how BBC3 is nurturing an impressive comic talent...*” (“Little Miss Jocelyn”, *10.30pm BBC3*, by Geoff Ellis, *Radio Times*, 19-25/08/06, p. 76: first sentence of text)

Here now are two examples involving the proximal pronoun as well as determiner *this*. The first ((3a)) is an instance of “symbolic deixis”², according to Fillmore (1997: 62-3), and the second ((3b)) an occurrence of straightforward, situational deixis (the image providing the situation):

- (3) a “(...) The top [of the bikini worn by Ursula Andress in the James Bond film *Dr No*]
I know *this* was the 1960s and they were playing it safe, but the top has far too much fabric...” (“Bikini Babes”, by Gok Wan, *Radio Times*, 19-25/08/06, p. 20)
- b “Less rain where you see *this sign*” (Picture of M-B trademark: steel tripod set in a circle, under which is the caption “Mercedes Benz”). (Advertisement for Mercedes Benz, *Radio Times*, 19-25/08/06, p. 140)

3.2 The anaphoric use

Now for the secondary, anaphoric use of demonstratives. Example (4) provides two initial attested illustrations.

- (4) “I noted with smug satisfaction that I own copies of 20 of the 25 films in your “How to be a film buff” feature (22 July), and generally agreed with the list. But I was staggered to see *Armageddon* included. Was it there for a joke, or a dare?
I rate *that film* as one of the most laughably bad I’ve ever seen, with its corn, abuse of the laws of physics, slow-motion shots of US “heroes” trudging purposefully, script straight from the Big Book of Clichés, poor music, cartoon characterisation and sheer implausibility. I could probably list 1,000 films that should be on *that list* rather than *Armageddon*, but will restrain myself to one: *Touch of Evil*.” (Ian Honest, Hessle, East Riding of Yorkshire, Letter to *Radio Times*, 29/07-4/08/06, p. 136)

² Involving reference in terms of the wider socio-cultural context within which the communication is situated. Here, the pronoun *this* refers to the time frame and its associated socio-cultural character corresponding to the 1960s, when the film *Dr No* first appeared.

There are two demonstrative NPs here, *that film* in line 4, and *that list* in line 7. The first retrieves a referent which enjoys a high degree of attention focus at the point of use³; but the second maintains the reference to an entity ('the list of 25 films featured in the RT edition of 22 July 2006') which has a somewhat lower degree of accessibility at the point of use. Now, given the "reinitialising" function of the subsequent reference to the former referent in line 4 at the start of a new paragraph, which is thereby signposted as going to be about this particular film, the pronoun *it* would not have been felicitous here. A further motivation for the anadeictic use of *that* rather than *this* is the negative stance adopted by the writer in relation to the referent; thus he is certainly not subjectively identifying with it (quite the reverse): the use of proximal *this* would have had this effect (Cheshire, 1996; Cornish, 2001): see as an illustration example (1) above.

The pronoun *it* would not have been appropriate in place of the distal demonstrative NP *that list* in line 7, either. This is because unstressed third person pronouns signal referential continuity. Now, since the referent in question is no longer salient (topical) at the point of reference⁴, an attempt at retrieval via a pronoun is unacceptable. See in this respect Linde's (1979) conclusions on the conditions for use of tokens of the pronoun types *it* and *that* in oral descriptions of apartment layouts. The broad outlines of Linde's characterization (that the pronoun *it* refers to entities which are in current attention focus, while *that* specializes in picking out those which are outside it) are confirmed by a series of experiments reported in Brown-Schmidt *et al.* (2005). See also the statistical Table 9 giving raw numbers and percentages of tokens of *it* and *that* referring to an in-focus or not-in-focus referent in the TRAINS93 corpus, in Byron & Allen (1998: 77).

So although these two occurrences are anaphoric, they are not straightforwardly anaphoric in function (as an unstressed 3rd person pronoun would be): let us call these instances "anadeictic" in order to recognize this 'deictic' dimension of their reference maintenance here (see Fig. 1). In both cases, the demonstrative NPs could be replaced by definite NPs (*the film* and *the list*, respectively), since the lexical heads of these NPs both correspond to presupposed information. Note also that substituting the proximal demonstrative NP *this film* for the distal *that film* in line 4 would be felicitous (but would lose the suggestion of a "negative" stance adopted towards the intended referent, mentioned above), but not the proximal *this list* for *that list* in line 7. This is because the referent of the latter has been supplanted as macro-topic in the first paragraph by 'the film *Armageddon*' in the second.

One other interesting (here marked) anadeictic use of a demonstrative NP is *These snapshots of his childhood growing up in Leeds* in example (5) (line 4):

³ 'The film *Armageddon*' has already been retrieved by a high accessibility expression, the 3rd person pronoun *it* in line 3.

⁴ Up to that point, the paragraph has been dealing only with the film *Armageddon*, no mention having been made in it of 'the list of 25 films featured in the RT edition of 22 July 2006'.

- (5) “Originally written and read by their author Alan Bennett (...) for TV, these autobiographical stories work so much better on the radio. He re-recorded them for Radio 4 in just one day back in 2000 with the then producer and now head of programmes at BBC 7, Mary Kalemkerian. *These snapshots of his childhood growing up in Leeds* are delivered in that quietly spoken voice, where his pauses are just as powerful as the words that led up to or followed them...” (“**Choices**. Telling Tales” (Mon-Fri 11.30 a.m./12 midnight BBC 7), *Radio Times* 29/07-4/08/06, p. 126)

Here, the referent is salient and topical at the point of occurrence, having already been retrieved via a 3rd person pronoun (*them*) in line 2. But the introduction of new, non-inferable information⁵ requires a demonstrative and not a definite-article determiner: #*The snapshots of his childhood growing up in Leeds* would not have been felicitous as a substitute, since if this definite NP were to have been construed as anaphoric, the head noun + PP complement would need to be presupposed information, which is manifestly not the case here. The anaphoric use of definite NPs normally entails that the addressee is (potentially) familiar with the intended referent.

Finally, here are three further anadeictic references (in examples (6a) and (6b)), the first two of which involve proximal demonstrative NPs. The second occurrence (*these young men* in (6a), line 5) refers in terms of a stereotype associated with the evocation in the initial sentence of the extract of ‘English [football] hooligan violence’ — namely that this is typically perpetrated by ‘young men’ — in spite of the fact that this ‘antecedent’ has not been introduced explicitly via the cotext.

- (6) a “At the end of *Hooligans* (2 August BBC1), an unedifying hour of English hooligan violence in Germany during this year’s World Cup, I waited for some comment or analysis. It wasn’t forthcoming.
Unless we understand the causes of *this behaviour* we can’t hope to deal with it. In spite of their bravado, *these young men* are deeply unhappy...” (“Mindless spectacle?”, Letter from Peter Galbraith, Leicester, *Radio Times*, 19-25/08/06, p. 137)

(6b) is an informal, spoken extract where the demonstrative NP (here with a distal determiner) also refers to a contextually implicit referent. The inference to a ‘conversation’ may be licensed for the (regular) listener in terms of his or her knowledge that this jazz programme always features a recorded conversation between the musician selected as topic and the presenter.

- (6) b “(...) I caught up with McCoy recently, and we’ll be hearing from *that conversation* in a few moments...” (Programme devoted to the pianist McCoy Tyner, *BBC Radio 3*, 2002)

⁵ The fact that the stories in question are “snapshots of AB’s childhood when he was growing up in Leeds”.

4. The discourse-deictic use of demonstratives

Finally, **discourse deixis** involves contextual pointing to a part of the recently constructed discourse representation, and building it into a discourse entity which may subsequently be retrieved via an anaphor (see Webber, 1991; Bühler, 1982; Fillmore, 1997: 103-6, and what Lyons 1977: 668 calls “impure textual deixis”). In this type of contextual reference, the reader or addressee must create a referent from within the immediate discourse context. Clearly, it is demonstrative-based expressions which are specialized in this function. In the anaphoric use of demonstratives, seen in §3.2, there was an identifiable entity within the discourse representation upstream of the point of occurrence whose saliency level (whether high or medium) the demonstrative reference could boost. This “boosting” function is a reflex of the proximal or distal character of the demonstrative, and the anaphoric function corresponds to the maintenance of the reference involved. In the discourse-deictic use, on the other hand, there is no independently delimitable discourse entity pre-existing the indexical reference: the demonstrative “points” to the relevant part of the context representation (guided by the predicative component of the indexical clause as a whole) and the process of understanding it actually creates a referent out of it: there is a sense of “accommodation” applying here. We are still in presence of an “anadeictic” reference (see the relevant section of the scale in Fig. 1), but unlike the purely anaphoric use of demonstratives, here the deictic dimension encoded by these expression types comes to dominate their anaphoric one.

First of all, distal demonstrative pronouns bearing a medium level of pitch and stress may fulfil such a function: see for instance the use of *that* in example (7) below (line 4):

- (7) “In the fury of a force-ten storm, 30ft waves lift and toss a fragile-looking fishing boat on churning seas as skipper Jimmy Buchan and his crew frantically bid to free their nets from the seabed before their boat sinks beneath the waves pounding on its stern. Should *that* happen, there’ll be no survival beyond a few minutes in the near-freezing North Sea....” (Article “Hell on high water”, *Radio Times* 29/07-4/08/06, p. 14)

This is more a discourse-deictic occurrence of distal *that* than a simple anadeictic (anaphoric) one, since the ‘antecedent’ (“antecedent-trigger”, in my terminology: see Cornish, 1999: §2.4.1) is not an independent referring phrase, but is a temporal clause embedded within a dependent infinitival purpose clause inside a VP (...*before their boat sinks beneath the waves pounding on its stern*). This does not evoke an actualised event, whereas the indexical clause (*Should that happen...*), albeit presented as a condition, does. *That* is used instead of *this* since the situation is still not actual but is a condition for the lack of survival of the trawlermen in the icy seas as a result. That is, a degree of modal “distance”

from the actualisation of the situation denoted is at issue here, while the use of proximal *this* would have connoted the writer's identification with the referent presented as potentially existing⁶. Notice also that the 3rd person neuter pronoun *it* would have been less than felicitous here. See also the two occurrences of *that* in example (8), where this is also the case:

- (8) “As my kids have grown up, watching TV has become quite a struggle; you have to fight for control of the remote. *That* means I spend a lot of time watching CBeebies and *Brainiac*. One thing we all agree on is *Malcolm in the Middle*. It's very inventive, intelligent and daring, but it still manages to have family appeal. *That's* what really, really irritates me about mainstream British comedy: why does it have to be so twee? (...)” (“What I'm watching”. Armando Iannucci, *Radio Times* 29/07-4/08/06, p. 31)

We clearly see here also the generalizing effect of the use of demonstrative pronouns, the distal variants in particular, an effect partly contributed by the nature of what is predicated of each referent (here, respectively, “...means I spend a lot of time watching CBeebies and *Brainiac*”, and “...is what really, really irritates me about mainstream British comedy”).

The occurrence of the demonstrative NP *those boring Sundays* in example (9) (line 3) is particularly interesting:

- (9) “There's a word for people who keep obsessive records about how often they've mowed their lawn in the past 25 years. But one listener to last year's *The First Cuckoo and the Last Swallow* on Radio 4 counted *those boring Sundays* and has now proved to be one of the many extremely important contributors to a nationwide nature diary...” (“Return of the First Cuckoo” (3.45pm R4), *Radio Times* 5-11/08/06, p. 132)

This is an example of discourse deixis in that it requires the reader to construct out of the discourse context an entity, such that the people who “keep obsessive records about how often they've mowed the lawn in the past 25 years” do so once a week “on Sundays”, and that the obsessive recording of the fact is a boring, routine activity (cf. the connotation of “Sunday” as already being the most “boring” day of the week, anyway). It would not have been possible to substitute either the proximal variant here (*#these boring Sundays*) nor the definite NP counterpart (*#the boring Sundays*), and clearly not a pronoun (*#them*).

There are several examples in the corpus where the demonstrative pronoun or NP has an illocutionary value, referring meta-discursively to the intended speech act value of the relevant context utterance: see for example *this statement* in (10), *this startling fact* in (11), *that's not your business* in (12), and *that advice* in (13):

⁶ See Cheshire (1996) and Cornish (2001) on this aspect.

- (10) “We all have our own ways of filling idle moments. For instance, I revise my eight records ready for the call from *Desert Island Discs*. Does Tony Hancock’s *The Radio Ham* count? Is Joy Division’s *Love Will Tear Us Apart* just too depressing a soundtrack for a stranded, solitary life? At other times, I refine the title of my autobiography. Until recently, it was *EastEnders Poisoned my Soul*, but lately I’ve decided upon *TV Light Entertainment Almost Ruined My Life*.
I know *this statement* to be true, having watched the excellent *The Story of Light Entertainment* (Saturday BBC2)....” (Article “Slight entertainment”, *Radio Times* 29/07-4/08/06, p. 31)
- (11) “*CSI: Miami* is the most popular programme in the world. *This startling fact* was unearthed by a study of global viewing trends earlier this year. (...)” (“Top Ten Shows around the World”, *Radio Times* 5-11/08/06, p.11)
- (12) “...Here are some of my favourite films:
Judgment at Nuremberg, 12 Angry Men, West Side Story, The Third Man, Bandit Queen, Casablanca, The Hill, What Ever Happened to Baby Jane. Why are they some of my favourites? *That’s* not your business; I don’t know you...” (“What I’m watching”, Jeremy Hardy, *Radio Times* 5-11/08/06, p. 36)
- (13) “(...) **No manhandling soft toys, then?**
A little bit. I once had to point at a puppy and say, “Hey kids, this is a puppy. But you know, even though they’re really sweet, they’re not just for Christmas – they’re for life.” I’d like to think that, somewhere, someone has benefited from *that advice*....” (“One Final Question”, Interview with Dara O’Briain, *Radio Times* 5-11/08/06, p. 14)

One test of the distinction between the anadeictic (anaphoric) value of a demonstrative-based expression and its discourse-deictic character is this: in the former case, it is generally possible to substitute an equivalent definite NP (on condition that the original demonstrative NP’s predicative component is presupposed and not “characterizing”), though not normally a pronoun; while in the latter case, neither a definite NP nor a pronoun would be possible. Indeed, substitution of the definite article for the demonstrative determiner in examples (10), (11) and (13) would not be felicitous (respectively, #*the statement*, #*The startling fact*, and #*the advice*). The pronoun *It* would have been marginally acceptable in (12) in place of *That*, however⁷.

We end by looking at two examples involving contrastively-accented demonstratives. In all the examples of discourse deixis we have seen so far, the demonstrative (whether pronoun or determiner), if spoken, would have been pronounced with at least a medium pitch level, as well as a lexical stress. A contrastive accent placed on these demonstratives gives them a greater degree of referential strength still than would be the case without it. As we shall see, the discourse-referential properties of the demonstrative change as a result.

⁷ This is no doubt due to the quasi-idiomatic character of the very similar phrase *It’s none of your business*.

- (14) a “*Buoyant tax revenues from North sea oil won’t last for ever - what will Mr. Lawson [at the time, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer] do THEN?*”

L* H*%⁸

(*The Listener*, 17 January, 1985) (Example (4.6) in Cornish, 1999: 122. The capitals with which the word *THEN* is written here are due to me)

- b ...#What will Mr Lawson DO *then* ?

H* L%

A relation of implicit contrast is involved in (14a), namely: “North sea oil may be plentiful NOW, but it won’t be THEN (i.e. at some point in the future)”. The pronoun must be heavily accented if spoken (see the incoherent version given in (14b), where it is unstressed). A (non-defeasible) entailment is involved in the interpretation of the initial clause of this example: namely, that “(If buoyant tax revenues from North sea oil will not last for ever, then) there will necessarily come a time when they will run out”. It is this particular time, whenever it is, to which the contrastively accented distal demonstrative pronoun-adverb *THEN* refers in the second clause. Interestingly, this entailment is, by hypothesis, effected by the reader of this fragment as part of the process of interpreting the accented pronominal adverb *THEN*, and not immediately after processing the antecedent-trigger sentence. The “anaphoric procedure” signalled via unstressed *then* would not be appropriate here, since there is no salient temporal referent in the immediate discourse context for it to retrieve. In fact, unstressed *then* would not necessarily even be referential here at all, since its most natural interpretation would be equivalent to “in that case”. See Schiffrin (1990) for an interesting analysis of the deictic-anaphoric (or “anadeictic”) character of the temporal pronominal adverb *then*, as well as the comparison of English *then* and Norwegian *da/så* in Fretheim (2006) (an expression type which corresponds to the indexical category “distal demonstrative adverb” in Figure 1).

- (15) a [Interview with Jonathan Porritt, then leader of the environmental pressure group *Friends of the Earth*, by Nicholas Witchell, *BBC Radio 5*, 16 October, 1994]

NW: *do you think that he [‘Prince Charles’] will become a GREEN monarch?*

JP: *well, yes, but I don’t think that everyone necessarily subscribes to THAT.*

L L* L H*L%

NW: *-- what, that he will ever one day beCOME king?*

JP: *yes.* (Example (2.8a) in Cornish, 1999: 30)

⁸ I use Pierrehumbert & Hirschberg’s (1992) notation system for intonation here, as follows: ‘L’ = “low pitch syllable”, ‘H’ = “high pitch syllable”; ‘*’ = “accented syllable”; ‘%’ = “boundary syllable”. See Ladd (1996) for further details of this “phonological” approach to intonation; see also Hirschberg (2004) for a more wide-ranging discussion, as well as Cornish (2006) on the effects of prosody on the reference potential of 3rd person and demonstrative pronouns in English.

Such a difference between contrastively accented *THAT* and unstressed *it* is paralleled by Norwegian stressed *DET* (equivalent to *THAT* in English) in contrast to unstressed *det* (comparable to *it*), according to the experimental results obtained by Fretheim *et al.* (1997).

5. Conclusion

The differences between the anadeictic and discourse-deictic uses of demonstratives in English seem to be as follows: unlike in the case of the purely deictic use, the referent is present — or potentially present — in the discourse model (corresponding to working memory, psychologically speaking) in both cases at the point of occurrence; but while it is a determinate entity bearing a minimal level of saliency in the case of an **anaphoric** retrieval, in the **discourse-deictic** use, this is not initially the case. The interpretation of a demonstrative in its discourse-deictic use requires the understander to operate upon the immediate discourse context, constructing out of it an entity, proposition or illocution which can later be retrieved via an attenuated indexical expression (a 3rd person pronoun or a zero element). While the anaphoric dimension of the demonstrative takes priority over the deictic one in its anaphoric use, in the case of discourse-deixis, the relationship is the reverse (see the “anadeictic” span within the scale of indexicality in Figure 1, where this dual coding is recognized). Typically, the referent retrieved via the anaphoric use of a demonstrative will have been introduced into the discourse via an NP (see the two demonstrative NP anaphors *that film* and *that list* in example (4), as well as the proximal demonstrative anaphor in (5)), though this is by no means a necessary condition: see *these young men* in (6a) and *that conversation* in (6b). Under their discourse-deictic use, on the other hand, the representation out of which the referent is constructed may have been introduced via a range of different types of expression: sentences, clauses (whether finite or non-finite), NPs (see (9), where the referent is constructed out of the content of a restrictive relative clause modifying a head noun), PPs and even whole paragraphs in the written form of language.

There are at least two degrees of markedness in discourse-deictic references: an unmarked one, illustrated by examples (7), (8), (10), (11), (12) and (13), and a marked one, exemplified by (9) and the two instances of contrastively-accented demonstrative pronouns in (14) and (15). This is in keeping with the cline of indexical expression types displayed in Fig. 1, which starts from the purely anaphoric pole on the right (3rd person reflexive and ordinary pronouns), moving up through a segment of anadeictic expression types (definite lexical NPs, distal and proximal demonstrative pronouns, followed by distal then proximal lexical demonstrative NPs and distal demonstrative adverbs, the last five of which may also realize discourse deixis — all six being equally capable of expressing deixis proper), and finally the pure

deixis pole occupied by proximal demonstrative adverbs then by 1st and 2nd person personal pronouns.

Unlike the anaphoric use of demonstratives, in the discourse-deictic use, the demonstrative, where it is an NP, cannot normally be replaced by an equivalent definite NP (see (9), (10), (11) and (13)) — such a substitution only being possible in the anaphoric use where the denotation of the demonstrative NP's lexical component is presupposed, in conformity with the condition regulating the anaphoric use of definite NPs. And in neither case can the demonstrative, whether an NP or a pronoun, be substituted by an appropriate unaccented 3rd person pronoun bearing the same reference. Characteristically, such a substitution would be markedly deviant in the case of the discourse-deictic use, but merely somewhat infelicitous in that of the anaphoric. In the discourse-deictic use, finally, the predicative content of the indexical clause takes on a much more significant role than in the purely anaphoric, orienting the addressee or reader towards the likely intended interpretation: it is as a function of this, together with the expression's lexical component (head noun and any complement or adjunct phrase(s)) where the demonstrative is an NP, that the referent of the discourse-deictic demonstrative is created out of the relevant discourse representation.

References

- Brown-Schmidt, S., Byron, D. & Tanenhaus, M. (2005). Beyond salience: interpretation of personal and demonstrative pronouns. *Journal of Memory and Language* 53: 292-313.
- Bühler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fischer Verlag.
- Bühler, K. (1982). The deictic field of language and deictic words. Extracts in English from Bühler (1934). In Jarvella & Klein (eds.), 12-28.
- Byron, D.K. & Allen, J.F. (1998). Resolving demonstrative pronouns in the TRAINS93 corpus. In Botley, S. & McEnery, T. (eds.), *New Approaches to Discourse Anaphora, Proceedings of the Second Colloquium on Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution (DAARC2)*. University Centre for Computer Corpus Research on Language, University of Lancaster, UK, 68-81.
- Cheshire, J. (1996). That jacksprat: an interactional perspective on English *that*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 369-93.
- Conte, M-E. (1992). Deixis textuelle et Deixis am Phantasma. In S.R. Anschütz (ed.), *Texte, Sätze, Wörter und Moneme. Festschrift für Klaus Heger zum 65. Geburtstag*. Heidelberger Orientverlag, 153-161.
- Cornish, F. (1999). *Anaphora, Discourse and Understanding. Evidence from English and French*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Cornish, F. (2001). "Modal" *that* as determiner and pronoun: the primacy of the cognitive-interactional parameter. *English Language and Linguistics* 5(2): 297-315.
- Cornish, F. (2006). How contrastively- and weakly-stressed indexicals refer: prosody, discourse deixis and anaphora in English. Unpublished paper, Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail, France.
- Dik, S.C. (1997). *The Theory of Functional Grammar Part I: The structure of the clause* (ed. K. Hengeveld). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ehlich, K. (1982). Anaphora and deixis: same, similar, or different? In Jarvella & Klein (eds.), 315-338.
- Fillmore, C.J. (1997). *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Fretheim, T. (2006). English *then* and Norwegian *da/så* compared: A Relevance-theoretic account. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 29: 45-94.
- Fretheim, T., van Dommelen, W., & Borthen, K. (1997). Linguistic constraints on relevance in reference resolution. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 33: *The Main Session*, 99-113.
- Gundel, J.K., Hedberg, N. & Zacharski, R. (1993). Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69(2): 175-204.
- Hanks, W.F. (1992). The indexical ground of deictic reference. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (eds.), *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 43-76.
- Hegarty, M., Gundel, J.K. & Borthen, K. (2001). Information structure and the accessibility of clausally introduced referents. *Theoretical Linguistics* 23: 163-186.
- Himmelman, N.P. (1996). Demonstratives in narrative discourse: a taxonomy of universal uses. In B.A. Fox (ed.), *Studies in Anaphora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 206-254.
- Hirschberg, J. (2004). Ch. 23: Pragmatics and intonation. In L.R. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 515-537.
- Hobbs, J.R. (2004). Abduction in natural language understanding. Ch. 32 in L.R. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 724-741.
- Jarvella, R. J. & Klein, W. (eds.) (1982). *Speech, Place and Action. Studies in deixis and related topics*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- Kadmon, N. (2001). Ch. 13: Focus and focus identification. In *Formal Pragmatics. Semantics, Pragmatics, Presupposition, and Focus*. Oxford: Blackwell, 250-287.
- Kemmerer, D. (1999). "Near" and "far" in language and perception. *Cognition* 73: 35-63.
- Ladd, D.R. (1996). *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Levinson, S.C. (2004). Deixis. In L.R. Horn & G. Ward (eds.), *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 97-121.
- Linde, C. (1979). Focus of attention and the choice of pronouns in discourse. In T. Givón (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics Vol. 12: Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 337-354.
- Lindström, E. (2000). Ch. 6: Some uses of demonstratives in spoken Swedish. In S. Botley & A.M. McEnery (eds.), *Corpus-based and Computational Approaches to Discourse Anaphora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 107-128.
- Lyons, J. (1977). Ch. 15: Deixis, space and time. In *Semantics*, Vol 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 636-724.
- Maclaran, R. (1980). On two asymmetrical uses of the demonstrative determiner in English. *Journal of Linguistics* 18: 803-820.
- Maes, A.A. & Noordman, L.G.M. (1995). Demonstrative nominal anaphors: a case of nonidentificational markedness. *Linguistics* 33: 255-282.
- Nunberg, G. (1993). Indexicality and deixis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16: 1-43.
- Petch-Tyson, S. (2000). Ch. 2: Demonstrative expressions in argumentative discourse. In S. Botley & A.M. McEnery (eds.), *Corpus-based and Computational Approaches to Discourse Anaphora*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 43-64.
- Pierrehumbert, J. & Hirschberg, J. (1992). The meaning of intonational contours in the interpretation of discourse. Ch. 14 in P.R. Cohen, J. Morgan & M.E. Pollack (eds.) *Intentions in Communication*. Cambridge, Mass./London: MIT Press, 271-311.
- Schiffrin, D. (1990). Between text and context: deixis, anaphora and the meaning of *then*. *Text* 10(3): 245-270.
- Webber, B-L. (1991). Structure and ostension in the interpretation of discourse deixis. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 6(2): 107-135.