3.0 Preamble:

This chapter is an attempt to describe and discuss the personal, spatial, and temporal deixis in English. It starts with giving various definitions of deixis by different linguists. It deals with some other concepts such as pronoun, person, indexical, anaphora, sentence, utterance, context, text, and discourse with relation to deixis. It gives a detailed review of personal, spatial, and temporal deixis in terms of their semantic properties and pragmatic use. It ends with a conclusion summarizing the discussion and analysis of the chapter.

3.1 Definitions of Deixis:

Deixis is one of the most important notions in general linguistics and is a vital link between the real life environment around us (time frame, physical location, people involved, etc) and what we actually say (the linguistic terms used). Deixis has always been at the heart of reference research as widely known literature in semantics and pragmatics demonstrates. Being fundamental, it is in the common focus of several disciplines: Cognitive Science, Linguistics and Psychology.
The origin of deixis is ‘deiktikos’ (deictic) in Greek, meaning ‘pointing’, which reflects the core function of deixis. Deixis has been called by different names in different approaches: Pure index (Pierce 1932), Zeigwörter (index) + Symbolwörter (symbol) (Bühler 1934), Indexical symbol (Burks 1948), Indicator (Goodman 1951), Indexical expression (Bar-Hiller 1954), and Shifter (Jespersen 1965[1924], Jakobson 1971[1957]). Since the Greek period, deixis has been a subject of study in philosophy. In recent years, many studies on deixis have been conducted from the linguistic point of view (Bühler 1934; Fillmore 1971b, 1975, 1997; Lyons 1968, 1977b; Levinson 1983; Anderson and Keenan 1985; and Diessel 1999, among others). The present study focuses on basic functions corresponding to the meaning of ‘deiktikos’ mentioned above. The important feature of deictic pointing is that it cites not only referents but also gestures towards locating them – in relation to a speaker and a hearer.

Expressions like I, we, you, this, that, here, there, now, yesterday, next year are all indexed to the speaker in speaking; that is, they take their current interpretation from the speaker at the moment of speaking. It is necessary for a listener to identify the speaker, and the time and place of utterance, in order to interpret fully what was said, and what was meant by what was said.

In literature, there have been three traditionally recognized categories of deixis based on three axes, namely, spatial-socio-temporal axes. Spatial deixis is based on spatio-axes, (e.g., this, that, here, and there). Personal
deixis is based on socio-axes (e.g., *I* and *you*). Temporal deixis is based on temporal axes (e.g., *now*, *today*, and *yesterday*) but not including *before* or *earlier* (Fillmore 1982: 35, 38, Jarvella and Klein 1982: 2). Levinson (1983), following Lyons (1968, 1977a), and Fillmore (1975), adds to them social deixis, that is, honorific and discourse (or text) deixis.

Levinson (1983:63) further argues that visibility (i.e., visible or invisible) should also be considered another deictic category as he argues:

“quite a number of languages of different stocks that encode a basic distinction between objects visible and non-visible to participants. This distinction is often subsumed under place deixis, as it tends to show up in demonstratives, but it is in fact an independent and parallel dimension of deictic organization that ought to be added to the major five categories of deixis.”

However, as a start it will be useful to take a bird’s eye view of different definitions of deixis in general. Crymes (1968:63) has defined deixis as “any pointing that locates either a real-world referent or a linguistic referent in terms of its orientation to the speaker spatially, temporally, discriminately, affectively”. Fillmore (1982: 35) has defined deixis as the name given to uses of items and categories of lexicon and grammar that are controlled by certain details of the interactional situation in which the utterances are produced.

For Yule (1996: 9), deixis is a technical term (from Greek) for one of the most basic ones that means ‘pointing’ via language.

Fillmore also (1997:59) refers to deictics as those lexical items and grammatical forms which can be interpreted only when the sentences in
which they occur are understood as being anchored in some social context, that context defined in such a way as to identify the participants in the communication act, their location in space, and time during which the communication act is performed. For Bühler (1934), any expression which locates a referent in space or time is a deictic expression.

Deixis stands at the crossroads of two major fields, namely, semantics and pragmatics. Lyons (1977:636) has used the term deixis to cover the function of personal and demonstrative pronouns, of tense and of variety of other grammatical and lexical features which relate utterances to the spatio-temporal co-ordinates of the act of utterance. Lyons (1977:637) has defined deixis as follows:

“By deixis, is meant the location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatio-temporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee.”

Attempting to grammaticalize the aspects of deictic use in languages, Levinson (1983:54), however, prefers to define deixis as follows:

“Deixis concerns the ways in which languages encode or grammaticalize features of the context of utterance or speech event, and thus also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance.”

Deixis, in a broad sense, is potentially context-dependent linguistic expression and typically anchoring in the perspective of the speaker. In this regard, the view that deixis is, in fact, a part of pragmatics is highly advocated, as its interpretation depends directly and primarily on features of
the context involved, i.e., context-dependent, such as the speaker and addressee, their location in space and time, etc.

3.2 Deixis and Indexicals:

‘Indexicality’ (or rather ‘index’ from which ‘indexicality’ derives) was introduced into logic and the philosophy of language via semiotics by the American philosopher C. S. Peirce (1839-1914) (Lyons, 1995) and is first dealt with in modern philosophy of language by Gottlob Frege (1892) who distinguished the ‘reference’ of linguistic expressions from their ‘sense’, i.e., their descriptive content (what he calls a ‘manner of presentation’) (Leezenberg, 1994).

Indexicals are expressions whose interpretation depends on the occasion on which they are uttered and whose reference shifts from utterance to utterance such as *I, here, today, this* …etc.

The philosophical use of this term (either alone, or in the phrase indexical expression) is sometimes encountered in linguistics to refer to those features of language which refer directly to characteristics of the situation within which an utterance take place, i.e., their meaning is thus relative to that situation. Linguists more regularly refer to these features as deictic features.

‘Deixis’ (and more especially the adjective ‘deictic’) goes back to the work of ancient Greek grammarians and was introduced into linguistics in the sense that it now bears as explained by the German psychologist K.
Bühler (1879-1963) (Lyons, 1995). Crystal (1992:96) has used the terms deixis and indexical interchangeably. He refers to them as a grammatical category involving direct reference to the characteristics of the situation where an utterance takes place. The terms ‘deixis’ (means “pointing” or “showing” in Greek) and ‘index’ (the Latin word for the pointing-finger) both originate in the notion of gestural reference, that is, in the identification of the referent by means of some bodily gesture on the part of the speaker (Lyons, 1995).

Kaplan (1989a) has argued that what makes an expression an indexical is the fact that its character is unstable, i.e., it has different values in different contexts. Kaplan distinguishes two aspects of meaning for indexicals: character and content. A content is fixed or stable if it is a constant function, for example, proper names have a stable content. Character is the function that determines the content in different contexts of utterance (Leezenberg, 1994). He further distinguishes pure indexicals, i.e., expressions such as I or now, the referent of which is entirely determined by linguistic rules, from demonstratives proper (true) such as he, she, his, i.e., expressions that require an act of- usually nonlinguistic- demonstration, like pointing, in order to determine their referent or demonstratum. Richard (1992: 201) has affirmed Kaplan’s identification of character that may be determined by linguistic convention and what is known by the competent speaker who understands an expression.
To eliminate confusion in the present study, the two terms, namely, deixis and indexical, will be used interchangeably, following Lyons (1995), Crystal (1992) among others.

3.3 Deixis and Anaphora:

Anaphora, as a term, is used in two ways in the literature: (a) as a general description of coreferential process, where one element refers back to another; (b) in the restrictive and ‘technical’ sense of anaphoric binding, where the ‘anaphor’ is restricted to necessarily referentially dependent noun phrase (Lebeaux, 1992).

Anaphora is sometimes characterised as the phenomena whereby the interpretation of an occurrence of one expression depends on the interpretation of an occurrence of another or whereby an occurrence of an expression has its referent supplied by an occurrence of some other expression in the same or another sentence.

Anaphora is considered as a fundamental mode of reference in pronoun. Toolan (1990:129) refers to anaphora as “the coreferential tie or relation between a pronoun (the anaphor) and a – usually preceding – phrase or clause (the antecedent)”. Crymes (1968) emphasizes that deixis and anaphora may be signalled simultaneously by the same pointing word, as in:

- Take a look at this book. This is the best book I’ve read in a long time.

The relation between the pronoun and its antecedent is not to be confused with that between the pronoun and its referent as the traditional
grammarians tend to say that a pronoun ‘refers’ to its antecedent which refers to the referent of the antecedent expression with which it is correlated, for example:

- *The Empress hasn’t arrived yet but she should be here any minute*

The relation between *she* and its antecedent expression (the NP the Empress) is not to be confused with that between *she* and its referent (the Empress person, not a linguistic form) (Lyons 1977; Huddleston 1984).

Himmelmann (1996: 240) calls anaphora ‘tracking use’ and defines it as the use of demonstratives for referents which have already been mentioned. Anaphora is regarded as the use of a word referring back to a word used earlier in text or conversation to avoid repetition, for example the pronoun *he, she, it, they* and the verb *do* in:

- I like *it* and so *do they*

Crystal (1997:19) describes anaphora as “a term used in grammatical description for the process or result of a linguistic unit deriving its interpretation from previously expressed unit or meaning (the antecedent)”. Anaphora is often contrasted with cataphora where the words refer forwards, and sometimes with deixis or exophora where the words refer directly to the extralinguistic situation. Lyons (1991:166) argues that deixis is both ontogenetically and logically prior to anaphora. By this, he means that the deictic use of pronouns and other such expressions precedes their anaphoric use in the earliest stages of language-acquisition. The primacy of deixis is a principle that can be related very directly to what
Bullowa and Halliday had to say about the primacy of gesture, attention and interaction in the acquisition of language (Lyons, 1991). Halliday emphasized that the child’s earliest semiotic acts are gestural, rather than vocal, and that the earliest exophoric (i.e., deictic) expressions tend to be accompanied with a gesture indicative of attention. Stirling and Huddleston (2002) have described anaphora as the relation between an anaphor and an antecedent, where the interpretation of the anaphor is determined via that of the antecedent. For example:

- *Max* claims *he* wasn’t told about it.

Reading this sentence, we are concerned with *he* (the anaphor) and *Max* (the antecedent) and *he* is understood to refer to the same person as Max by virtue of the relationship of anaphora.

Anaphora and deixis have a great deal in common. Forms may be simultaneously deictic and anaphoric (Stirling and Huddleston, 2002). For example:

i) *Sue* is coming over later; *we* are having lunch together.

ii) *I* was born in *London* and have lived *here* all my life.

To interpret (i), *we* refers to the set consisting of Sue and me: the speaker component of this is determined deictically by virtue of *we* being a 1st person pronoun, while the inclusion of *Sue* in the set is determined anaphorically by virtue of the previous mention of her. In (ii) *here* is anaphoric in that it obtains the interpretation “in London” from the preceding preposition phrase, but at the same time it is deictic in that it refers to a place, which includes where the utterance-act takes place.
3.4 Sentences and Utterances

Although a clear distinction between sentences and utterances is not available, definitions of each category provided by different linguists can be used for distinguishing between these two entities. Focusing on linguistic features, Bloomfield (1946:170) defines a sentence as:

“an independent linguistic form, not included by virtue of any grammatical construction in any larger linguistic form.”

According to Bloomfield, the sentence is the largest unit of grammatical description, that is, it is the maximum unit of grammatical analysis. Therefore, the sentence is conveniently taken as the largest unit of grammatical analysis and the upper limit of structural statement at the grammatical level (Robins, 1967:191). However, Scheflen (1974:19) defines a sentence from a relatively conversational point as he states that a syntactic sentence is not identified according to a grammatical structure; it is instead that unit of speech that is marked off by certain traditional behaviours that accompany the stream of speech.

Peter Grundy (1995:210) refers to a sentence as the formal output of a grammar in which constituent items are combined in a limited set of rule-determined configurations. A sentence is, by definition, grammatically complete. It may, therefore, be preceded and followed by infinite pause or silence, together with those phonetic features associated in each language with pre-pausal position; it is usually marked in writing by final punctuation, full stop, question mark, exclamation mark, or semicolon, and
in speech by a characteristic intonation tune. According to Trask (1999:273), a sentence is the largest linguistic unit, which is held together by rigid grammatical rules.

Utterances can be defined as everything said by one speaker before another speaker beginning to speak. Harris (1951:14) defines an utterance as:

“any stretch of talk, by one person, before and after which there is silence on the part of that person.”

This definition is also adapted by Lyons (1977a:26) and Hurford and Heasley (1983:15). An utterance is the use of a piece of language by a particular speaker on a particular occasion such as a sequence of sentences, or a single phrase, or even a single word. Utterances have verbal and non-verbal qualities. In defining utterance, Charles Goodwin (1981:7) includes the phenomena of whole vocal production of the speaker such as midword plosives, inbreaths, laughter, crying, and pause…etc. Conversation mainly consists of utterances as Lyons (1972:61) argues that sentence never occurs in speech. In the same vein, Peter Grundy (1995:121) embraces this view as he remarks that the sentence has been subsumed within the utterance so that it is no longer a separate component.

According to their form and function, sentences can be classified into different types: simple, complex, interrogative, negative, exclamatory, declarative, imperative, assertive, and so on. Similarly, H. P. Grice (in Searle 1974:60) talks of utterance types such as non-sentential utterance,
indicative utterance, imperative utterance, complete utterance, non-complete utterance, syntactically structured utterance and so on. Characteristic features of sentences and utterances can be briefly discussed as follows:

As sentences are the typical grammatical products, certain rules and conventions govern their productions. Any sentence conventionally begins with a capital letter and ends with a full stop, a question mark, or an exclamatory symbol. A sentence is an abstract, static and grammatical entity, which is invented by grammarians to exemplify rules of syntax and semantics. It can be broken up into phrases and these again into words. Among the constituents of sentences, there exists manifold relationships. Thus, sentences are quite clearly structural units. An utterance, on the other hand, is a speech act, which is a form of act or activity. Being a speech act, an utterance is necessarily context bound, whereas a sentence is context free. An utterance is a unit of communication whose significance or value is established by its contextual situation, immediate context (neighboring utterances or other linguistic clues) and larger context (background knowledge and circumstances). According to Blake (1990), every sentence consists of clause elements: subject, predicate, object, complement and adjunct. It does not mean that every sentence possesses all of these elements; however, most of the sentences may have subject and predicator. Moreover, the literal meaning is a special feature of a sentence. A sentence being a purely grammatical object is concerned with semantics.
Therefore, semantics deals with sentence meaning. Utterances have linguistic, non-linguistic and pragmatic properties.

The minimum pragmatic requirement for an utterance is that it has both a speaker and a hearer who understand the sense of the utterance and are capable of exchanging their roles. An utterance may be a full sentence, a fragment, a false start, or brief utterances such as ‘mum’, ‘uhuh’, ‘yes’, ‘no’ and so on. Utterances may omit clause elements that is, subject, object, verb, etc. An utterance being context-oriented is concerned with pragmatics. Therefore, pragmatics deals with utterance meaning. In this context, Katz (1977:14) writes:

“Sentence meaning is the meaning of a sentence type in the language, whereas utterance meaning is the meaning of a particular use, or token, of a sentence type on that particular occasion. Grammars represent sentence meaning because the meaning of a sentence in the language is the meaning it has by virtue of its having a particular grammatical structure. Pragmatic theories represent utterance meaning because the meaning of an utterance is the meaning it has by virtue of its being a specific spatiotemporal occurrence of a particular contextual structure.”

It is important to distinguish between word meaning and what is intended to convey when using a range of words. The distinction is useful in analysing the various kinds of communication between people made possible by language. Accordingly, it is noteworthy to mention that SPEAKER MEANING is what a speaker means (i.e., intends to convey) when he uses a piece of language. SENTENCE MEANING (or WORD MEANING) is what a sentence (or word) means, i.e., what it counts as the equivalent in the language concerned.
3.5 **Context and Text:**

3.5.1 **Context:**

The notion of context is very flexible (even somewhat vague). Communication is a social affair. It takes place within the context of social situation. It has been time after time emphasized by linguists that the functions of language should be performed within a context. In traditional linguistics –until today– context is often limited to the ‘verbal’ context surrounding some words or sentences.

Context is both social and interpersonal. It is social in the sense that context encompasses the internal organization of a society, its intentions, internal differences, sub-groupings, and so on. Therefore, the study of language in a social context consists of the study of the linguistic material produced within the structure of the society. It focuses on the way in which particular characteristics of the society affect the structure of change and variation of the language spoken, and, conversely, on the way in which different attitudes about its variation affect the internal dimensions and forces of the recipient community. The interpersonal context usually takes priority over the social context in such sub-disciplines as pragmatics, discourse analysis, conversational analysis, etc. These disciplines are not devoted to understanding the interaction of the linguistic structure of the society. The focus is rather on the individuals involved in the interaction. These individuals are the speaker and the hearer, or the reader and the
writer. The interpersonal context, here, is essential to the understanding of the exchanged utterances or texts. Such a context usually includes statements rooted in psychology, such as intentions, beliefs, and rationality.

Features of context such as the physical setting of utterances, participants’ personal background knowledge and beliefs (or their world view), their goals and intentions, their attitudes toward each other, the sociocultural assumptions concerning role and status relationship, the social values associated with various message components, etc. play an important role in the interpretation of utterances. However, the role of context in language use has been most forcefully asserted in the studies associated with non-traditional linguistics - this kind of studies is normally associated with names like Malinowski, Firth, Goffman, Fishman, Halliday, Hymes, among others. Malinowski introduced the notion of context of situation, which refers to the “environment of the text” (Halliday, 1989:6). Consequently, Malinowski (1923: 307) points out that the spoken statement or utterance in everyday life has no meaning except in the context of situation.

Knowledge is transmitted in social contexts, through relationships, like those of parent and child, or teacher and pupil, or classmates, that are defined in the value of systems and ideology of the culture. Moreover, the words that are exchanged in these contexts get their meaning from activities in which they are embedded, which again are social activities with social agencies and goals (Halliday 1989).
Halliday (1989: 12) has specified the features of the context of situation under three headings:

1. THE FIELD OF DISCOURSE refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place.
2. THE TENOR OF DISCOURSE refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their status and roles.
3. THE MODE OF DISCOURSE refers to what part the language is playing, what is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation.

Systemic functional linguistics, even though explicitly interested in the relations between language and society, defines context in terms of the relevant aspects of the social situation – a tradition that goes back to the definition of ‘context of situation’ by Firth and Malinowski (Ghadessy 1999; Leckie-Tarry 1995). On the other hand, classical sociolinguistics systematically studies those properties of language use that co-vary with aspects of the social context (Labov, 1972a, 1972b). Attempting to distinguish types of context, Bach (1997: 39) has pointed out that there are two quite different sorts of context, and each plays quite a different role. Wide context concerns any contextual information relevant to determining the speaker’s intention and to the successful and felicitous performance of the speech act and narrow context concerns information specifically relevant to determining the semantic values of indexicals. He has further declared that narrow context is semantic, wide context is pragmatic. For Ochs (1979c:5), the scope of context includes minimally language users’ beliefs and assumptions about the temporal, spatial and social settings; prior,
ongoing and future actions (verbal and non-verbal), and the state of knowledge and attentiveness of those participating in the social interaction in hand. For both Lyons and Ochs, ‘context’ includes linguistic features as well because such features often invoke the relevant contextual assumptions.

Allan (1986: 36-54) has employed the notion ‘context’ to refer to “the setting of the utterance U (spatio-temporal location of the utterance and consequently of speaker S and hearer H), the world W spoken of in U utterance, and the textual environment of the language expressions within utterance U”. For Dijk (1986:192), a context is a course of events having three states: initial, intermediary, and final. Allan (1986) and Dijk (1986) consider context as dynamic, non-static. It is not just one possible world-state or situation but at least a sequence of world-states or situations. However, these situations do not remain identical in time, but change. Leech (1983: 13) describes a context as:

“any background knowledge assumed to be shared by s [speaker] and h [hearer] and which contributes to h’s interpretation of what s means by a given utterance.”

For him, the speaker of utterance and the hearer should have information in common to understand and interpret the utterance accurately.

Lyons (1977a:574) has stated some features of context as universal principles of logic and language usage as follows:

i. Knowledge of ‘role’ and ‘status’ (where role covers both role in the speech event, as speaker or addressee, and social role, and status covers notions of relative social standing);
ii. Knowledge of spatial and temporal location;
iii. Knowledge of formality level;
iv. Knowledge of the medium (roughly the code or style appropriate to a channel, like the distinction between the written and spoken varieties of a language);
iv. Knowledge of appropriate subject matter;
v. Knowledge of appropriate province (or domain determining the register of a language).

Firth (1950) outlined his description of context of situation under the following headings:

- The PARTICIPANTS in the situation: what Firth referred to as persons and personalities, corresponding more or less to what sociologists would regard as the status and roles of the participants;
- The ACTION of the participants: what they are doing, including both their verbal action and their non-verbal action;
- OTHER RELEVANT FEATURES OF THE SITUATION: the surrounding objects and events, in so far as they have some bearing on what is going on;
- The EFFECTS of the verbal action: what changes were brought about by what the participants in the situation had to say.

Context, however, is a problematic concept. Mey (1993: 8) views it as a notoriously hard concept to deal with. Linguists have repeatedly expressed their inability to provide exact characterization of the notion (e.g. Bar-Hillel 1970: 80; Ochs 1979: 1).

3.5.2 Text:

Linguists have long used the word text very informally to denote any stretch of language they happened to be interested in. Especially since the 1960s, however, the notion of a text has acquired a theoretical status, and the analysis of texts is now seen as a major goal of linguistic investigation.
However, the conception of what constitutes a text is not everywhere the same.

The term ‘text’ derives from the Latin verb ‘texere’, meaning to weave, though it does not reveal its Latin origin (Van Peer, 1994). Beaugrande and Dresseler (1981:3-12) define a text as “a COMMUNCATIVE OCCURRENCE which meets seven standards of TEXTUALITY”. They further outlined the seven standards of textuality as follows: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality. According to them, if any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative. Hence, non-communicative texts are treated as non-texts. They view cohesion as a necessary ingredient in order to speak of a text.

For generative grammarians, a text is defined as a string of sentences (Van Peer, 1994). Crystal (1992) has referred to a text as a piece of naturally occurring spoken, written, or signed discourse identified for analysis or description. In addition, he asserts that a text is often established as a language unit with definable communicative function characterised by such principles as cohesion, coherence and informativeness, which can be used to provide a formal definition of what constitutes their identifying textuality or texture.

Brown and Yule (1983: 6) have used text as a technical term, referring it to the verbal record of a communicative act. Trask (1999:312)
has described text as a continuous piece of spoken or written language, especially one with a recognizable beginning and ending. For some linguists, a text is not different from a discourse. On the one hand, a text, for others, is a more or less physical product, the result of a discourse, which itself is then seen as a process leading to the construction of a text; on the other hand, others see a text as an abstraction with a discourse being the physical realization of a text. Finally, some linguists merely hold the view that a text is written while a discourse is spoken. Halliday (1989:10) simply defines text as “language that is functional”. By functional, he means language that is doing some job in some context. In addition, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 1) have defined a text as “a unit of language in use”. Halliday holds the view that a text functions within a specific situation, considering it as ‘meaning in action’, which constitutes a pragmatic framework. Because of this view, texts are utterances within a communicative context, may consist of spoken or written language, and may consist of one word such as ‘stop!’ (Van Peer 1994). Halliday and Hasan (1976: 2) have a view that a text has texture and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text; the texture is provided by the cohesive relations. Cohesive relationships within a text are put up “where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRESUPPOSES the other in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it” (Halliday and Hasan 1976). They, furthermore, outlined the cohesive devices as follows: (1) REFERENCE (2) SUBSTITUTION and ELLIPSIS (3) CONJUNCTION (4) LEXICAL
COHESION. These are the semantic relations that enable one part of the text to function as the context for another (Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

3.6 Discourse:

Discourse is a concept that is frequently used in literary discussions today. There are different definitions of discourse, which are sometimes contradictory. Discourse refers to the set of norms, preferences, and expectations relating language to context, which language users draw on and modify in producing and making sense out of language in context (Ochs, 1992). Different discourse analysts have tried to define it in different ways to restrict the scope of this vast domain to meet the needs of their individual purposes. Discourse knowledge, relating language to psychological as well as social context, allows language users to produce and interpret discourse structure such as verbal acts (e.g. request or offer), conversational sequences (such as questions and answers), activities (such as story-telling and arguing), and communicative styles (such as women’s speech) (Ochs, 1992).

Broadly speaking, the term ‘discourse’ may be said to cover a whole range of human interactive behaviour. Thorat (2000: 9) argues that any meaningful interaction between or among interactants could legitimately be labelled as discourse. Connected by means of certain logical, chronological, or psychological links, utterances do not occur at random in a discourse.
Discourse thus means any continuous composition of the utterances in which they show different levels of anchorage. For Van Dijk (1977: 3), discourse is:

“a sequence of sentences or utterances on any particular topic, on a particular occasion.”

A discourse is any connected piece of speech or writing and may be produced by a single speaker or writer, or by two or more people engaging in a conversation or (rarely) in a written exchange (Trask, 1999).

The study of discourse is characterised by having two fundamental properties, which are cohesion and coherence. Cohesion is the presence of explicit linguistic links which provide recognisable structure, such as she, this, after, therefore and but. Most researchers regard cohesion as a strictly linguistic phenomenon (Karmiloff-Smith, 1985). Logical and cohesive devices combine linguistic units into stretches of meaningful discourse. Coherence is the degree to which a discourse makes sense in terms of our knowledge of the world. For example, in response to the question Who's going to drive to the Christmas party?, the remark Susie's on antibiotics might seem irrelevant and uncooperative, but of course it makes perfect sense if we know about the real world links between alcohol and Christmas parties, alcohol and driving, and alcohol and antibiotics (Trask, 1999). Coherence refers to the connectivity of the elements of a text. According to Lyons (1981:199), the connectivity of the elements of a text is essentially a matter of meaning and reference; a matter of content rather than form. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) semantically attribute coherence to the “intra-
textual semantic relations” which are “primarily non-structural” (Halliday, 1978:133). For Halliday, coherence means “discourse well-formedness in terms of discourse relevance and discourse topic”. Coherence thus is the general principle that facilitates the production and interpretation of human interaction.

Coherence may be viewed from two angles: local and global. Local coherence refers to organisation of propositions at the level of sentences, whereas global coherence refers to the further organisation of ideas at the level of higher units like paragraphs, chapters, sections, volumes/books, etc within the text (Jarange, 2006). Local coherence is the organising principle underlying the structure of a paragraph, while global coherence is the organising principle underlying the structure of the text as a whole. At both local and global levels, there is both semantic and pragmatic coherence, the first defined in terms of propositions, and the latter in terms of speech acts (Patil, 1994: 23).

Discourse could be classified into two major categories: verbal and non-verbal discourse. Non-verbal discourse (e.g. mimes or gestures) is by definition non-linguistic. On the basis of the medium of expression, verbal discourse could be classified into two sub-categories, namely, spoken and written discourse. According to the nature and role of interlocutors’ mutual participation, spoken or written discourse could be classified into two major categories: ‘monologic’ and ‘dialogic’ discourse. A monologic discourse lies in an uninterrupted flow of communicative activity on the part of one
person. A dialogic discourse, on the other hand, is composed of one or more utterances by two or more interlocutors on a given topic, on a given occasion (Van Dijk, 1977: 3). According to Spielmann (1989:104), discourse types are classified into narrative, procedural, oratory, explanatory, argumentative, and conversational.

The present study makes use of the non-verbal discourse, i.e. gestures, and the verbal, especially written.

3.7 Deixis in English:


Familiar ways in which participant-roles are encoded in language are of course the pronouns and their associated predicate agreements. A brief sketch of the concept of ‘pronoun’ and English pronominal system is displayed. According to Fillmore (1971b), the most obvious manifestations of deictic categories in languages are to be found in the systems of pronouns, demonstratives and tenses.
Therefore, this part is allocated to examine the English personal pronouns with a particular reference to 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronouns which are considered to constitute the situation act. This investigation excludes 3\textsuperscript{rd} person for the reason that it does not take any part in forming the situation act as Lyons (1977) states:

“only the speaker and the addressee are participating in the drama. The term third person is negatively defined with respect to ‘first person’ and ‘second person’. It does not correlate with any positive participant role”

Accordingly, the speaker and the hearer are the main and direct participants in the deictic situation, which determines the form of a referring term used therein.

3.7.1 Personal Deixis in English:

Deixis forms an important and integral subsystem of the referential system of a natural language. The production and comprehension of deictic terms presuppose a consciousness of immediate situation on the part of the speaker-hearer. Thus, according to Fillmore (1971b:239), deixis involves an understanding of the ways in which linguistic forms are chosen on the basis of the language user’s perception; his awareness of his interlocutor’s ability to monitor his postures and movements, his ability to locate the communication act’s participant in space and time; and his control of temporal organization of the discourse.
3.7.1.1 The Concept of ‘Pronoun’:

Jespersen (1924) claims that pronouns are characterised by their signification of being variable and essentially contained in a reference to some circumstances which are found outside the linguistic expression itself and are determined by the whole of the situation.

Traditionally pronouns are examined in relation to nouns. In his book, *Language*, Bloomfield (1935:249) expands on the notion of grammatical substitution in which, among other cases, a pronoun is treated as a substituted form for a previously stated or understood expression. Huddleston (1984) considers pronouns as a subclass of noun, and prefers to analyse pronouns as a subclass of noun rather than as a separate part of speech for the reason that the phrases they head are like those headed by common or proper nouns in terms of their functional, potential and, though to a lesser degree, their internal structure.

Pronouns are traditionally recognised as a class of so-called ‘function-words’ as Lees and Klima (1963:17) remark:

“The very name ‘pronoun’ taken directly from French and, Latin in its original meaning, is still understood etymologically and, we believe, quite correctly, as word used in place of a noun.”

A pronoun is defined as a word that can be used instead of a noun or noun phrase, and sometimes instead of a clause or sentence (Miller and Johnson-Laird, 1976: 311). Generally speaking, a pronoun has a syntactical function as replacing a noun phrase. This view has been denied by Hintikka
and Carlson (1977:1) who argue that the ordinary function of pronouns is more semantical rather than syntactical for the reason that it picks up the reference to which the pronominalizing noun phrase stand for. Consequently, as formulated by Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990:207) that pronominal grammar provides a window to the relationship between selves and the outside world.

Pronouns have a great social relevance. They are linguistic reflections of human relationships. A speaker is not free to choose any of the alternations available to him in the language. He has to select only that pronoun which is socially acceptable as appropriate one. In a social interaction, the selection of an appropriate pronoun is very important because the pronouns symbolise a man’s social status in relation to people around him. The selection of linguistic forms between the speaker and the addressee is governed by their social relationship. Pronouns are one of the several means at the speaker’s disposal to indicate social distance or proximity between him and the addressee.

3.7.1.2 The Concept of ‘Person’:

As used in grammar, Jespersen (1924: 212) defines ‘person’ as “Each of the three classes of personal pronouns, and corresponding distinctions in verbs, denoting or indicating respectively the person speaking (first person), the person spoken to (second person), and the person or thing spoken of (third person)”. Lyons (1968:276) states that the category of person is
clearly definable with reference to the notion of participant roles: the ‘first’
person is used by the speaker to refer to himself as a focus of discourse; the
‘second’ person is used to refer to the hearer; and the ‘third’ person is used
to refer to persons or things other than the speaker and hearer.

The identification of person system in a communicative event may,
schematically, be represented as in figure (1).

![Diagram](image)

The origin of the traditional terms ‘first person’, ‘second person’,
‘third person’ as used by grammarians nowadays is derived from the Latin
word ‘persona’ (meaning “mask”) which was used to translate the Greek
word for “dramatic character” or “role”, and the use of this term by
grammarians derives from their metaphorical conception of a language-
event as a drama in which the principal role is played by the first person, the
role subsidiary to his by the second person, and all other roles by the third
person (Lyons 1977: 638).

Deictic expressions are traditionally divided into three categories:
person, place and time (Bühler 1934:102). In addition to person, place and
time deixis, Levinson (1983:62-63), following Lyons (1968, 1977) and Fillmore (1971b, 1997), adds two other deictic categories: ‘social deixis’, which concerns the encoding of social distinctions that are relative to participant-roles, particularly aspects of the social relationship holding between speaker and addressee(s) or speaker and some referents, and ‘discourse deixis’, which concerns the encoding of reference to portions of the unfolding discourse in which the utterance (which includes the text referring expression) is located.

As earlier stated, the latter two types of deixis will not be discussed since they are beyond the scope and limitations of the present study.

3.7.1.3 Egocentricity:

Invoking the notion of the deictic context, which operates as an integral part of the context of utterance, Lyons (1995: 304) regards every act of utterance (every locutionary act) as occurring in a spatio-temporal context whose centre, or zero-point, can be referred to as the here-and-now.

Every utterance of “I am here now” is analytic as Fillmore (1966:222) points out that a statement like “I am not here” is a contradiction since it says that I am not in the place where I am. Utterances should be produced in a canonical situation-of-utterance in order to avoid the ambiguity and indeterminacy if spoken in a non-canonical one. For Lyons (1977: 638), the canonical situation of utterance is egocentric, i.e., the deictic centre, (which is also called origo by Bühler, 1934), in the sense that
the speaker, by virtue of being the speaker, casts himself in the role of ego and relates everything to his viewpoint. In other words, the typical situation of utterance is egocentric as the role of the speaker is transferred from one participant to another in a conversation, so the ‘centre’ of the deictic system switches (‘I’ being used by each speaker to refer to himself, ‘you’ being used to refer to the hearer).

For Levinson (1983:64), deixis is organised in an egocentric way, constituting the deictic centre as follows: (i) the central person is the speaker, (ii) the central time is the time at which the speaker produces the utterance, (iii) the central place is the speaker’s location at utterance time or coding time, (iv) the discourse centre is the point which the speaker is currently at in the production of his utterance, and (v) the social centre is the speaker’s social status and rank, to which the status or rank of addressees or referents is relative.

### 3.7.1.4 Deictic Features of Personal Pronouns:

A question like, what constitutes a deictic situation? , can be raised regarding person deixis. A deictic situation is simply one in which a conversation between speakers and hearers becomes possible and the things, entities, persons, instances, etc. are referred to with such referring terms whose understanding involves the understanding of the roles and locations of the participants in this situation. Such a situation covers:
(a) a speaker  (b) a number of hearers and  (c) people or things that are being talked about or who are at least not being addressed to.

Person deixis concerns the encoding of the role of participants in the speech event in which the utterance in question is delivered. The category first person is the grammaticalization of the speaker’s reference to himself, second person the encoding of the speaker’s reference to one or more addressees, and third person the encoding of reference to persons and entities which are neither speakers nor addressees of the utterance in question (Levinson, 1983). All of these, at least in English, come in singular and plural forms, several are marked for case, and the third person singular forms encode gender as shown in table (1):

Table (1) Personal Pronouns in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Person</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person</td>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Person</td>
<td>M He</td>
<td>Him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F She</td>
<td>Her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following Ingram (1971,1978), the following subject pronoun system which is considered the most common system of diverse languages will be taken as a basis for discussion to mark person system in English. This is shown in table (2):
Table (2) common subject pronoun system of diverse languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st} person</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd} person</td>
<td>thou</td>
<td>you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} person</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, Ingram (1978:216) prefers to refer to subject person system of English such as \textit{(I, we, thou, you, he, they)}, as deictic person system.

In this part, our concern is focused on describing the deictic features of subject person in English. The semantic features of person are based solely on the speech act, marking a category for one possible role in the communication. Deictic features handle the fact that language is used to communicate between speakers and hearers. There is, however, the possibility that features of person deixis are one kind of syntactic feature. Langendoen (1970: 62) states:

“the semantic relationships are most easily and directly described in terms of roles -as if each sentence were a miniature drama, whose plot is given by the main predicate and whose actors (in their various roles) are the nominal expressions that occur with them.”

(Quoted in Miller and Johnson-Laird, 1976: 316)

Communication requires a source, whose role can be played by only one person, and a receiver, whose role can be played by one or more persons, some of whom may be intended receivers (addressees) and some
not (Miller and Johnson-Laird, 1976: 316). Thus, the semantic analysis of personal pronouns is based on the situation of the communication since the meaning of the personal pronouns is situationally determined.

Ingram (1971: 42) has suggested formalism for capturing the deictic features of person pronouns. Consequently, he proposed three features of personal deixis whose basic roles are captured in the speech act. These spring up from the two features of the linguistic theory (semantic and syntactic ones) as follows:

(a) Speaker  (b) Hearer  (c) Other

On these bases, we will discuss how the participants in a deictic situation identify themselves linguistically and look at the personal pronoun system of English with a view to examining their deictic features. That is, what are the roles or combination of roles in the speech act that are of sufficient importance to be marked by a separate lexical form?

The discussion of the description of English deictic features is principally based on the analysis of person deictic features by Ingram (1971, 1978) who states that there are three features that formally comprise the person deictic unit as follows:

\[
\left\{ \pm \text{sp} \atop \pm \text{hr} \atop \pm \text{x} \right\} \quad \text{where:} \quad \begin{align*}
\text{sp} &= \text{speaker} \\
\text{hr} &= \text{hearer (or Addressee)} \\
x &= \text{other} \\
n &= \text{number}
\end{align*}
\]
The plus or minus choice with each allows for personal pronouns that represent combinations of roles. According to Ingram (1978), the number system in English is as follows:

- 1, 1>, u
- 2  2  1

This means that the number system in English is more-than-one, and that two person forms represent one referent per form, and two represent more than one; but it has a form which is unmarked for number 'u' that is used to stand for neutralized form, i.e. for both singular and plural.

As mentioned earlier, there are three roles used to describe the deictic person system of English which produce seven possible combinations (Miller and Johnson-Laird, 1976).

In regard to the speaker, there is no combination of roles since s/he used the 1st person ‘I’ to refer just to herself/himself. The 1st person singular is considered as a universal category. The unit of features the 1st person singular takes is shown in (1):

1)  

\[
\begin{align*}
1 & \\
\{ & + \text{sp} \\
- & \text{h} \\
- & \text{X} \\
\} & \text{‘I’}
\end{align*}
\]

For example, in the following utterances, ‘I’ refers to the speaker:

- *I am hungry*
- *I’ll be here in an hour*
• *I have just finished my homework*

Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976: 318) remark that person and number are the major semantic features of personal pronouns in English. In English, the 1\textsuperscript{st} person is marked for number. English distinguishes between singular 1\textsuperscript{st} person ‘I’ and plural 1\textsuperscript{st} person ‘we’. The features of 1\textsuperscript{st} person plural will be as shown in (2):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1> \\
+ \text{sp} \\
- \text{hr} \\
- \text{X}
\end{array}
\]

‘We’

For example:

• *You, Ed, and I deserved what we got.*
• *Why are we waiting?*
• *We have enjoyed ourselves.*

However, a view shared by some linguists (Postal 1966; Lyons 1977; Huddleston 1984; Stirling and Huddleston 2002) that ‘we’ is certainly not the plural of ‘I’ in the same sense in which 'boy' is the plural of 'boys'. Huddleston (1984: 288) argues that number is predominantly an inflectional category but in personal pronouns, it is not. He further comments that ‘I’ and ‘we’ are forms of different lexemes, i.e. the semantic contrast of ‘we’ to ‘I’ is not the same as that of 'books' to 'book'. 'Books' is used for a set containing two or more books, but the meaning of *we* is not “two or more speakers / writers”: rather it is applied to a group of two or more individuals
at least one of whom is speaker/ writer of the utterance containing the form. In other words, the traditional category of plural is not symmetrically applied to 1st person in the way it is to third: ‘we’ does not mean plural speakers in the same way that ‘they’ means more than one third person entity. Accordingly, it is noteworthy to distinguish between an ‘inclusive’ and ‘exclusive’ use of the pronoun ‘we’ in term of whether the ‘1st person plural’ pronoun includes a reference to the hearer or not (Anderson and Keenan, 1985; Fillmore, 1971b; Stirling and Huddleston, 2002; Quirk et al., 1985). In some languages (like Tamil, Fijian), there are two first person ‘plural’ pronouns, corresponding to ‘we-inclusive-of-addressee’ and ‘we-exclusive-of-addressee’ (Fillmore, 1997). This distinction is not lexically explicit in English except in one case, e.g. the contraction from let us to let’s only seems felicitous if the ‘us’ is understood inclusively, as illustrated below (Fillmore, 1971b, Levinson, 1983):

- *Let's go to the cinema*
- *Let's go back to the hotel now, shall we?*

Besides, it is apparently understood from the context of situation that ‘we’ is used inclusively as it is illustrated in the following examples:

- *Why don’t we go together instead of taking two cars?*
- *Only you and I know we are here*

The following deictic unit can describe this use of ‘we– inclusive’ as in (3):
In English, ‘we’ can also be used exclusively under ordinary conditions. Consider the following examples:

- *We could lend you a couple of hundred dollars if that would help.*
- *We didn’t invite you.*
- *We saw you in the garden this morning*
- *We accept your offer that you gave yesterday*

‘We’, in these utterances, can be interpreted exclusively (i.e., as excluding the addressee from the class of those who did the lending, inviting, seeing, and accepting respectively). Consequently, the unit of features that can be given to this occurrence is shown in (3):

\[
3): \begin{cases} 
+ \text{sp} \\
+ \text{hr} \\
- \text{X} \\
\end{cases} 
\]

‘We- exclusive’

However, in some pronominal systems, ‘plural’ can be neatly analysed as augmenting a minimal deictic specification with ‘plus one or more additional individuals (AUG). Thus the distinction between *I* and *We* might be analysed as (+S,–Aug), (+S, +AUG) (Levinson, 1992).
As for the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun, Anderson and Keenan (1985:264) comment that it is possibly more common for a language to fail to distinguish number in 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun than in 1\textsuperscript{st}, such as, English which does not distinguish between 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular and plural ‘you’.

Hence, the form of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person singular and plural is syncretized and neutralized in English as ‘you’. Thus, the features that are given for the singular addressee ‘you’ are shown in (4):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\{ - \text{sp} \} \\
&\{ + \text{hr} \} \\
&\{ - \text{X} \} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘You’

The symbol 'u', here, means that the feature occurs as unmarked, i.e. it does not take a number. However, when the number system is applied to this unit of features, the result will be two referents with the same form 'you', which is understood from the context in which it is produced. The following examples illustrate this:

- \textit{You are one.}
- \textit{How are you, man?}
- \textit{Have you hurt yourself?}
- \textit{Ahmed, what are you doing here?}

The following unit of features in (5) will be identical with the meaning extracted from the examples above:
Lexically, the 2nd person plural is distinct from the singular only in the reflexive form *yourself / yourselves*, for example:

- *Have you done it yourself?*
- *You have to find yourselves a new home.*

Due to the absence of a singular/plural distinction in the 2nd person pronoun, plural reference is sometimes indicated by lexical additions, e.g., *you people, you boys,* and (esp. AmE.) *you guys* (Quirk et al. 1985). It applies to a set consisting of an addressee and one or more non-speakers. For this use, the features applicable to the plural form will be as in (6):

Examples to illustrate the plural meaning of 'you' are as under:

- *You and Ed said you knew each other*
- *You are all listening to me now*
As related to the third person singular, gender is manifested only in the 3rd person singular as masculine, feminine, and neuter. Owing to the reason that it does not take any part in the communicative event, the discussion will exclude it because it is beyond the scope of the study. The features given for the 3rd person singular are shown in (7):

$$7): \begin{bmatrix} \text{sp} \\ - \text{hr} \\ + X \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{c} 1 \end{array}$$

‘he/she/it’

These examples illustrate it:

- *He is alone*
- *He's got lots of photographs of loins*
- *She is five years older than him*
- *He saw himself in the mirror*
- *She saw herself in the mirror*

As for the third person plural, the unit of features is given in (8):

$$8): \begin{bmatrix} \text{sp} \\ - \text{hr} \\ + X \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{c} 1> \end{array}$$

‘They’

Examples are:

- *They are together*
- *They helped themselves to coffee and cakes*
According to Ingram (1978), English is a five-person system that can be shown in Table (3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>They</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In English, the pronouns *I*, *we*, and *you* are genderless, depending on sex, although, as Weinreich (1966: 405) points out that any physical object can in English be referred to by ‘she’ with special semantic effect. The gender distinction is made in English in the third person only: *he* is used for masculine referents and *she* for feminine referents. In other languages, gender may be marked in the other persons as well. In Hebrew, for example, the second person singular pronoun is *atah* for masculine referents but *at* for feminine referents. Number is marked on English pronouns in the first person (*I* ‘Sg’ versus *we* ‘Pl’) and in the third person (*he/she/it* ‘Sg’ versus *they* ‘Pl’); the second person pronoun *you* can refer to both singular and plural entities.

To sum up, the deictic features of person in English can be shown as in the table (4):
Table (4) deictic features of personal pronouns in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Person</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Person</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Person</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7.1.5 Uses of the First and Second Persons:

Stirling and Huddleston (2002) argue that personal pronouns are so-called because they are the ones which the grammatical system of person applies. This is the system whose terms are differentiated by reference to the utterance-act roles of speaker and addressee:

(a) 1<sup>st</sup> person is characteristically used for the speaker or a group including at least one speaker;

(b) 2<sup>nd</sup> person which is used for the addressee or a group at least one addressee but no speaker; and

(c) 3<sup>rd</sup> person which is the residual category— not 1<sup>st</sup> or 2<sup>nd</sup> person.

As discussed before, the third person is excluded from the following discussion. Accordingly, in this part, the uses of the first and second person are analysed and discussed. Fillmore (1971b) notes that the editorial *we* of, for example, the *New Yorker* takes plural verb agreement (thus *we are*, not *we am*), but in the reflexive the underlying singularity shows through in
phrases like *as for ourself*. Quirk et al. (1975, 1985) argue that the so-called ‘EDITORIAL we’, which is now formal and somewhat old-fashioned, is used by a single individual in a formal (especially scientific) writing to avoid egotisticalness. For instance, the writer of a scholarly article may prefer (i) to (ii):

(i) As we showed a moment ago...
(ii) As I showed a moment ago...

‘Editorial’ here is not applied to the fully justified use of *we* with reference to the consensus of an editorial board or other collective body.

Head (1987) states that first person reference can show variation of number to show different degrees of respect or social distance. The use of a “plural of majesty” is found at one time or another in the history of most, if not all, languages of Western Europe. He further comments that the “plural of majesty”, the “plural of modesty” (as used by the Pope) and the “editorial we” are sometimes mentioned as contrasting uses of the first person plural.

Bean (1970: 564) states:

“In English, an individual of very high rank sometimes speaks in the first person plural (e.g. the “royal we”). The speaker makes himself symbolically plural, precluding dyadic relationships, and establishing distance between himself and his audience. In this way, he indicates that the deference is expected. The “editorial we” may also be seen as an introduction of social distance … In this case, however, the distance serves to deemphasize the personality of the writer.”

(Cited in Head, 1978: 164)

Similarly, Muller (1914: 68) states that the social meaning of the 'pluralis reverentiae' used in address is the opposite of that of the 'pluralis
modestiae’ used by the speaker to refer to himself, although the origin of the “plural of respect” in address is attributed to the use of the “plural of modesty” by the speaker. Jespersen (1924: 193) and Brunot (1953: 273) also distinguish differences in meaning between uses of the plural of the first person in self-reference. Parallel contrasting uses (of modesty and of authority or superiority) are not said to occur in the case of the plural of the second and third person.

The status of the plural is no doubt unique in the first person. Unlike its use in pronouns of the second and third persons, the plural in the first person does not normally refer several people with the same role in the speech act. Except in the rather uncommon case of several people speaking in unison, it does not refer to several speakers, but to one, by himself or along with whomever else he chooses to include. The differences between exclusive and inclusive uses of the plural in the first person perhaps underlie the alleged distinctions in meaning between “Royal we”, “editorial we”, and the “plural of modesty”. “Royal we”, which is obsolete (Quirk et al., 1985), is normally exclusive, referring only to the speaker, for instance:

- *We are not interested in the possibilities of defeat.* (Queen Victoria)

While “editorial we” and the “plural of modesty” tend to be inclusive, associating the speaker with the addressee(s), the notional third person or both. The use of the first person plural to show greater respect or social
distance is exclusive, while inclusive use indicates proximity between the speaker and the other referent(s) (Head, 1978).

On the other hand, “royal we”, “editorial we”, and the “plural modesty” have features in common. All three can call attention to the special status of the speaker as king (or other authority), writer or Pope (or some other spokesman for a group). Special status is inherent in the use of the first person plural in self-reference in speech communities in which such use is not appropriate for all speakers. Thus, all three can serve to indicate a greater degree of respect or social distance than is implied by the more common use of the singular.

Quirk et al. (1985: 350) and Stirling and Huddleston (2002: 1467) remark that written works authored by a single person often use we (or INCLUSIVE AUTHORIAL we) as a means of involving the reader in a joint enterprise and/or avoiding the 1st person singular, which refers to the speaker as an individual that may make the text appear inappropriately personal and subjective. This is shown in the following examples:

- *In the next chapter we will describe the methodology used*
- *We have seen in Ch.3 that this methodology has a number of drawbacks.*

In some certain communicative act, ‘we’ is used as speaker-exclusive. The use of we in reference to the hearer or addressee (you) which may occur, for example, when a doctor is talking to a patient who has an implication of
sharing the problem with ‘you’ as in the situational context of a
doctor/patient or teacher/student relation (Quirk et al., 1985; Stirling and
Huddleston, 2002); for example, a doctor to a patient, says:

- How are we feeling this morning?
- Have we taken our medicine

The 2nd person singular can be used as non-referential (generic use)
‘you’ which is commonly used as a less formal variant of one. This ‘you’
does not refer to a specific person, the addressee, but is used to talk about
people in general. Accordingly, this use can create ambiguity that interprets
‘you’ as referential or not, for instances:

- You will be fined for parking on the footpath.
- You can never tell what will happen.

Earlier, a status distinction was expressed in English by thou-you
which is now obsolete. Thou and its transforms, thee, thine, and thy were
used in Old English in ordinary speech; in Middle English they were
gradually replaced by the plural forms, ye, you, your, and yours, in
addressing a superior, and later an equal, but were long retained in
addressing an inferior. Thou is also used in religious activities as addressing
God or Christ, in preaching language and in poetry, and elevated prose.
Thou, in Shakespeare’s time, was the pronoun of: (i) affection towards
friends: (ii) good-humoured superiority to servants; and (iii) contempt or
anger to strangers. It has, however, already fallen into disuse, though it is
seen occasionally in a higher poetic style and in the language of solemn
prayer (Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976). You, in earlier English, was a plural pronoun only and was restricted to oblique cases. Although you has gained universal currency as a 2nd person pronoun which is neutral in case and number, there is an archaic system of pronouns where other 2nd person pronouns survive in restricted situations, especially in religious language, as shown in Table (5):

Table (5) Archaic system of pronouns in English (Quirk et al., 1985: 345):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJECTIVE</th>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
<th>POSSESSIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td>thou /ðaʊ</td>
<td>thee /ði:/</td>
<td>thyself</td>
<td>thy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(th-forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td>ye /jɪ:/</td>
<td>you / (ye)</td>
<td>yourselves</td>
<td>your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(y-forms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in some dialects of BrE, particularly in the north of England, forms deriving from the earlier singular thou/thee are still current also in nonreligious contexts (Quirk et al., 1985).

3.7.2 Spatial Deixis in English:

Place deixis concerns the specification of locations relative to anchorage points in the speech event. The importance of locational specifications in general can be counted from the fact that there seem to be two basic ways of referring to objects - by describing or naming them on the one hand, and by locating them on the other (Lyons, 1977a: 648).
Fillmore (1997:31) remarks that the typical kind of locating expression in a language is one, which indicates the location of one object with respect to some other object. Objects, areas, and spaces can be thought of as having extremities and parts, and a language provides separate words for these. The locative expressions place something inside or in contact with the reference object or reference area. It is also possible to introduce the concept of relative distance, and refer to one object as being near to or far from the reference object.

Broadly speaking, the notion of the primacy of spatial expressions has been favoured by a number of linguists. Urban, arguing for the primacy of spatial terms, states:

“Our intellect is primarily fitted to deal with space and moves most easily in this medium. Thus language itself becomes spatialized, and so far as reality is represented by language, reality tends to be spatialized."

(quoted in Miller and Johnson Laird 1976:375)

Bang (1893) thinks it undeniable that the human mind before having the conception of ‘I’ and ‘Thou’ had of ‘here’ and ‘there’. Moreover, Lyons argues (1975:65) that the child in the early stages of language acquisition does not make a difference between a pronominal and an adverbial deictic. Therefore, when the child starts using 'I', this is ‘the first sign of self-consciousness’ (Jespersen, 1924).

Spatial deixis is the marking in language of the orientation or position in space of the referent of a linguistic expression. The most obvious place-
Deictic terms in English are the demonstratives pronouns ‘this’ and ‘that’, along with their plural forms, and the locative adverbs (or local adverbial demonstratives, Dixon 2003) ‘here’ and ‘there’ (Fillmore 1971; Lyons 1977a; Levinson 1983).

Accordingly, this section discusses the demonstratives and the locative adverbs in English in terms of their semantic features and pragmatic uses. The prepositions and verbs of motion (such as go and come), which have deictic properties, are excluded from discussion for they are beyond the scope and limitations of this study.

3.7.2.1 Demonstratives in English:

Demonstratives play an important role in language use and grammar. They are used to focus the hearer’s attention on elements in the speech situation (often with a pointing gesture), and they are used with reference to elements in discourse. They constitute a subclass of deictic expressions that function to focus the hearer’s attention on elements in a spatial reference frame.

All languages have demonstratives, but their form, meaning and use vary tremendously across the languages of the world. Some languages have only a few demonstrative particles, which are employed in a variety of syntactic contexts for a wide range of semantic and pragmatic functions. Other languages have demonstratives that are morphologically complex (i.e.
not merely particles), syntactically restricted, and semantically and pragmatically very specific in function (Diessel 1999: 1).

A view shared by the Greek grammarians that the adjective deictic 'deiktikos' had the sense of “demonstrative”, which is translated into the Latin ‘demonstrativus’ chosen by the Roman (Lyons 1977a : 636). Historically, the term ‘demonstrative pronoun’ is referred to as ‘deictic article’, which was later followed by the modern term ‘article’. There are languages which do not have a definite article, but which use demonstratives instead (Clark and Marshall 1981: 46).

Fludernik (1991:194) defines demonstratives as those lexically and morphologically encoded expressions that are accompanied by a pointing finger that establishes their referent(s). Dixon (2003:61-62) defines a demonstrative as “any item, other than 1st and 2nd person pronouns, which can have pointing (or deictic) reference”. He, furthermore, asserts that there are three well-attested types of demonstrative:

a) Nominal — can occur in an NP with a noun or pronoun (e.g. “this stone is hot”) or, in most languages, can make up a complete NP (e.g. “this is hot”). Stirling and Huddleston (2002) call it as dependant and independent.

b) Local adverbial — occur either alone (e.g. “put it here”) or with a noun taking local marking (e.g. “put it (on the table) there”)
c) Verbal “do it like this”, with an accompanying mimicking action—
can occur as the only verb in a predicate, or together with a lexical
verb.

The data are taken from several different linguistic studies on
demonstratives (e.g. Fillmore 1971b, 1997, 1982; Anderson & Keenan

3.7.2.1.1 The Semantic Features of Demonstratives

Demonstratives belong to the class of so-called ‘deictic’ expressions.
Generally speaking, deictic expressions are linguistic elements whose
interpretation makes essential reference to some aspect of the speech
situation (Lyons, 1977; Jarvella & Klein, 1982; Weissenborn & Klein, 1982;
Levinson, 1983; Rauh, 1983; Fuchs, 1993; Fillmore, 1997). The function of
the demonstrative pronoun is to draw the attention of the addressee to a
referent, which satisfies the description implied by the use of the pronoun in
terms of gender, number, status, etc. Lyons (1977a:648) states:

“there are two ways in which we can identify an object by
means of a referring expression: first, by informing the
addressee where it is (i.e. by locating it for him); second, by
telling him what it is like, what properties it has or what class
of objects it belongs to (i.e. by describing it for him).”

Accordingly, the description of the meaning of demonstratives
comprises two kinds of features: (i) deictic features, which indicate the
location of the referent relative to the deictic centre, and (ii) qualitative
features, which characterize the referent (Lyons 1977; Fillmore 1982; Rauh
1983; Hanks 1989, 1990; Diessel 1999). The deictic features indicate whether the referent is near or removed from the deictic centre or whether it is moving toward or away from the deictic centre. These features are primarily encoded by demonstrative roots in English. The qualitative features provide classificatory information about the referent. They indicate, for instance, whether the referent is animate or inanimate, female or male, human or non-human or whether it is a single entity or a set. These features are usually expressed by morphemes that attach to a demonstrative root, but in some languages, such as English, the root itself is classifying.

3.7.2.1.1.1 **Deictic Features:**

Demonstratives, as deictics, are linguistic elements whose interpretation makes crucial reference to some aspect of the speech situation. The notions of deixis and demonstratives must be kept separate: deixis is a semantic notion that characterizes the meaning of a wide variety of expressions whose interpretation involves the deictic centre as a reference point. Demonstratives constitute a subclass of deictic expressions that function to *focus* the hearer’s attention on elements in a spatial reference frame (Diessel 2003).

All languages have at least two demonstratives, which are deictically contrastive, locating the referent at two different points on a distance scale: a proximal demonstrative referring to an entity near the deictic centre, and a
distal demonstrative indicating a referent that is located at some distance to the deictic centre (Diessel 1999).

In English, Demonstrative pronouns and demonstrative adjectives, like ‘this’ and ‘that’, as well as demonstrative adverbs, such as ‘here’ and ‘there’, are primarily deictic; and when they have this function, they are to be interpreted with respect to the location of the participants in the deictic context (Lyons 1977a). Proximal and distal are relative terms; their interpretation is based on the conceptualization (i.e. the cognitive structuring) of the speech situation. The boundary between the proximal and distal domain is defined by the engagement area (Enfield 2003).

Contrasting the relative spatial location of their referents, this and that can be illustrated in English by considering the following situation: John and Mary are sitting at a table on which two bowls of strawberries are placed, X and Y; bowl X is nearer to both John and Mary with Y being further away. This can be shown diagrammatically as follows:

Mary offers John a bowl of strawberries. She could offer X or Y, saying in either case Would you like this one? Suppose that John prefers the other bowl; his reply would vary, depending on whether he had been offered X or Y. Consider the following:
a. Mary: *Would you like this one?* [pointing at X]  
John: *No, I'd rather have that one* [pointing at Y]

b. Mary: *Would you like this one?* [pointing at Y]  
John: *No, I'd rather have this one* [pointing at X]

In (a) Mary offers John the nearer bowl and refers to it by *this*; he prefers the farther one, and refers to it by *that*. In (b) she offers him the farther, again refers to it by *this*. He again prefers the other one; however, he can not refer to it by *that*, since it is nearest to him of the two bowls, and must use this. Note that the response in (b) could be expanded to: No, I'd rather have this one [pointing at X] than that one [pointing at Y].

Mary uses this in each of (a) and (b) since in English this is employed to introduce new information. The spatial sense of this only comes into play when there is an explicit spatial contrast between two objects at different distances from the speaker. In the second utterances of (a) and (b), John is comparing X and Y and so uses this for the bowl that is nearest to him (X) and that for the one which is further away (Y) (Dixon, 2003).

The adverbial demonstratives in English, *here* and *there*, have parallel deictic use to *this* and *that*. Referring again to the table at which John and Mary are sitting, suppose now that X and Y are plates. Mary holds a cake in her hand and enquires as to which plate she should put it on. There are again two scenarios:

a. Mary: *Shall I put it here?* [pointing at X]  
John: *No, put it there* [pointing at Y]

b. Mary: *Shall I put it here?* [pointing at Y]  
John: *No, put it here* [pointing at X]
Exactly the same discussion applies as for *this* and *that*. However, it should not be assumed that adverbial demonstratives always have the same deictic as nominal demonstratives. Thus, in English ‘here’ denotes a region (boundedness) including the speaker, ‘there’ a distal region more remote from the speaker (unboundedness). According to Diessel (1999a:38), the deictic adverbs, like *here* and *there*, may be the most direct and universal examples of spatial deixis.

Stirling and Huddleston (2002) state that the primary use of the demonstratives is, in NPs, refer to objects present in the situation of utterance, with *this* applying to objects relatively close to the speaker (proximal), and *that* to objects relatively distant from the speaker (distal):

- *This apple looks riper than that one.*
- *Is this yours?*
- *What’s that you’re eating?*

If the demonstrative NP co-occurs with an adverbial demonstrative as a post-modifier that participates in the proximal vs. distal distinction, demonstrative and post-modifier must agree, for instance, *this book here, those flowers over there*, but not *this book there*.

So far, it is clear that *this* and *here* carry the meaning of (proximal), while *that* and *there* carry the meaning of (distal).

In English, when two or more referents are at the same distance from the speaker, the first referent may be referred to with *this* and the second one with *that*. Sequential constraint may be relevant to a contrast (Fillmore
1982). For some speakers of English “this cup is mine; that cup is yours” may be acceptable, but reversing the order of this and that, namely “that cup is mine; this cup is yours” may not be acceptable. Some speakers of American English can refer to an object in one hand with proximal form this and another object in the other hand with that which is known as ‘contrastive’ use in English.

In Old English, there were three ways of distinction to express proximal, medial, or distal. The expression used to indicate medial position was obsolete as Jespersen (1924:214) states:

“the local adverb corresponding to the first person is here, and where we have two adverbs for ‘not-here,’ as in northern English dialects there and yonder (yon, yond), we might say that there corresponds to the second, and yonder to the third person; but very often there is only one adverb for both ideas, as in Standard English there (yonder being obsolete).”

To sum up, English has such a two-term deictic system, consisting of the proximal demonstratives here and this and their distal counterparts there and that as shown in table (6):

Table (6) Demonstratives and Locative Adverbs in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic Feature</th>
<th>Demonstrative Types</th>
<th>Demonstrative pronouns/Determiners</th>
<th>Demonstrative adverbs (or locative adverbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proximal to the speaker</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>Here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distal from the speaker</td>
<td>That</td>
<td>There</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7.2.1.1.2 Qualitative Features:

In addition to deictic information, demonstratives usually provide some qualitative information about the referent. They may indicate, for instance, whether the referent is animate or inanimate or whether it is a single entity or a set.

According to Diessel (1999a: 47), the qualitative features are divided into the following categories: (i) ontology, (ii) animacy, (iii) humanness, (iv) sex, (v) number, and (vi) boundedness.

The category of ontology includes two semantic features, which indicate whether a demonstrative refers to a location or to an object or person (Diessel, 1999a; Jackendoff, 1983). In English, demonstrative adverbs can only refer to a location, while demonstrative pronouns are used to indicate a person or object. In other words, the semantic distinction between locational and non-locational referents corresponds rather closely with the categorial distinction between demonstrative adverbs and pronouns.

- “This lollipop is for you, Jenny” (identifying an object)
- That man is my brother (identifying a person)
- Put it there, on the table (identifying a location)
- Place it here (identifying a location)

In English, demonstrative pronouns are inflected for number to distinguish between singular and plural. *This* and *that* are used when referring to a single thing, i.e.: with singular count nouns, e.g.: *this box, that book*, or uncountable nouns, e.g.: *this music*. *These* and *those* are used when
the speaker is talking about more than one thing, i.e.: with plural count nouns, e.g.: *these flowers, those magazines*. For instance:

- *This chair* is more comfortable than *that*. [= *that chair*]
- *Those apples* are sweeter than *these*. [= *these apples*]

The categories animacy, humanness and sex overlap, to a great extent; a demonstrative that indicates a human referent presumes, for instance, that the referent is also animate and when it is human, it entails that it is either male or female. Lexically speaking, English does not mark demonstratives with basic roots for these features i.e. they are not lexicalized in the form of the demonstrative.

Stirling and Huddleston (2002: 1504) state that singular independent *this* and *that* can not, in general, be used for humans or animals, for instance:

a) *Those who obtain a score of 90% will win a prize.*

b) *That who obtains the highest score will win a prize.*

c) *He/That saved my life.*

da) *The population of Victoria far exceeds that of Queensland.*

e) *The premier of Victoria will be meeting with that of Queensland.*

‘Those’ in (a) is understood as denoting a set of people, but the corresponding singular *that* in (b) is inadmissible. In (c) ‘he’ and ‘that’ contrast in animacy, ‘he’ is referring to a person or animal, ‘that’ to an inanimate. In addition, in the anaphoric cases in (d-e) ‘that’ is acceptable with the interpretation “the population” but not “the premier”. No such restriction applies to dependent *this* and *that*:

- *This guy / that guy saved my life.*
'This' and 'that' can have animate reference, however, when they function as subject of the verb 'be':

- *This is my father, Hussein.*
- *Look over there. Isn't that your Linguistics tutor?*

In a similar vein, as deictic pronouns, the demonstratives normally refer to non-human. Quirk et al (1985: 373) regard the use of demonstrative pronouns as an insult “as if the person indicated is non-human” with exception for the introductory use in which the demonstrative pronoun can have both personal and non-personal reference. For example, instead of (a) it is preferable to say (b):

(a) Is she going to marry *THÁT*?
(b) Is she going to marry *THÁT man*? (Quirk et al 1985)

### 3.7.2.1.2 The Pragmatic Uses of Demonstratives:

Demonstratives serve important pragmatic functions in the communicative interaction between the interlocutors. They are primarily used to orient the hearer in the speech situation, focusing his or her attention on objects, locations, or persons, but they also serve a variety of other pragmatic functions. Following Himmelmann (1996, 1997), Diessel (1999a) has distinguished four pragmatic uses of demonstratives: the exophoric, anaphoric, discourse deictic, and recognitional uses.

This part examines the various pragmatic uses of demonstratives in English. Diessel (1999a: 91) claims that the exophoric use is the basic use from which all other uses derive.
3.7.2.1.2.1 The Exophoric Use:

Exophoric demonstratives focus the hearer’s attention on entities in the situation surrounding the interlocutors. They have three distinctive features: first, they involve the speaker (or some other person) as the deictic centre; second, they indicate a deictic contrast on a distance scale; and third, they are often accompanied by a pointing gesture. None of these features is shared by the other three uses.

Fillmore (1971) distinguishes between two uses: the gestural and symbolic uses. Following Halliday and Hasan (1976: 57-76), Diessel (1999a) refers to them as exophoric. The gestural use requires monitoring the speech event in order to identify the referent, whereas the symbolic use involves activating knowledge about the communicative situation and the referent. The two uses are exemplified by the following examples (Levinson, 1983):

a. This finger hurts. (gestural)

b. This city stinks. (symbolic)

The demonstratives in both sentences involve the speaker (or some other person) as the deictic centre. They are anchored in the speech situation, which indicates that they are exophoric. However, only the demonstrative in (a) can be accompanied by a pointing gesture. This example illustrates the gestural use. The demonstrative in (b), which does not involve a pointing gesture, draws on knowledge about the larger situational context, which involves more than what is immediately visible in the surrounding situation.
This example illustrates the symbolic use. The symbolic use shows that the exophoric use is not limited to concrete referents that are present in the surrounding situation. Exophoric demonstratives are sometimes described as ‘pointers’ which simply locate an object in the physical world. Exophoric demonstratives may also refer to entities that are not immediately visible in the speech situation, as in (b) where the city as a whole is not visible.

Consider also the following examples:

- Hello, is Peter *there*? (on the telephone)
- *Here* in Italy
- *Here* on earth

Moreover, exophoric demonstratives are also commonly used with reference to entities that do not have a physical existence, as in:

- *This* is an absolutely amazing feeling.

Another use other than the abovementioned ones is distinguished by Bühler (1934: 121-140) which he calls ‘Deixis am Phantasma’. This use involves shifting the deictic centre from the speaker in the current speech situation to a person in a different (imaginary) situation, i.e., narrated situation that is brought to mind by the ongoing discourse as if the narrated event were actually happening in front of the narrator and the audience. This phenomenon, which Lyons (1977:579) calls ‘deictic projection’ and Fillmore (1975) shifts in points of view, is characteristic of narratives and descriptions. Himmelmann (1996) cites the following example from the Pear Stories, in which the proximal demonstrative ‘this’ refers to a location that only exists in the imagination of the interlocutors.
And he's... you see a scene where he's... coming on his bicycle this way.

(Himmelmann 1996:222)

Here, the deictic centre has been shifted from the speaker to an imaginary observer in the story world. Diessel (1999a:95) argues that the use of demonstratives ‘am Phantasma’ is a subtype of the exophoric usage for the reason that accompanying demonstrative ‘am phantasma’ with a pointing gesture like that anchored in the speech situation makes the speakers point to the physically absent referents which do exist in the universe of discourse as if they were there. The reference frame of exophorically used demonstratives is a mental model of the speech situation (i.e. it is not the physical situation surrounding the interlocutors).

3.7.2.1.2.2 The Anaphoric Use:

As stated earlier, anaphora is a process where a word or a phrase (anaphor) refers back to another word or phrase which was used earlier in a text or a conversation. Similarly, anaphoric demonstratives are coreferential with a noun or noun phrase in the previous discourse. They refer to the same referent as their antecedent (Lyons 1977:660).

In the case of anaphorically used demonstratives, the deictic centre is shifted to a specific place in the progressing discourse. Bühler (1934: 390) describes the anaphoric use of demonstratives as follows:
• “If anaphorically used demonstratives could speak, “they would speak as follows: look ahead or back along the band of the present utterance. There something will be found that actually belongs here, where I am, so that it can be connected with what now follows. Or the other way round: what comes after me belongs there, it was only displaced from that position for relief.”

(Quoted in Diessel 2003)

• Jack was very rude, but that didn’t bother me.
• Listen to this. Peter and Mary will marry.

Anaphoric demonstratives interact with other tracking devices such as personal pronouns, definite articles, zero anaphors, and pronominal affixes on the verb. Unlike exophoric demonstratives, which are primarily used to orient the hearer in the outside world, anaphoric demonstratives serve a language internal function: they are used to track participants of the preceding discourse. Himmelmann (1996) refers to the anaphoric use as the ‘tracking use’, emphasizing that the discourse pragmatic function of demonstratives is coreferential with a prior NP. A number of grammarians and linguists, e.g. Quirk et al (1985) amongst them, have noted that this/these can be used both anaphorically and cataphorically whereas that/those can be used anaphorically only. For example:

Anaphoric use:

• “Last year at this time I talked here about some of the rules governing politeness, and I pointed out that these rules, apparently pragmatic, had to be correlated and integrated with purely linguistic rules - had to deal with syntactic and semantic phenomena, as well as pragmatic. One reason for this was that a single device, such as question-Intonation, might be used for very disparate uses…”

(Lakoff 1974: 345)

• I hear you disliked his latest novel. I read his first novel, and that was boring, too.
• He asked for his brown rain coat, insisting that this was his usual coat during the winter months.

(Quirk et al. 1985: 375)

Cataphoric use:

• He told the story like this: ‘Once upon a time…”
• *He told the story like that: ‘Once upon a time…”

The use of ‘that’ in lieu of this in the cataphoric use would sound unacceptable. Chen (1990: 141) comments that ‘this’ and ‘these’ help bring their referents into focus while ‘that’ and ‘those’ distance their referents.

In English, ‘there’ has a gestural place-deictic function, and it also has anaphoric function (Fillmore 1971: 226). An example to illustrate this is as follows:

• We’re there

This use is anaphoric once it is uttered when we arrived at the place we have been recently talking about.

3.7.2.1.2.3 The Discourse Deictic Use:

Similar to anaphoric demonstratives, discourse deictic demonstratives refer to elements of the surrounding discourse. Discourse deictic demonstratives are, however, not coreferential with a prior NP; rather, they refer to propositions (or speech acts) (Lyons, 1977; Webber, 1991; Himmelmann, 1996; Fillmore, 1997). In other words, they are used to focus the hearer’s attention on aspects of meaning expressed by a clause, a sentence, a paragraph, or entire story. Consider the following examples:
A: Hey, management has reconsidered its position. They’ve promoted Fred to second vice president.

B: a. That’s false. (reference to proposition)
   b. That’s a lie. (reference to illocution)

the demonstrative in (a) refers to the propositional content of the preceding utterance, while the demonstrative in (b) focuses the hearer’s attention on its illocutionary force (Webber, 1991:112).

Diessel (1999a) argues that the discourse deictic demonstrative creates an overt link between two discourse units and functions, like sentence connectives, to combine two portions of discourse as illustrated in the following excerpt from USA Today (p. 25C, Dec. 12, 1997):

“The object is to make fun”, said Jon Butler, Executive Director of Pop Warner. “Teams have been working together since August to get here and we want them to have a good time.”

That’s why Pop Warner moved to the Disney complex three years ago. With more than 5,000 players, coaches and parents attending in 1994, it was growing.”

(Cited in Diessel 1999a:102)

‘That’ in the second paragraph summarizes the theme of the 1st paragraph and functions as a connective between the preceding discourse and the following one.

Fillmore (1971b: 229) states that as a discourse deictic in English, ‘this’ can be used to refer either to something that has just happened or to something that is about to happen, whereas ‘that’ can only be used to refer to what has already happened. Referring to textual anaphora and cataphora, Jespersen (1933:158) apparently states that ‘this’ often refers to what is following and ‘that’ to what precedes. A number of grammarians and
linguists (e.g. Quirk et al. 1972, among them) have noted that *this* can be used both anaphorically and cataphorically whereas *that* can be used anaphorically only. For example:

- *This* is what I mean . . . (with either anaphoric or cataphoric reference, but especially the latter).
- *That* is what I mean . . . (with anaphoric reference only).

Accordingly, Diessel (1999a) states that anaphoric demonstratives are always anaphoric, while discourse deictic demonstratives can be both anaphoric and cataphoric. This is illustrated in the following instances:

a.  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
A: & *I've heard you will move to Hawaii?* \\
B: & *Who told you that* (*this)*?
\end{tabular}

b.  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
A: & *Listen to this* (*that): John will move to Hawaii.*
\end{tabular}

The distal demonstrative in (a) refers back to the preceding proposition, whereas the proximal demonstrative in (b) anticipates upcoming information expressed in the subsequent clause. Fillmore (1997: 103) refers to discourse deictic as “the choice of lexical or grammatical elements which indicate or otherwise refer to some portion or aspect of the ongoing discourse _ something like, for example, the former”.

Lakoff (1974: 349) remarks that 'this' may refer to a prior or subsequent discourse by one individual only, while 'that' can be used by a speaker to comment on an immediately prior remark by another, for instance:

1. Dick says that Republicans may have credibility problems.

2.  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. *That* \\
\item b. *This* 
\end{enumerate}

\{is an understatement.\}
'That' can be used if the speaker is not the same person with the speaker of (1). 'This' can only be used if the speaker is also the speaker of (1).

Finally, the referent of anaphoric demonstratives usually persists in the subsequent discourse, while the referent of a discourse-deictic demonstrative is not continued.

### 3.7.2.1.1.2.4 The Recognitional Use:

In addition to the exophoric, anaphoric and discourse deictic uses, Himmelmann (1996, 1997) describes another usage, which he calls the recognitional use. In the recognitional use, demonstratives function to indicate that the speaker and hearer are familiar with the referent due to shared experience. The demonstrative in the following sentence exemplifies this use:

- *Do you still have that radio that your aunt gave you for your birthday?*

Diessel (1999a) states that the recognitional use is distinguished from the three other uses by two features: First, it does not involve any kind of pointing or discourse-internal reference. Second, recognitional demonstratives are always accompanied by a coreferential noun, i.e. there are no recognitional demonstrative pronouns or adverbs. Fillmore (1971b: 227) says:
“The demonstrative determiners can be used, under conditions that I do not understand very well, in phrases of anaphoric reference. It appears to be the case that [that] is used when either or both of the interlocutors can expect to know the identity of the person or object of anaphoric reference (as in [that person], [that car]; but [this] is selected in assertions when the speaker assumes his addressee does not know about the entity being mentioned, or in questions where the speaker cannot identify the entity but he assumes his addressee can.”

Examples he gave are:

- *I went out with a friend of yours last night. Well, this person told me . . .*
- *Could this person you’ve been telling me about by any chance be a native speaker of Albanian?*

Recognitional demonstratives function to activate specific shared knowledge (Himmelmann 1996; Diessel 1999a).

- *I couldn’t sleep last night. That dog (next door) kept me awake.*

In this example, the noun ‘dog’ occurs with the distal demonstrative 'that' at its first mention. The demonstrative does not refer to an entity in the surrounding discourse or speech situation; rather, it indicates that the speaker believes that the hearer knows the referent.

In addition, demonstratives can employ other kinds of meaning, for example, indicating an emotional attitude, or personal interest, familiarity, or solidarity. For Lakoff (1974: 247-51), this use is called ‘emotional deixis’ which indicates emotional closeness or solidarity, sympathy, and shared beliefs between the two participants by implying that they share the same view or that they sympathize with one another.

- *That Henry Kissinger sure knows his way around in Hollywood.*

The demonstrative in the previous example suggests that the interlocutors share the same view about Henry Kissinger. Another example:
• How’s that throat?
• How’s that leg?

The demonstratives in these sentences indicate that the speaker shares the hearer’s concern about his or her throat and leg that shows sympathy; it is often manifested in questioning about injuries and illness. Chen (1990:149) explains:

“By using ‘that’ with the injuries or illnesses, the speaker distances the problem. Once the illness is distanced from both the speaker and the hearer, the speaker and the hearer would seem nearer to each other than otherwise, hence the effect of being on the same side, which in turn creates sympathy on the part of the speaker.”

Quirk and Greenbaum (1973:107) suggest that in English ‘this/these’ may be used to “connote interest and familiarity”, whereas ‘that/those’ may imply “a corresponding emotive rejection”. Zandvoort (1975:148) has a view that the demonstrative pronouns, especially in their deictic function, are often used with emotional connotation. The kind of feeling implied (affection, irritation, contempt, disgust, etc.) depends on the situation. That is, both this and that may carry either a positive or a negative overtone. Examples include:

• I can’t stand that/this mother-in-law of mine. (negative)
• These/those modern poets publish a lot. (could be positive or negative)
• This headache is killing me. (negative)

As shown in the examples, demonstratives are often used to indicate emotional closeness sympathy, and shared beliefs.
To sum up, the pragmatic uses of demonstratives can be schematically shown as in the following figure:

Figure (2) The pragmatic uses of demonstratives (Diessel, 2003):
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3.7.3 Temporal Deixis in English:

Deixis manifests the interpretation of those extralinguistic contexts that are relevant from the speaker’s and addressee’s point of view. Though the concept of deixis involves various aspects of deictics which are reflected in the conversation of the interlocutors in a number of speech act situations, temporal deixis refers to an event of an utterance, which takes place anytime relative to the speaking time and is, therefore, represented by tense, time adverbials and other temporal expressions. The location of an event referred to and represented by time and tense constitutes the deictic centre in the utterance of a speaker.

Time is one-dimensional and unidirectional. If two events can be said to take place at different moments of time, it is necessarily the case that one of them is earlier, the other later. Since time is unidirectional, the
relationship between that which remains the same at different times and the
time dimension itself is frequently thought of by the human mind as
movement. The movement metaphor for time allows one to think of ‘the
world’ as moving through time, or ‘the world’ as being constant and time
passing by it (Fillmore 1997: 45).

Comrie (1985: 8) points out that all human languages have ways of
locating events in time, even though they may differ from one another.
Cross-linguistically, the concept of time is represented by three main classes
of expressions: 1) grammatical expressions (whether inflectional or by
means of auxiliaries), 2) lexical expressions (like, ‘today’, ‘tomorrow’), and
3) lexically composite expressions (like ‘ten minutes ago’). Lexicalization
and grammaticalization are the major ways to express time. Lexicalization
includes time adverbials, which have more specific time references and
allow for an infinite number of expressions. Grammaticalization
encompasses much broader notions such as anteriority, simultaneity, or
posteriority usually with respect to the present moment as deictic centre. The
grammaticalized elements are generally called tense in descriptions of
languages.

Hence, this part is allocated to analyse and discuss the temporal
deictics with respect to twofold aspects, namely, the lexical and composite
expressions, which are of deictic function, and the grammaticalized
elements, i.e. tense.
3.7.3.1 Lexicalization of Temporal Deixis:

In this section, our concern is the discussion of ‘pure’ time deixis, where there is no direct interaction with non-deictic methods of time reckoning. Lexicalization of temporal deixis comprises two divisions: simple lexical deictics and lexically composite deictics. These include the deictic time adverbs such as now, then, soon, tomorrow, today and this day, the day before yesterday, last/next Monday… etc.

‘Now’ can be glossed as “the pragmatically given span including coding time (CT)”, where that span may be the instant associated with the production of the morpheme itself, as in the gestural use in (a), or the perhaps infinite period indicated in (b):

a. (i) Pull the trigger now
   (ii) you must do it now but now

b. (i) I’m now working on a Ph. D.
   (ii) Now I’m running my own business

Fillmore (1997) affirms that the word ‘now’ can be used in two voice gestural ways in a single utterance, as in:

- Now you see it, now you don’t

The words ‘right’ and ‘just’ narrow the vagueness associated with ‘now’. So we can say ‘right now’ and ‘just now’. Consequently, in the expression with ‘right’, the addressee is assumed to be monitoring the message as it is being produced, and is therefore able to identify the intended time point but ‘just
“now” is generally used to indicate a short period of time before the coding time (Fillmore 1997). *Now* contrasts with *then*, and indeed *then* can be glossed as “not now” to allow for its use in both past and future. *Then* is sometimes claimed to be necessarily anaphoric in nature, and to have no gestural deictic usage (Fillmore, 1971; Quirk et al., 1985; Stirling and Huddleston, 2002). Consider the following example:

- *They were married in 1982; he was then just short of twenty-one.*

The main purpose of the proximal deictic time category is to identify a particular time as coinciding with, being close to, or being contained in the same larger time unit as, the moment of speech, or the coding time (Fillmore 1997).

Time periods that are located at measured or unmeasured distances earlier than or later than the coding time call for adverbs like ‘recently’ or ‘soon’, or measurement expressions like ‘three days ago’ or ‘ten years from now’. As a first step towards considering how time deixis correlates with cultural measurements of time in an absolute or non-deictic way, let us consider words like *today, tomorrow, yesterday*. Such terms presume a division of time into diurnal spans. Generally, *today* glosses as ‘the diurnal span including CT’, *tomorrow* as ‘the diurnal span succeeding the diurnal (or nocturnal) span including CT’, and *yesterday* as ‘the diurnal span preceding the diurnal (or nocturnal) span including CT’ (Levinson, 1983, 1994). However, as Fillmore (1975) notes, these have two kinds of referent:
they can either refer to the entire span itself, as in (i), or to a point within the relevant span, as in (ii):

(i) *Tomorrow* is Wednesday

(ii) Dennis hit Murphy with a baseball bat *yesterday*

Fillmore (1997) and Levinson (1983) note that the deictic words *yesterday, today, and tomorrow* pre-empt the calendrical or absolute ways of referring to the relevant days. Thus, the following utterance, said on Thursday, can only be referring to next Thursday (or perhaps some more remote Thursday), otherwise the speaker should have said *today*:

- I’ll see you on *Thursday*

If it is said on Wednesday, the same interpretation is called for due to preemptive *tomorrow*.

Many languages have richer lexicalized expressions for the deictic day names than English does; for example, some have separate words for yesterday, day before yesterday, the day before the day before yesterday, etc. The Persian system goes two days ahead and four days back; Japanese goes three days ahead and three days back and so does Russian; Vietnamese goes three days ahead and four days back; Chinantec (an Amerindian language) goes four days ahead and four days back; Hindi has the same word for yesterday and tomorrow (i.e. it glosses as ‘the relevant day adjacent to the day including CT’) (Fillmore, 1997).

Briefly, the bases for systems of reckoning and measuring time in most languages seem to be the natural and outstanding cycles of day and
night, lunar months, seasons and years. Such units can either be used as *measures*, relative to some fixed point of interest (including, crucially, the deictic centre), or they can be used *calendrically* to locate events in ‘absolute’ time relative to some absolute *origo*, or at least to some part of each natural cycle designated as the beginning of that cycle (Fillmore, 1975). It is with these units, calendrical and non-calendrical, that time deixis interacts (Levinson, 1983: 73).

Further aspects of the interaction of calendrical reckoning and time deixis arise when we consider complex time adverbials (or lexically composite expressions) like *last Monday, next year, or this afternoon*. These consist of a deictic modifier, *this, next, last,* etc., together with a non-deictic name or measure word. The interpretation of such adverbials in English is systematically determined by (a) the calendrical vs. non-calendrical (and specifically deictic) modes of reckoning, and (b) the distinction between common noun units, like *weeks, months, years*, and proper name units, like *Monday, December*, and perhaps afternoon, which cannot be used as measures (Fillmore, 1975, 1997). For example:

- I’ll do it *this week /this year /this November*

This sentence is ambiguous between guaranteeing achievement within seven days from utterance time, or within the calendar unit beginning on Sunday (or Monday) including utterance time. *This year* means the calendar year including the time of utterance (or in some circumstances the 365 day unit beginning at the time of utterance), but *this November* means the next
monthly unit so named (usually, the November of the year including CT),
while \textit{this morning} refers to the first half of the diurnal unit including CT,
even if that is in the afternoon (Fillmore, 1975, 1997; Levinson, 1983,
1994). Applying \textit{next} to calendrical names of days arises an ambiguity: \textit{next Thursday} can refer either to the Thursday of the week that succeeds the
week which includes CT, \textit{or} that Thursday which first follows CT. Note that
on a \textit{Friday} or a \textit{Saturday}, these will coincide; and given the rule that \textit{today}
and \textit{tomorrow} pre-empt calendrical day names, on Wednesday and
Thursday, \textit{next Thursday} can only mean the Thursday of next week. It
follows that, if one starts the week on Monday, \textit{next Thursday} is ambiguous
only on Monday and Tuesday (Fillmore, 1971b).

\subsection*{3.7.3.2 Grammaticalization of Temporal Deixis :}

Tense has been a major topic in linguistics and philosophy. However,
it remains theoretically controversial. It has not received a unified account in
literature. This means that there is little agreement on what tense is, how
many tenses a language has, or whether tense should be dealt with only in
terms of semantics and pragmatics or also in the syntax.

The term ‘tense’ derives (via Old French) from the Latin translation
of the Greek word for ‘time’ (Greek \textit{khronos}, Latin \textit{tempus}) (Lyons
1968:304).

Time may be represented as a straight line on which the past is
located to the left and the future to the right of the present understood as a
point with no duration. Quirk et al (1972, 1985) view time as “a universal concept with three divisions” in which the units of time are extra-linguistic: they exist independently of the grammar of any particular language. Time is conceptualized as a linear perception, which could be called time scale as follows:

Figure (3) Linear time conceptualization:
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Tense in English is regarded as a semantic category whose function is to express essentially the concept of time in its three dimensions: past, present, and future. Some linguists (Jespersen, 1946; Hockett 1958; Lyons 1968, 1977a; Palmer, 1974; Quirk et al., 1972, 1985 among others) do not include the future tense in English. They assume that the inflectional morphology of the English verb does not include any affix that could be regarded as an explicit marker of future tense, as is in some inflectional languages, such as Latin. They think that the auxiliary verbs SHALL and WILL, which are usually considered as markers of future tense by other linguists, should be treated as modals because of the modal connotation they express in certain contexts.

Different linguists and grammarians have defined tense differently. Jespersen (1946:1) defines tense as “the linguistic expression of time-relations, so far as these are indicated in verb forms”. Hockett (1958:237) supports the view that “tenses typically show different locations of an event in time”. Lyons (1968:305) presents a broader definition of tense by saying:
“The essential characteristic of the category of tense is that it relates the time and the action, event or state of affairs referred to in the sentence to the time of the utterance (the time of the utterance being ‘now’). Tense is therefore a deictic category which (like all syntactic features partly or wholly dependent on deixis) is simultaneously a property of the sentence and the utterance.”

King (1983:113) defines tense as “the semantic notion which expresses the subjective or ‘psychological’ time to which the speaker ties the reported occurrence”. Crystal (1997:384) defines tense as “a category used in the grammatical description of verbs (along with aspect and mood), referring primarily to the way the grammar marks the times at which the action denoted by the verb took place”. Quirk et al. (1972: 87; 1985:213) advocate the view that there is no obvious future tense in English corresponding to the time/tense parallel for present and past. Consequently, tense in English is classified into present and past as Jespersen (1938: 231) puts:

“the English verb has only two tenses proper, the present and the preterite.”

Quirk et al. (1985) assure that tense is expressed by morphological inflection of the verb and the future is expressed by the use of an auxiliary verb construction. Chung and Timberlake (1985: 203) describe tense in terms of a temporal dimension that is directional with a privileged point or interval of time. For them, there are two most important considerations in tense systems which are the selection of the tense locus (a privileged point
or interval of time) and the nature of the relationship between the tense locus and the event frame (the occurrence of an event on an interval time).

Comrie (1985) points out that all human languages have ways of locating events in time, even though they may differ from one another. English, like many (not all) languages, grammaticalizes the temporal dimension of the deictic context in its tense system.

3.7.3.2.1 Tense Meanings and Uses in English:

The present semantic analysis of tense in English is mainly based on the analysis of Reichenbach (1947), Leech (1971), King (1983), Comrie (1985), and Huddleston (2002). The English semantic category of tense is regarded as an essential and indispensable component of the logical structure of the English sentence. This semantic category is manifested in surface structure by the inflectional morphology of the verb and temporal adverbs. All the languages of the world appear to have ways of locating events in time. Linguistic time expressions are either lexical (whether composite like “ten minutes ago” or non-composite like “tomorrow”) or grammatical (whether inflectional or by means of auxiliaries). Although some linguists restrict the term ‘tense’ to morphologically expressed location in time, i.e. to those distinctions in the forms of verbs that place the event described by a verb in time. This means that tense may also be expressed by auxiliaries or by a combination of an auxiliary and an inflection. Although most languages of the world have tense in this sense of the word, some do not have it, such
as Burmese, Chinese, in the same way, as there are languages, which lack certain other grammatical categories. It is noteworthy that tense is a so-called deictic category. Lyons (1968: 305) refers to tense as “a deictic category which is simultaneous property of the sentence and utterance”. He furthermore emphasizes that the essential characteristic of the category of tense is that it relates the time of the action, event or state of affairs referred to in the sentence to the time of utterance (the time of utterance being ‘now’). This means that the deictic centre is indispensable element of the interpretation of tense and hence tense is a relational category.

To interpret a sentence or an utterance, it is noteworthy to distinguish between the moment of utterance (or inscription) or coding time (CT) – the time of the ‘communication act’ – from the moment of reception or receiving time (or RT) – the time at which the message is received (Fillmore, 1971b, 1997). In the canonical situation of utterance, RT can be presumed to be identical to CT and this is what Lyons (1977a: 685) calls deictic simultaneity. McCoard (1978:13) agrees with Allen (1966: 146) in calling it the moment of coding in order to neutralize the difference between encoding and decoding. Levinson (1983:73 remarks:

“Complexities arise in the usage of tense, time adverbs and other time-deictic morphemes wherever there is a departure from this assumption, e.g. in letter writing, or the pre-recording of media programmes.”

The examples he gave to illustrate that are as follows:

(i) a. This programme is being recorded today, Wednesday April 1st, to be relayed next Thursday

b. I write this letter while chewing peyote
(ii)  
a. *This programme was recorded last Wednesday, April 1st, to be relayed today*

b. *I wrote this letter while chewing peyote*

Here, in (i) the deictic centre remains on the speaker and CT, but in (ii) it is *projected* on the addressee and RT (Fillmore, 1975).

King (1983:104) stresses on the importance of the time of communication as opposed to any other time (past or future) in the real time. Huddleston (2002:51) states that there are two tense systems in English. The primary one is marked by verb inflection and contrasts preterite (as in *she was ill*) and present (as in *she is ill*). The secondary one is marked by the presence or absence of auxiliary *have* and contrasts perfect as in (*she is believed to have been ill*) and non-perfect (*she is believed to be ill*). The perfect can combine with primary tense to yield compound tenses preterite perfect (*she had been ill*) and present perfect (*she has been ill*). Following Reinchenbach (1947), King (1983), and Huddleston (2002), the semantic categories: past, present, and future are inherently relational: one time is defined by its relation to another, i.e. tense relates time of the event described by the verb to some other time, typically the moment of speech.

Following Reinchenbach (1947: 290), event time is symbolised by E, and speech time by S. Simultaneity is represented by the “equal sign ‘=’” (Huddleston: 2002) to indicate the relation between E and S. Separation in time is symbolised by ‘<’ meaning “anterior to” and by ‘>’ meaning “posterior to”. Consider the following examples:
(i) He died of lung cancer. [past time]
(ii) I promise to let you have it back tomorrow. [present time]
(iii) If you see her tomorrow give her my best regards. [future time]

In (i), the time of dying is past, which is understood as a time earlier than now, i.e. than the time at which the sentence is uttered. E is the time of dying, S is the time of utterance, and the relation is “earlier than”, i.e. “anterior to”. In (ii), E is the time of promising, S is also the time of the utterance, and the relation is “simultaneous with”. In (iii), E is the time of your seeing her, S is the time of utterance, and the relation is “later than”, or “posterior to”. These three relations can be symbolised as follows:

i) Past time  E anterior to S  E < S
ii) Present time  E simultaneous with S  E = S
iii) Future time  E posterior to S  E > S

In the case of the perfect tenses, the time of the event described by the verb is related not only to the point of speech but also to a second point of reference, symbolised as R. For this reason, the perfect tenses have been called two-point tenses (Reichenbach, 1947; McCawley, 1976; Huddleston, 2002; Comrie, 1985). In an example like:

- *She had signed the letter (when I returned)*

the event of signing takes place before this reference point (that of my return) which in its turn is anterior to the point of speech (what I say now).

According to Reichenbach (1947:288), in past perfect tense (e.g., *Peter had gone*), there are two temporal points: the point of event and the point of reference. These positions are determined with respect to the point
of speech, and the point of reference is a time between the time when Peter went and the point of speech.

Let us consider the following examples having other forms of perfect as follows:

- *She will have signed the letter (when I return)*
- *She has signed the letter (now)*

In the first example, the event of signing takes place before the reference point (that of my return) and after the point of speech (what I say now) whereas in the second, the event of signing takes place before the reference point which is simultaneous with the moment of speech. These relations can be symbolised as follows:

- **Present Perfect**  \( E < R = S \) \hspace{1cm} *has signed*
- **Past Perfect**  \( E < R < S \) \hspace{1cm} *had signed*
- **Future Perfect**  \( E < R > S \) \hspace{1cm} *will have signed*

According to king (1983), the perfect forms are called relational i.e. they show explicitly an ordering relationship. They denote anteriority in the sense that the situation reported by the perfect form is ordered in time anterior to some other situation.

By this description of tense meanings in English, let us now examine the different uses of tense with respect to their meanings, beginning with tenses that are primary tenses as called by Huddleston (2002) and King (1983), or absolute tenses by Comrie (1985, 1994). These are present, past, and future. The other type of tense is described as secondary tenses by
Huddleston (2002) and relative tense by Comrie (1985, 1994). The following sections give a detailed description of the uses of tenses in connection to their meanings in terms of the speaker’s perspective.

3.7.3.2.1.1 The Present Form:

The most basic element in an English sentence is the verb in which tense can be manifested. King (1983) assumes that there is no one-to-one correspondence between tense form and time in the real world, i.e. past form for past occurrence, present form for present occurrence, and future form for future occurrence.

The present tense in English indicates a state or event in the present time and in relation to the moment of speaking. Leech (1971: 1-2) states that the function of the present state is to describe a state of indefinite duration and the duration of the state is regarded as indefinite because no temporal constraints or limitations are put on the extension of the state into past and future time. Besides, he adds that the present event usually occurs with non-stative verbs, which denote events occurring simultaneously with the moment of speaking.

Conceptually, the present tense form ties the situation described closely to the situation of utterance (Yule, 1998). King (1983:114) suggests that tense must be analysed as speaker's perspective and not real time reference. According to him, ‘present’ does not mean simultaneous with the moment of speaking, but rather included within the perspective of that time
at which the communicative act is performed, i.e. the speaker’s ‘present’. Therefore, the simple present form is used whenever the speaker includes the situation s/he is reporting within the same perspective as the time of communication. The use of the present tense for the ‘instantaneous present’ illustrates this (Quirk et al., 1972, 1985). For example:

- The quarterback *drops* the ball!
- I hereby *inform* you that you are fired

In those cases where the event described by an utterance is not separated from the moment of speech either backwards or forwards in time, the present tense is used. The relationship between event time and speech time may be one of coincidence or inclusion:

- *I sentence you to six months in jail.*
- *John lives in London.*

The use of the present tense, which has been termed ‘instantaneous’, is fairly restricted because it implies that the event referred to has little or no duration. As pointed out by Quirk et al. (1985: 180) and Huddleston (2002: 128), it is found in (broadcast) commentaries, demonstrations, special exclamatory sentences, and performative use of verbs, for instance:

- *Ronaldo passes the ball to Ronaldino.*
- *I promise to be back by ten*
- *Here comes the winner!*

As it appears from the examples, exact simultaneity between event time and speech time is only a characteristic of the present tense in performative utterances. In the other utterance types where the ‘instantaneous’ present occurs, there is necessarily a brief speech time span.
Another special use of present form is the universal (eternal) time and habitual occurrences. King (1983:106) states that universal (eternal) time and habitual occurrences fall within the perspective of the time of communication because they are valid at that time and rightfully included within the present perspective:

- The Ohio River flows into the Mississippi.
- We have liver and onions for supper once a week.

Lyons (1977a:680) states that in English and many other languages, both tenseless and omni-temporal propositions are expressed characteristically by sentences in the so-called present tense, for instance:

- God is just.
- The sun rises every day

The present form of the English verb is used to perform secondary roles to refer to past time and future time depending on the context i.e. the speaker’s perspective. King (1983:107) says:

“When the present tense form is used for a future occurrence, the speaker is simply bringing that which is planned for the future into the realm of the present.”

For instance,

- We arrive in Miami on New Year's Eve.
- The plane leaves for Chicago at eight o’clock

As the examples show, the future is not clearly separated from the present, which makes it all the easier for the speaker to view a future situation as part of the present, i.e. the future situation is ‘pulled’ into the time of
communication. Many scholars have called the use of present for future occurrences a ‘schedule’ or an indication of certainty. As for Quirk et al. (1985), this typically occurs with time-position adverbials as shown in the above examples.

A situation belonging to the past in real time may also be brought or ‘pulled’ into the present perspective of the speaker (King, 1983):

- Dad tells me that you want to quit school.
- Columbus discovers America in 1492...

The ‘telling’ and the ‘discovering’ take place (i.e. took place) in the past, but they are viewed within the perspective of the speaker’s present. They are past in the real world of time, but they are simultaneous (included within) the speaker’s perspective of the present. According to Quirk et al., (1985) and Huddleston (2002), the present tense is used for past time situations in informal conversational narration which is so-called historic present. This use is closely connected to that of fictional narratives “dramatic present”, which are imaginary:

- There was I playing so well even I couldn’t believe it and along comes this kid and keeps me off the table for three frames!
  
  (Huddleston, 2002:130)

- The crowd swarms around the gateway, and seethes with delighted anticipation; excitement grows, as suddenly their hero makes his entrance…
  
  (Quirk et al., 1985:183)

The historic present describes the past as if it is happening now; it conveys something of the dramatic immediacy of an eyewitness account. In the
fictional narrative, the events of the play are described as if they are being performed before our eyes as we read the script.

3.7.3.2.1.2 The Past Form:

In this section, we examine the use of the preterite to indicate that E is earlier than S. The basic use of the preterite is to locate E as anterior to S, where S is identified as the deictic time (the time of utterance). The past tense generally describes a state that existed or an event that actually occurred in the past and was prior to the moment of speaking. The basic meaning of the simple past tense is to denote definite past time i.e. that took place at a given time or in a given period before the present moment. The definiteness of the past time springs up from the fact that the existence of states and events has no connection to the present time. The past tense form makes the situation more remote from the situation of the utterance (Yule, 1998). The actual time expressed by the simple past tense is necessarily definite in all cases. The adverbial expressions that usually accompany the verb play an important role in expressing vividly the definiteness of the past time. The past form of the English verb, like the present form, has secondary roles, which are semantically and contextually restricted. There are three exceptional uses of the past form as stated by Quirk et al., (1972, 1985) and Huddleston (1984, 2002). They are not related to the past time. These uses can be outlined as follows:

(i) The use of the past form in indirect (reported) speech in which the
past tense of the reporting verb tends to make the verb of the subordinate past tense as well. This phenomenon is called back-shift, for example:

- *I have too many commitments.* [original utterance: present tense]
- *Jill said she had too many commitments.* [backshifted report: past]

(ii) The second use is bound to express the speaker's attitude rather than to the past time. Quirk et al. (1985) call this use attitudinal past whereas Huddleston (1984, 2002) refers to it as a pragmatic use of the past to fulfill politeness and deference due to the distancing of the situation from the deictic centre, i.e. here and now. For example:

- *Could I have a couple of minutes of your time? there was something I wanted to ask you about.*
- A: *Did you want me?*
  B: *Yes, I hoped you would give me a hand with the painting.*

(iii) The third one is the hypothetical past, which is used in some constructions such as subordinate clauses, especially if-clauses. They express modal rather than the temporal time:

- *If you loved me, you would not say that*
- *If he took the later plane tonight, he won’t have to rush.*
- *If he loved her, he’d change his job.*

In addition to these, Huddleston (2002) states that the central use of the preterite (past) is to locate the situation, or the part of it under consideration, in the past time:

- *She always took her dog with her.*
- *I promised to be back for lunch.*
In a similar vein, Leech (1971:10-11) had described three secondary uses to the past form of the English verb: the hypothetical meaning, the attitudinal uses with overtone indication, and the use of narrative past as it is used by a writer in literature, especially science fiction, where the writers use the past form of the verb to narrate events that are assumed or imagined to take place in the future but portrayed in such a way as if they had already happened, for example:

- In the year 3000, the spaceship, Colombia, *made* ten trips to the moon.

King (1983) supports the view that the use of the past tense regards the situation as external to the time of communication as it is with the future tense. The simple past generally describes a state that existed or an event that actually occurred in the past and prior to the moment of speaking. The temporal adverbial expressions that co-occur with the verb help in expressing explicitly the definiteness of the past time as in the following example:

- Ali bought a new car *yesterday*.

### 3.7.3.2.1.3 The Future Form:

There is no obvious future tense in English corresponding to the time/tense parallel for present and past. In other words, the future tense is not morphologically represented in English. The future tense in English expresses future time relative to the present moment of speaking. It refers to states that may exist and events that may take place forwards in time. Future
time could be either definite or indefinite. Situations in the future are treated differently. They are inherently non-factual, but can be considered as either relatively certain (i.e. perceived as close to happening) or relatively unlikely or even impossible (i.e. perceived as remote from happening). The verb form that is traditionally called the ‘future tense’ is actually expressed via a modal verb, which indicates the relative possibility of an event. This modal also has two forms which convey the closeness (I will live here) or the remoteness as in (I would live there) of some situation viewed from the situation of utterance (Yule, 1998). King (1983) argues that since the real world future is not verifiable fact, the future perspective on a situation in every case involves prediction whether the speaker expresses an ‘intention’ or ‘willingness’ as in:

- He’ll be here tomorrow at seven,
- He’ll do it for you, don’t worry.

Future time is rendered by means of modal auxiliaries, by semi-auxiliaries or by simple present or progressive forms (Quirk et al., 1985). In English, the future time meaning is expressed in various ways by the following means:

i) **Non-progressive present tense:**

   In main clauses this is rare, being restricted to those situations where the future realization of something planned and certain is involved and where there is a future time adverbial:

   - Mrs. Thatcher visits Poland next week.
However, in subordinate clauses embedded in main clauses, which refer to the future, the present tense is the rule rather than the exception, particularly in conditional and temporal clauses, for instance:

- You’ll sleep better if you get a new mattress.
- When my son comes home, we’ll kill the fatted calf.

ii) Progressive present tense:

This form is used with future time meaning where an event is anticipated or in preparation at the moment of speech. It is used to express the degree of certainty in the occurrence of future events. Generally, the events expressed by this construction have already been planned, and their occurrence is almost certain.

For example,

- Jane is moving to the States next week.
- Ahmed is leaving for England tomorrow.

iii) Present tense of ‘be going to’:

This construction is the most frequent future time expression in English, particularly in informal style. As pointed out by Quirk et al. (1985: 214), its general meaning is ‘future fulfilment of the present’, and it therefore differs from the future tense in that reference time coincides with speech time. It is invariably used to indicate fairly clearly the immediacy or proximity of future events. This implies that the state of affairs referred to is verifiable at the moment of speech, and in this way 'be going to' differs from the future tense. According to Quirk et al., (1972:88), the form 'be going to'
has two more specific meaning. One of them is used chiefly with personal subject and is described as ‘future of present intention’, for example:

- When *are you going to get married?*

The other meaning is ‘future of present cause’, which is found with both personal and non-personal subject, as in:

- She’s *going to have a baby*
- It’s *going to rain*

iv) SHALL / WILL + Infinitive:

The most common expression of future meaning is ‘SHALL / WILL + Infinitive’ construction. The future time expressed by it can be near or remote. The future and modal functions can hardly be separated. *Shall* in the sense of future tense is restricted to the 1\textsuperscript{st} person in British English but as noted by Quirk et al. (1985: 230) “this prescription is old-fashioned and is nowadays widely ignored”, whereas *will* is used with all persons in the same sense. Consider the following:

- I \{ *shall* \}
  \{ *will* \} try to do my best

- he *will* be here in half an hour

The auxiliary verb SHALL denotes modal meaning (volitional use such as a promise, a threat, or a command) when it is used 2\textsuperscript{nd} and third persons:
- you shall have your money back
- you shall be fired if you do not do your work properly
- you shall do as I say

There are also some other constructions that are used to refer to future time. These are:

v) Present tense of ‘be about to’:

This idiomatic verb 'be about to' is used to refer to the imminent future (like the synonymous idioms be on the point of and be on the verge of) i.e. “imminent fulfilment” (Quirk et al., 1972):

- He’s about to join the army.
- We are about to leave

vi) Present tense of ‘be to’:

Apart from being used for the expression of compulsion (e.g. You are not to smoke), the construction ‘be to + infinitive’ denotes a future arrangement and pre-destined future outside the control of the speaker or the subject noun phrase referent (Quirk et al., 1972: 89):

- We are to be married soon
- There is to be a new hearing.
- I am to interview her today.

There is a tendency to view the technical terms ‘past’, ‘present’ and ‘future’ as being three points on a simple time line, which are similar to yesterday, today, tomorrow. It is, of course, possible to find or create English sentences that appear to connect these time expressions (yesterday, today, tomorrow) directly with the tenses (Yule 1998:58).
King (1983) concludes that the meaning of the primary present form is PRESENT TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE in the sense that the situation is included within the perspective of the time of communication. The meaning of the primary past form is PAST TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE in that the reported situation is removed from the perspective of the present into the realm of the past. Finally, the primary future form means FUTURE TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE, i.e. the situation is removed from the present and associated with the future.

3.7.3.2.1.6 The Present Perfect:

With respect to the present perfect, the event described by a clause is prior to the moment of speech and reference time coincides with speech time, anterior time meaning. The main function of the present perfect is to indicate indefinite past time meaning and to express current relevance. It is used with both states and events whose time is invariably indefinite. There is a lengthy and lively debate among linguists and grammarians in connection with the status of the present perfect form. As pointed out by McCoard (1978), there are three trends that have developed for the meaning of this form, as exemplified by the following examples:

- The kids *have gone* to bed.
- I’ve *been* to Europe several times.
- *Have you seen* that movie?

In the first place, there is the CURRENT RELEVANCE THEORY which maintains that “... the defining function of the perfect in English is to express
the pastness of the event(s) embodied in the lexical verb, together with a
certain applicability, pertinence, or relevance of said past event(s) to the
context of coding...‖ (McCoard, 1978: 31). Secondly, according to the
INDEFINITE PAST THEORY, “...the present perfect locates events somewhere
before the moment of coding, but without pointing to any particular occasion
or subpart of the past” (ibid: 75). Thirdly, the EXTENDED NOW THEORY sees
“... the perfect as the marker of prior events which are nevertheless included
within the overall period of the present” (ibid: 123). King (1983) views that
the present perfect form is oriented to some situation in the present, i.e.
antior to the time of communication. Thus in the following example:

- He *has traveled* to Europe.

the time of communication is the time to which the act of traveling is
anterior, whereas the primary past in:

- He *traveled* to Europe.

has no such overt orientation expressed; it simply associates the situation
with the past. From the point of view of reference point, Reichenbach (1947)
claims that the difference between the following two sentences is a matter of
the point of reference:

- I *have seen* John.

- I *saw* John.

The difference between the two sentences is that the reference point of the
second sentence is located in the past time, simultaneous with the point of
event, whereas that of the first is at the point of speech, the present moment.
The temporal composition of the first accounts for the present relevance of
the perfect tense. Leech (1971: 35) states that there are some characteristics
that distinguish the past tense from the present perfect. The indefiniteness of
the past time associated with the present perfect tense is the most prominent
characteristic that distinguishes it from the past tense. The other
characteristics attributed to the present perfect tense are the continuation of
states up to the present and the present result of event verbs. As pointed by
Quirk et al., (1985: 192), the present perfect has indefinite “past with current
relevance”. These properties are reflected by its unrestricted combinability
with indefinite time adverbials such as up to now, so far, since yesterday,
and yet, which refer to a period of time stretching up to the present, and by
its highly restricted combinability with definite past time adverbials like a
year ago, the other day, and yesterday. While adverbials of these two types
are thus normally restricted to co-occurrence with either the present perfect
or the past tense, there is a third group of adverbials which combine freely
with both tenses. This group includes time expressions such as this week,
this afternoon, recently, and today. When they are used with the past tense,
the time referred to is separated from the moment of speech, for example, an
utterance like

- I saw her this morning

is spoken in the late morning, afternoon, or evening of the same day. On the
other hand, in utterances where they combine with the present perfect, no
separation from the present moment is signalled, for example:

- I’ve seen her this morning

### 3.7.3.2.1.6 The Past Perfect:

Semantically speaking, the past perfect indicates past in the past (Leech, 1971; Quirk et al., 1985) and can be regarded as an anterior version either of the present perfect or of the past tense (Quirk et al., 1985). The past perfect denotes anteriority in the sense that the situation reported by the perfect form is ordered in time anterior to some other situation (King 1983). For example:

- He had already called me when his parents arrived
- The thieves had run away when the police arrived

The past perfect is typically used to describe an event preceding reference time which in turn precedes the moment of speech, in other words, it refers to a remote time in the past as viewed from a definite point of time in the past. According to Reichenbach (1947:288), in past perfect tense (e.g. Peter had gone) there are two temporal points: the point of event and the point of reference. These positions are determined with respect to the point of speech, and the point of reference is a time between the time when Peter went and the point of speech.

The ordering meaning of anteriority can be expressed by clauses in the past with temporal clauses beginning with the conjunction after. In this
case, the use of the past perfect would be redundant (Quirk et al., 1985: 196). The following examples illustrate this:

- After we boarded the train, no heads turned.
- After we parked, I peeked through the flap in the tent and saw it all.
- I ate my lunch after Sandra came back from her shopping.

The meaning of ordering anteriority can also be expressed by past tense utterances in English containing temporal subordinate clauses with *when* used in the sense of “immediately after” (Quirk et al. 1985: 197):

- I laid the table for tea when the children (had) returned from school.
- I ate my lunch when Sandra came back from her shopping.

In the following example, *before* locates the event of finishing as prior to that of leaving, so the use of the past perfect in the superordinate clause is redundant.

- Before she left, I (had) finished the letters.

The past perfect can be used, though, if the speaker wishes to emphasize the sequentiality of the two past events. As mentioned earlier, the past tense and present perfect tense have definite and indefinite past meaning respectively. Before concluding this section we should mention that the past perfect is used in clauses with either of these meanings, and in this sense it may be said to cover an area -further in the past- equivalent to both the present perfect and the past (Leech, 1987:47) as illustrated by the following examples (cited from Palmer 1987: 51):

- I had already seen him when you arrived.
- I had seen him an hour before you arrived.
While indefinite past time is referred to in the former clause, it is definite past time, which is referred to in the latter. This is due to the adverbials, and out of context utterances.

3.7.3.2.1.6 The Future Perfect:

The future perfect tense is used to describe an event by a clause that follows the moment of speech but precedes reference time. It has the function of denoting past in the future. It expresses anteriority i.e. an ordering relationship independent of real time (King, 1983). What makes the future perfect future is that it belongs to the future perspective. Illustrative examples of this form are as follows:

- He probably will have called me when his parents arrive
- By this time tomorrow, I’ll no doubt have finished sorting out the first batch of replies.

It refers to a state or event viewed in the past from a point of view of orientation in the future (Leech, 1971: 54). By using the future perfect, the speaker makes a prediction about the validity of an occurrence at the moment of speaking (King, 1983), for example:

- He will have left by now.

In this utterance, it predicts a valid occurrence at the time of speaking i.e. he has left by now. The future perfect tense is expressed by the auxiliary verb
SHALL / WILL + have and a past participle of a stative or non-stative verb with a temporal adverb.

3.8 Concluding remarks:

Many of the utterances we produce daily are requests, comments and questions about ourselves or our interlocutors. There are some expressions that are not understood unless the interlocutors have some knowledge about their referents in the real world. These words are variables and have no constant meaning. These expressions are known as deictics or indexicals. The word deixis comes from the Greek verb 'deiktikos' meaning “to point”. Deixis is the marking of the orientation or position of objects and events with respect to certain points of reference.

As seen, this chapter has been divided into two parts. In the first part, a discussion is conducted to display a review of some important notions that are related to the present study. The chapter starts with a review of definitions of the deixis by various scholars.

Deixis has been discussed in relation to Anaphora and how it is used both deictically and anaphorically. Sentences and utterances have been discussed to show the difference between them and how they are related to this survey and how an utterance is context-bound, whereas a sentence is context-free. In addition, it has been discussed that context is important to clarify the obscurity and ambiguity that may be associated with the meaning of an utterance or a sentence. Text is also important in the sense that it works
within a specific situation that constitutes a pragmatic framework. Finally, this part ends with the discussion of discourse, which is nowadays used more and more in diverse interdisciplinary fields.

The second part of this chapter is devoted to analyse and discuss, in detail, the deixis of person, place, and time in English. It begins with a discussion of the concept of pronouns and person. It extends to discuss and analyse the deictic system of person in English with respect to semantic (or deictic) features and pragmatic implications. Personal deixis system in English marks distinctions in gender (in the third person only) and number (in 1st and 3rd person); the second person pronoun you can refer to both singular and plural entities, i.e. neutralized. In addition to their deictic function, personal deixis frequently reflects the social status of referents. In English, the choice of a pronoun form in the first person depends on the nature of the speaker’s relationship to the addressee. English does not have independent lexical words to describe this relationship. Instead, it is deduced from the context of situation as the case of using the first person plural inclusive / exclusive, ‘royal’, ‘editorial’, and ‘authorial first person plural we. Thus, personal deixis can mark a number of overlapping distinctions: person, gender, number, and social status. The basic distinction between first person and second person, however, is found in English and appears to be a basic semantic category in the deictic system.
Place deixis concerns the specification of locations relative to anchorage points in the speech event. English has a two-term system of spatial deictics (proximal or distal from speaker), such as *this* / *that* and *here* / *there*. Demonstratives, as the most obvious source of place-deixis in English (Fillmore 1997), have been examined and discussed with respect to their semantic features and pragmatic uses. Demonstratives have two kinds of semantic features: deictic features, which indicate the location of the referent in the speech situation (proximal or distal from speaker), and qualitative features, which characterize the referent (ontology, animacy, humanness, sex, number, and boundedness). The pragmatic uses of demonstratives are also discussed in terms of four different uses: (i) the exophoric, (ii) anaphoric, (iii) discourse deictic, and (iv) recognitional uses.

A third type of deixis is temporal deixis, the orientation or position of the referent of actions and events in time. Time is unidimensional, i.e. unidirectional entity. English has words and phrases that are inherently marked for temporal deixis, like *yesterday*, *today*, *tomorrow*, *now*, *this evening* and *last year*. As shown in this section, the concept of time in English is represented by three main classes of expressions: grammatical expressions (whether inflectional or by means of auxiliaries), lexical expressions (like, ‘today’, ‘tomorrow’), and lexically composite expressions (like ‘ten minutes ago’). Lexicalization and grammaticalization are the major ways to express time in English. Lexicalization includes time adverbials, which have more specific time references and allow for an infinite number
of expressions. In English, there are some complex expressions containing temporal nouns that denote culturally determined time-units, which fall into two classes, non-positional and positional. Grammaticalization encompasses much broader notions such as anteriority, simultaneity, or posteriority usually with respect to the present moment as deictic centre. The grammaticalized element is generally called tense. The function of tense is to locate an event in time relative to some other time, which is often known as the moment of speech. In the case of some tenses, however, the situation is more complicated and involves other reference points than the moment of speech as indicated in the perfect tenses. It is concluded that the meaning of the primary present form is PRESENT TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE in the sense that the situation is included within the perspective of the time of communication; the meaning of the primary past form is PAST TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE in that the reported situation is removed from the perspective of the present into the realm of the past; and finally, the primary future form means FUTURE TEMPORAL PERSPECTIVE, i.e. the situation is removed from the present and associated with the future. As far as tense is concerned, the reference point is typically the present moment (or perhaps including the present moment), or prior to the present moment, or subsequent to the present moment. A system that relates entities to reference point is known as a deictic system, and according to this, tense is deictic.
Deictic expressions in English can be summarized in the following table:

Table (7) Deictic expressions in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Proximal</th>
<th>Distal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>This</td>
<td>That</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Here</td>
<td>There</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Now</td>
<td>Then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Today</td>
<td>Yesterday/Tomorrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Past-Future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>