2.0 Preamble:

In this chapter, a survey of the contrastive linguistics or contrastive Analysis, its kinds and the notion of transfer as well as the contrastive analysis hypothesis will be discussed. It will also contain a brief review of semantics and pragmatics and how they have been distinguished in the previous studies. Finally, this chapter includes a survey of the previous studies related to deixis of person, place and time.

2.1 Contrastive Linguistics:

Contrastive linguistics, which is also called Contrastive Analysis (henceforth CA), is the systematic comparison of two or more languages with the aim of describing their similarities and differences (Ringbom, 1994). The term ‘Contrastive linguistics’ was suggested by Whorf (1941) for a comparative study which is giving emphasis on linguistic differences.

The objective of the comparison may vary according to the purpose of the comparison. Language comparison is of great interest in a theoretical and applied perspective. It discloses what is universal and what is language specific and is therefore significant both for the understanding of language
in general and for the study of the individual languages compared (Johansson and Hofland, 1994).

Hartman and Stork (1972:53) define contrastive linguistics as:

“A method of linguistic analysis which shows the similarities and differences between two or more languages or dialects with the aim of finding principles which can be applied to practical problems in language teaching and translation, with special emphasis on transfer, interference and equivalents.”

Fisiak (1981:1) has defined CA as a subdiscipline of linguistics concerned with the comparison of two or more languages or subsystems of languages in order to determine both the differences and similarities between them. Verma et al. (1989: 348) maintain that the comparison of two or more linguistic systems as they exist today (i.e., a synchronic comparison) is known as contrastive linguistics. The diachronic comparison of two or more linguistic systems with a view of classifying languages into ‘families’ and finding out or reconstructing a parent language from which related languages have developed, is known as comparative or historical linguistics.

CA is not merely relevant to second language teaching but it can also make useful contribution to machine translation and linguistic typology. It is relevant to designing of teaching materials for use in all age groups.

Matthews (1979:44) postulates that contrastive analysis is any investigation in which the sentences of two languages are compared. A contrastive grammar establishes point-by-point relations between their
respective systems, with the aim e.g. of explaining, and thereby helping teachers to remedy errors made by speakers of one in learning the other. CA of different languages has made contribution to find out particularities and complexities of each language.

In the preface of his well-known book, *Linguistics across Cultures*, Robert Lado (1957) expresses the significance of the approach of contrastive linguistics that rests on the assumption that we can predict and describe the patterns that occasion difficulty in learning, on the one hand, and those that will not cause difficulty on the other.

The importance of contrastive analysis is that the comparison of the mother tongue with the foreign language being learnt paves the road for smooth and easy learning of a foreign language. Verma et al. (1989:348) point out that the mistakes committed in Second Language (L2) are due to:

1. the gravitational pull of the first language/mother tongue;
2. internal analogy and overgeneralization (e.g., *childrens*, *furnitures*, *teached*, *bringed*, *a milk*, etc., are ‘created’ on the basis of other items like *boys*, *tables*, *walked*, *worked*, *a man*, etc.);
3. pronunciation according to spelling;
4. bad teaching;
5. exposure to the non-standard variety used outside the classroom;
6. the attitudes of community, those in power, the policy of the government and such other factors;
7. failure to understand the nature of the second language;
8. lack of adequate vocabulary; and

9. the cultural gap between the two systems.

They assert that CA is only a predictive technique; in other words, this means that by looking at the structure of two or more linguistic systems we can predict the difficulties the learner is likely to encounter; it does not mean that the first language habits alone are responsible for all the mistakes a learner makes in the second language.

2.1.1 Language Transfer and Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis:

CA has a psychological basis because CA is founded on the assumption that Second Language (L2) learners will tend to transfer to their L2 utterances the formal features of their First language (L1) as Lado (1957:2) puts:

“individuals tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture, and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practised by natives.”

The term 'transfer', as extensively used in the first half of the 20th century, is defined as the carry over of prior linguistic knowledge to an L2 context. It refers to the psychological process whereby prior learning is carried over into a new learning situation. The main claim with regard to transfer is that the learning of task A will affect the subsequent learning of task B (Gass & Selinker 1994:54). Furthermore, Corder (1971:158) tries to
explain the reason of committing L2 errors due to the previous experiences that the learner gets from his mother tongue and tries to impose them into the second language learning. This view, to a great extent, supports the assumption that language is some sort of habit-structure as Behaviourists regard it. This transfer is either positive or negative:

i) Positive transfer (facilitation): where features of the L1 and the L2 match, and acquisition of the L2 is facilitated.

ii) Negative transfer (interference): acquisition hindered where features of L1 and L2 differ.

Positive transfer takes place when L1 habits facilitate L2 learning, while negative transfer occurs when L1 linguistic characteristics interfere with L2 learning.

Pragmatic and discourse transfer refers to the learners’ carrying over their L1 sociocultural and linguistic norms of politeness and/or appropriateness into their L2 performance of communicative acts.

Weinreich (1953:1) discusses how two language systems relate to each other in the mind of the learner and provides the definition of interference as follows:

“Those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact.”
This idea of creating difficulties by transfer was generalized later in the period from the 1940s to the 1960s as the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (or the strong form of language transfer theory). The hypothesis was linked to behaviourist learning theory, in which it is assumed that language is habit and that language learning involves the establishment of a new set of habits.

The central notion of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is advocated by Lado (1945) and Weinreich (1953) who support the view that those items that are similar to the learner’s native language will be easy for him, and those items that are different will be difficult. In other words, the greater the difference between the two systems of the mother tongue and foreign languages, the greater is the learning problem and the potential area of interference.

It is noteworthy to mention Wardhaugh’s (1970) contribution to the empirical status of CA. He has distinguished between the following two claims of CA:

- a strong (a priori) claim: L2 learning problems can be predicted on the basis of linguistic differences between LI and L2;
- a weak (a posteriori) claim: L2 learning problems can be explained on the basis of linguistic differences between LI and L2.

The strong claim has generally been made under the following two assumptions:

- The chance of L2 learning problems occurring will increase
proportionally to the linguistic differences between LI and L2: linguistic differences give rise to interference;

- The chance of L2 learning problems occurring decreases proportionally to the absence of linguistic differences between LI and L2; absence of linguistic differences gives rise to facilitation.

Furthermore, Lee (1968:186) has summed up these assumptions as follows:

(1) that the prime cause, or even the sole cause of difficulty and error in foreign language learning is interference coming from the learner's native language;

(2) that the difficulties are chiefly, or wholly due to the differences between the two languages that the greater these differences are, the more acute the learning difficulties will be;

(3) that the results of a comparison between the two languages are needed to predict the difficulties and errors which will occur in learning the foreign language.

(4) that what there is to teach can best be found by comparing the two languages and then subtracting what is common to them, so that what the student has to learn equals the sum of the differences established by the contrastive analysis.

The change that has to take place in the language behaviour of a foreign language student can be equated with the differences between the structure of the student’s native language and culture and that of the target
language and culture. The task of the linguist, cultural anthropologist, and the sociologist is to identify these differences. The task of the writer of a foreign language teaching program is to develop materials which will be based on a statement of these differences; the task of the foreign language teacher is to be aware of these differences and to be prepared to teach them; the task of the student is to learn them (Banathy, Trager, and Waddle, 1966). CA is generally concerned with comparing specific linguistic characteristics of two or more languages to identify, predict, and explain the problems in second language learning (L2) and teaching for the sake of developing teaching materials.

Fries (1945:9), indicating the usefulness of contrastive analysis in the context of foreign language teaching, affirms that the most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learnt, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner. As it is apparent, the task of the teacher of foreign language is to make a comparison of the foreign language with the native language of the learners to be able to predict the points of the real learning problems.

The contrastive analysis process essentially involves four stages, namely, description or explanation, selection, contrast and prediction. In the first stage, the structures of the languages to be compared are comprehensively described and analyzed according to a certain linguistic model
selected for that purpose. In the second stage, a decision is made about those aspects of the two languages to be used for comparison since it is impossible to contrast everything in the two languages. The third stage is the contrastive analysis itself where one linguistic system is mapped onto the other. The fourth stage is the stage in which the difficulties are accounted for or predicted.

Achieving the goals of comparison between two languages, Ellis (1985) has summarised those four processes to predict L2 errors as follows:

1. Description (i.e., a formal description of the two languages is made)
2. Selection (i.e., certain items, which may be entire subsystems, such as the auxiliary system, are selected for comparison)
3. Comparison (i.e., the identification of areas of difference and similarity)
4. Prediction (i.e., identifying which areas are likely to cause errors).

The contrastive method proves to be a useful tool capable of throwing valuable light on the characteristic features of the languages contrasted. Therefore, this method is implemented to explore the two languages under consideration, viz, English and Arabic.

2.1.2 Types of Contrastive Studies:

According to James (1980), there are two types of contrastive studies: theoretical (pure) and applied. Theoretical contrastive studies present a comprehensive and exhaustive analysis of phonology, syntax and semantics
of two or more languages. It provides an adequate model for comparison. It also specifies the elements subjected to comparison and the way of carrying out the comparison.

Fisiak (1978: 2) is concerned with universal studies as he states:

“Theoretical semantico - syntactic studies operate with universals, i.e., they specify how a given universal category is realized in the contrasted languages.”

Applied contrastive studies are related to an important branch of applied linguistics. They depend on the findings of the theoretical contrastive studies in providing framework for the comparison of languages. They select the important information for the purpose of teaching bilingual analysis and translation. Applied contrastive studies attempt to identify the potential problematic area in the target language. They are not only restricted to the differences but also to the similarities to save learners' efforts of identifying them.

It has been argued whether ‘applied linguistics’ is a science in its own right or not, and based on ‘pure’ linguistics. Corder (1973: 10) regards ‘applied linguistics’ as a technology based on pure linguistics, not as a science on its own, as he argues that the applied linguistics is a consumption of theoretical linguistics and not producing theories.

However, James (1980) advocates the view that there is a science of applied linguistics as he endorsed Malmberg’s (1971:3) statement, saying:

“The applications of linguistics can, and should, be looked upon as sciences in their own rights….we must be very careful not to mix up practical applications with purely scientific research.”
The assignment of CA to a science of applied linguistics is attributed to two reasons: first, that it is different from ‘pure’ linguistics in drawing on other scientific disciplines; and secondly, because linguistics is the science it draws most heavily upon. Supporting the view that CA is a form of both ‘pure’ and ‘applied’ linguistics, James (1980) concludes that applied CA is a central concern of applied linguistics. In the same connection, Wilkins (1972: 224) supports the view that the sole objective of CA is to improve pedagogy and as a result, it is ‘truly a field of applied language research’.

The term ‘Contrastive Linguistics’ or ‘Contrastive Analysis’ is especially associated with applied contrastive studies as a means of predicting and /or explaining difficulties of second language learners with a particular mother tongue in learning a particular target language.

With the broadening of linguistic studies in general in the 1970s and 1980s, contrastive studies became increasingly concerned with macro linguistic contrastive analysis (James 1980:98ff.): text linguistics, discourse analysis.

Most contrastive linguists have either explicitly or implicitly made use of translation as a means of establishing cross-linguistic relationships and in his book, Contrastive Analysis, Carl James (1980: 178) arrived at the conclusion that translation is the best basis of comparison as he says:

“We conclude that translation equivalence of this rather rigorously defined sort [including interpersonal and textual as well as ideational meaning] is the best available TC [tertium comparationis] for CA [contrastive analysis].”
From the above discussion, it can be summed up that CA is considered as a major subdiscipline of Applied Linguistics.

In his paper, ‘The Translation Paradigm’, Levenston (1965: 225) suggests that contrastive statements may be derived from either (a) a bilingual’s use of himself as his own informant for both languages, or (b) close comparison of a specific text with its translation.

Consequently, the present study would take advantage of the translation paradigm and depend on it while contrasting the two languages, namely, English and Arabic.

2.2 Semantics and Pragmatics:

In his semiotic trichotomy, Morris (1938: 6) had made a distinction between three branches, which was further developed by Carnap and Peirce in the 1930’s, as he states:

“syntactics (or syntax)- being the study of the formal relation of signs to one another; semantics -the study of the relations of signs to the objects to which the signs are applicable (their designata); and pragmatics -the study of the relation of signs to interpreters.”

The study of meaning and its manifestation in language is normally referred to as semantics from the Greek noun sema ‘sign, signal’; and the verb semains ‘signal, mean, signify’ (Varshney, 2002).

Semantics (Greek, semantikos, ‘significant’), is the study of the meaning of linguistic signs, i.e., words, expressions, and sentences. Broadly
Speaking, semantics is that aspect of linguistics which deals with the relations between referents (names) and referends (things) – that is, linguistic levels (words, expressions, phrases) and the objects or concepts or ideas to which they refer – and with the history and changes in the meaning of words. Diachronic (historical) semantics studies semantic change, whereas synchronic semantics accounts for semantic relationship, simple or multiple. Therefore the present study is a synchronic investigation of deixis in English and Arabic.

Semantics is studied from philosophical (pure) and linguistic (descriptive and theoretical) approaches, plus an approach known as general semantics. Philosophers look at the behaviour that goes with the process of meaning. Linguists study the elements or features of meaning as they are related in a linguistic system. One of the three major components considered in the ‘Aspects of the Theory of Syntax’ in the first complete model by Noam Chomsky was ‘Semantics’. Semantics is the study and representation of the meaning of language expressions, and the relationships of meaning among them (Allan, 1992).

General notion of semantics is that it studies the meaning that can be expressed. The keynote of a modern linguistic approach to semantics is that meaning can be best studied as a linguistic phenomenon with ‘knowledge of language’ and the ‘knowledge of real world’ (Leech, 1975).
A semantic theory is a general theory of language meaning, and should account for the correlation between the sense of language expression and its denotation. Denotation is the relation between language expression and what they denote in words. A semantic theory of a natural language is part of a linguistic description of that language (Katz & Fodor, 1963). They further state:

“Linguistic Description minus Grammar = Semantics (LD-G=S).”

That is, if the property belonging to grammar is subtracted from the problems in the description of a language, problems that belong to semantics can be determined. Grammar assigns structural description. To determine the domain of a semantic theory the formula LD-G=S may be applied. The speaker’s ability to interpret sentences provides empirical data for the construction of a semantic theory. Semantic theory describes and explains the interpretation and ability of speakers by accounting their performance in determining the number and content of the readings of a sentence, by detecting semantic anomalies by deciding on paraphrase relations between sentences and by marking every semantic relation. A semantic theory interprets the syntactic structure revealed by the grammatical description of a language.

In the recent years, there is a shift of emphasis on second language teaching and learning from a grammatical or formal approach to a growing interest in language use. As a subfield of linguistics developed in the late
1970s, pragmatics studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually a conversation.

According to Levinson (1983: 24), pragmatics refers to the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate. Pragmatics covers a number of topics including the ‘speech-act theory’ or the study of how we do things with sentences.

The word *pragma* is of Greek origin, meaning deed, activity, e.g., *prassein* or *prattein* means to pass through, experience, or practice (Webster Third New International Dictionary 1976).

Pragmatic theory was first originated as a philosophical theory (Morris, 1938; Wittgenstein, 1953; Austin, 1962; Strawson, 1964; and Searle, 1969). It can be seen, at least, in two fields: (1) a branch of semiotics- the study of signs and symbols-, where it is concerned with the relationship between signs or linguistic expressions and those who use them; (2) a branch of linguistics which deals with the contexts in which people use language and behaviour of speakers and listeners (London Dictionary of English, 1991).

It distinguishes two intents or meanings in each utterance or communicative act of verbal communication. One is the informative intent or the sentence meaning, and the other the communicative intent or speaker’s meaning (Leech, 1983; Sperber and Wilson, 1986). The ability to comprehend and produce a communicative act is referred to as pragmatic
competence (Kasper, 1997) which often includes one’s knowledge about the social distance, social status between the speakers involved, the cultural knowledge such as politeness, and the linguistic knowledge explicit and implicit.

Pragmatics is the study of the context-dependent aspects of meaning which are systematically abstracted away from the construction of logical form. Pragmatics seeks to “characterize the features of the speech context which help determine which proposition is expressed by a given sentence” (Stalnaker 1972: 383). The meaning of a sentence can be regarded as a function from a context (including time, place, and possible world) into a proposition, where a proposition is a function from a possible world into a truth value. Pragmatic aspects of meaning involve the interaction between an expression’s context of utterance and the interpretation of elements within that expression. The pragmatic sub-domain of deixis or indexicality seeks to characterize the properties of shifters, indexicals, or expressions like I, you, here, there, now, then, tense/aspect markers, etc. whose meanings are constant but whose referents vary with the speaker, hearer, time and place of utterance (Levinson, 1983). For Neville (1990), pragmatics involves three aspects of language use:

1. the study of discourse and conversational skills;
2. the study of the relationship between pragmatics and other levels of language; and
3. the study of the situational determinants of the use of language.
Leech (1983:6) defines pragmatics as the study of meaning in relation to speech situations and holds the view that it deals with utterance meaning rather than sentence meaning. In other words, the meaning of utterance is related to the speaker or user of the language. In his classical work, *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin (1962) has thrown light on new dimensions of language analysis. For him, speech is an action that has become the foundation for the development of communicative functions which is extended by Searle (1975; 1976). Blum-Kulka and Olshtain (1984: 196) point out:

“For applied linguists, especially those concerned with communicative language learning and teaching, cross-cultural research in pragmatics is essential in coping with applied aspect of the issue of universality to what extent it is possible to specify the particular pragmatic rules of use for a given language rule which second language learners will have to acquire in order to attain successful communication in the target language?”

As for them, the issue of universality is the basic challenge for the research in pragmatics. This study, thus, is an attempt to investigate the cross-linguistic variations of deixis between Arabic and English with a view to finding out the cross-cultural similarities and differences.

Levinson (1983: 9) seems to detect a conflict between those language-context relations that are and that are not grammaticalized when he defines pragmatics as “the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language”.
He further added that the main strength of this definition of pragmatics is that it restricts the field to purely linguistic matters (Levinson, 1983: 11).

Crystal (1987: 120) refers to pragmatics as those factors that govern our choice of language in social interaction and the effects of our choice on others. Fotion (1995), in The Oxford Companion to Philosophy, defines pragmatics as the study of language which focuses attention on the users and the context of language use rather than on reference, truth, or grammar.

Yule (1996:3) tries to correlate the knowledge shared by the sender and the receiver and relates it to the study of speaker meaning as he defined pragmatics as the study of meaning as communicated by speakers (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Davies (1995) says that the distinction between semantics and pragmatics is, roughly, the distinction between the significance conventionally or literally attached to words, and thence to whole sentences, and the further significance that can be worked out, by more general principles, using contextual information.

2.2.1 Contrastive Pragmatics:

The scope of traditional contrastive (linguistic) analysis has been extended beyond the levels of phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics to include discourse levels of language use. This type of study within pragmatics identifies cross-cultural and cross-linguistic pragmatic differences and similarities. Despite the pragmatic principles that exist
across languages, the ways people abide by in one language to realize communicative functions are often different in another.

Brown and Levinson (1987) have a view that speech acts are universal. Thus, several attempts have been made and the behaviour of speech acts across languages has been contrastively studied.

Contrastive pragmatics, however, is not confined to study certain pragmatic principles. Cultural break-downs and pragmatic failure, among other things, are also components of cross-cultural pragmatics.

Every language, however, has a set of lexemes which can be interpreted with reference to the speaker’s position in space or time such as here, there, now and then etc.

A major part of this thesis is devoted to highlighting cross-linguistic and cross-cultural differences and similarities between English and Arabic in terms of using personal, spatial and temporal deixis.

### 2.2.2 Semantics/Pragmatics Distinction:

We ordinarily distinguish between two aspects of what is communicated by an utterance: what it literally says and what it merely implies. For example, if you ask me if I have read Susan’s book and I respond that I never read biographies, I have implied, but not said, that Susan’s book is a biography. A common view among philosophers of language is that this ordinary distinction corresponds to the theoretical distinction between the information that is semantically encoded by a
sentence (i.e., its meaning or semantic content) and the additional information that is communicated by a particular utterance of a sentence (e.g., the conversational implicature of a given utterance). The study of the latter is generally seen as part of pragmatics rather than semantics.

Semantics is thus concerned with the meaning that is directly expressed, or encoded in sentences, while pragmatics deals with the principles that account for the way utterances are actually interpreted in context. Gazdar (1979a: 2), assuming that semantics is limited to the statement of truth conditions, has put:

“Pragmatics has as its topic those aspects of the meaning of utterances which cannot be accounted for by straightforward reference to the truth conditions of the sentences uttered. Put crudely:

PRAGMATICS = MEANING - TRUTH CONDITIONS.”

According to Fillmore (1981:144), pragmatics is concerned with the three-termed relation that unites (a) linguistic form (syntax) and (b) the communicative functions that these forms are capable of serving (semantics), with (c) the contexts or settings in which those linguistic forms can have those communicative functions.

Leech (1983:6) asserts that pragmatics and semantics are complementary for each other. For him, it is difficult to separate the two fields since they are interrelated and interwoven. He distinguishes three possible ways of structuring this relationship:
Semanticism (pragmatics inside semantics), pragmaticism (semantics inside pragmatics), and complementarism (they both complement each other, but are otherwise independent areas of research).”

Semantics deals with the conventional meaning of expressions. The conventional meaning of expressions is their contribution to the meaning of the sentences in which they occur, and the meaning of sentences is their speech act potential. Pragmatics studies speech acts, and semantics maps sentences onto the type of speech act they are designed to perform. It follows that there are two basic disciplines in the study of language: syntax and pragmatics. Semantics connects them by assigning speech act potentials to well-formed sentences, hence it presupposes both syntax and pragmatics.

Bach (1999) tries to make a distinction between two interpretations of linguistic utterances, i.e. semantic interpretation and Pragmatic interpretation. *Semantic interpretation* is the process whereby an interpreter exploits his or her knowledge of a language to assign to an arbitrary sentence of language its truth-conditions. Pragmatic interpretation is a totally different process. It is not concerned with language by itself, but with human action. When someone acts, there is a reason why he does what he does.

For Bach (2004), Semantic information is information encoded in what is uttered — these are stable linguistic features of the sentence — together with any extralinguistic information that provides (semantic) values to context-sensitive expressions in what is uttered. Pragmatic information is (extralinguistic) information that arises from an actual act of utterance, and
is relevant to the hearer’s determination of what the speaker is communicating. When semantic information is encoded in what is uttered, pragmatic information is generated by, or at least made relevant by, the act of uttering it.

Kempson (1988) tries to distinguish between semantics and pragmatics by saying:

“Semantics provides a complete account of sentence meaning for the language, [by] recursively specifying the truth conditions of the sentence of the language. … Pragmatics provides an account of how sentences are used in utterances to convey information in context.”

Katz (1977) draws the theoretical line between semantic interpretation and pragmatic interpretation by taking the semantic component to properly represent only those aspects of the meaning of the sentence that an ideal speaker-hearer of the language would know in an anonymous situation, where there is no clue whatever about the motive, circumstances of transmission, or any other factor relevant to understanding the sentence on the basis of its context of utterance.

By this brief review of the work done on semantics and pragmatics we arrive at the conclusion that semantics deals with the literal meaning of words or sentences and pragmatics starts at the point at which semantics ends, i.e. it deals with the utterance with connection to the context in which it is uttered. Kaplan (1989), delineating the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, puts:
The fact that a word or phrase has a certain meaning clearly belongs to semantics. On the other hand, a claim about the basis for ascribing a certain meaning to a word or phrase does not belong to semantics… Perhaps, because it relates to how the language is used, it should be categorized as part of … **pragmatics** …, or perhaps, because it is a fact about semantics, as part of … **Metasemantics**.”

### 2.3 Review of Related Works on Deixis:

Deixis nowadays is widespread as a subject of study in many languages. It helps to fill the gap between the linguistic forms that we use and the referents that we point at in the extralinguistic surrounding. There are many efforts done to describe how this phenomenon is fulfilled in languages.

One of these attempts is an investigation carried out by Reddy (2006) to examine the person system in Munda and Dravidian languages. An effort is conducted to explore the personal pronouns in the processes of lexicalization and inflection of person, number, gender, and animacy in the structure of verbs and certain other parts of speech. Many other characteristics of person like polite use of pronouns as honorifics, anaphoric functions of pronouns, the structure and meaning of demonstratives, interaction of person and other deictic elements are not discussed as the author suggests them for further survey. His work comes out with the conclusion that the Dravidian 3rd person pronouns lexicalize the features of number and gender which are redundantly copied in the verb (with the
exception of a few languages like Malayalam and Erukala). Animacy plays a major role in Munda languages for prompting object integration.

Another study in the field of deixis is done on 'the Romanian demonstratives in various types of deixis' by Calude (2002) with a view to exploring the types of deixis that Romanian demonstratives (proximal “acest/a” and distal “acel/a”) are involved in. In addition to their function as spatial deictics, Romanian demonstratives appear to function as discourse and emotional deictics. Their deictic use is discussed with reference to the specific Romanian forms employed as well as their pragmatic and semantic functions. The project is considered as a window into the intra-linguistic mechanisms of encoding contextual information and how these relate to each other. As stated by Calude (2002), Standard Romanian demonstratives are part of a two-way deictic system consisting of the features [+ proximal to the speaker] and [-proximal to the speaker], although there is disagreement regarding the deictic system of other dialects of Romanian.

Findings show that both the proximal and the distal demonstratives can act as discourse deictics, being able to refer to previous as well as following discourse. The scope of the proximal deictic can include noun phrases, sentence and clauses. In contrast, the distal demonstrative has a more limited scope, being able to point to noun phrases but not sentences (or clauses). The forms of the demonstratives have to agree in number and gender, but not case with the nouns which they are co-referential with. What is striking here is that the proximal deictic uses feminine forms when
pointing to entire sentences (or clauses) – never masculine or neuter ones. Furthermore, the Romanian distal demonstrative can also be used in emotional deixis, similarly to the proximal one, for the purpose of showing solidarity or closeness to the addressee or the topic of conversation. The proximal demonstrative shows physical closeness to the addressee and the distal one, physical distance from the hearer – being polar opposites of each other. When the physical distance is transposed to an abstract distance (i.e., an emotional distance), the two demonstratives act in the same way, i.e. both of them represent closeness to the audience.

Regarding temporal deixis, a survey in Punjabi is conducted by Mudhu Bala (1996) with a view to examining the correlation and correspondence between the semantics of tense in Punjabi and its grammatical form. The study starts with a brief description of Punjabi tense which is described in three moments: (i) the moment of speech (S); (ii) the moment of reference; and (iii) the moment of event (E). These three relational categories can be manifested through auxiliary tense operators, which agree with nouns and pronouns in gender and number. As the study disclosed, tensed propositions in Punjabi are not always time-bound and temporally restricted. In other words, there is no correspondence between the tense form and the time referred to. For example, it is not necessarily for present tense to express only present time; it may be used to refer to past or future time. This view supports King’s (1983) and Huddleston’s (1984, 2002)
ones that there is no correspondence between the grammatical form and the
time referred to.

The study ends with a conclusion that the verbal forms and the auxiliary tense operators do not display one to one correspondence between tense and time in Punjabi. Accordingly, the semantic value of the utterance or syntactic construction is measured at a deeper level because a sentence uttered in present tense may be an indicator of passed over period or future time.

A study was conducted by Mehmet Özcan (2004) on Turkish children, aging from 3 to 9-year-olds plus 13year-olds and adults, to examine how the use of the deixis varies with the increase of the age of the subjects. It is descriptive in nature with developmental perspective; that is, how the use of deixis differs in narratives relative to age of the narrator.

The data used in the study were collected through using Mercer Mayer’s (1969) wordless picture book Frog, where are you? Each age group contained fourteen informants, and with 14 adults, the subject group summed up 126.

The Turkish deictic expressions examined in the study are bu ‘this’, bura(sı) ‘here’; böyle ‘thus, like this’, şimdi ‘now’, o ‘she/he/it’, ora(sı) ‘there, yonder’, öyle ‘like that’ and o zaman ‘then, at that time’, including plural form and dative, accusative, ablative and genitive cases of each element. The other deictics such as first and second person pronouns, for
instance, are not included in the study for the reason that they did not emerge in the narratives because narrators did not involve themselves in the story events but acted as 3rd person narrators in the data set.

The study ends with noteworthy findings. In the first place, there is a close relationship between the use of deixis in narrative texts and the biological maturity, that is, cognitive capacity of the narrator. Younger children, namely, 3, 4, 5 and 6-year-olds, who are still at the stage of egocentric thought, use deixis deictically while anaphoric and cataphoric use of deixis increases with growing age. In other words, the number of deictics used by 3-year-olds is 464, the frequency decreases to 264 in 5-year-olds, to 176 in 7-year-olds, and 112 in 13-year-olds. As apparent from the figures and the variation of the age, it seems that at the age of 5, the frequency of the use of deixis is the greatest that considers this stage as the transitional age from preoperational period to concrete operations in the stages of cognitive development. This means that the child in the first stages uses the language deictically.

Finally, there are certain deictics that fundamentally tend to occur deictically rather than occurring anaphorically or cataphorically. For instance, the deictic use of proximal deictics here, like this and now never predominates their anaphoric occurrence in 13-year-olds and in adults’ narratives. Similarly, the distal deixis then / at that time is never observed to occur deictically. Thus, it can be argued that the occurrence of deixis
deictically or anaphorically is the result of the interplay between the age of the narrator and the nature of the deixis along with other contextual factors.

As far as we are concerned with deixis, an investigation is implemented by Jayaseelan and Hariprasad (2001) to examine the place deixis in the Dravidian pronominal system. They assume that all referring nominal expressions have Place Deixis, i.e. are marked as ‘proximal’ or ‘distal’. They postulate a Deixis Phrase in the extended nominal projection, possibly immediately under Case Phrase. The study shows that the correlation between reference and place deixis can be expressed in the case that the referential index of a referring nominal expression is not something other than Place Deixis, that the index is the “interpretation” of Place Deixis (of ‘this’ and ‘that’). They suggest that a non-linguistic object like a referential index should have a linguistic encoding and the Place Deixis is that linguistic encoding.

In his paper ‘Deictic Expressions and Discourse Segment in English and Japanese Task-Oriented Dialogue’, Yoshida (2003) has three aims: (1) to provide a pragmatic perspective in a contrastive study of deictic expression in English and Japanese spontaneous dialogue, (2) to suggest the implications for both Givenness Hierarchy model (1993) and Centering model of discourse reference, based on a preliminary study of a task-oriented speech, and then (3) to predict the way deictic elements can contribute to discourse organization in structuring and focusing the specific discourse segment. His study is based on data of English and Japanese
dialogue corpus. In the first place, the data was collected from a selection of eight English dialogues based on maps on which labels had not been written to identify the landmarks after completing the original Map Task Corpus (MTC) compiled by Human Communication Research Centre (HCRC), Edinburgh, UK. Doing so, the labelless MTC is relevant data in the sense that the lack of written labels on the maps encourages the participants to construct their own expressions to identify entities of landmarks and to employ a number of deictic expressions than the maps of ‘ready-made’ written labels. Secondly, the Japanese MTC has been conducted as a project at Chiba University, Japan, based on the Edinburgh MTC with respect to map and route designs and situational parameters such as familiarity and eye contact. 128 dialogues have been collected. The small data of 8 dialogues based on Japanese labelless MTC have been collected at Mie University, Japan, using the same labelless maps as MTC and the same experimental design: familiar and unfamiliar pair, each participant plays a role as a giver twice on the same map with different followers, and then as a follower twice with different givers and different maps. In Japanese data, he also predicts that there are a number of deictic expressions that may be considered parallel in discourse function to the one assumed in English labelless MTC.

The purpose of his study is to examine three aspects of deictic expression, which are: spatial deixis, anaphoric demonstratives, and discourse deixis in English and Japanese. The selection of these is due to the fact that the actual use of these categories is interactively related in discourse
processing of dialogue. He assumes that although each deictic system of English and Japanese is different in linguistic form and function, there may be a pragmatically significant parallelism on the correlation between the choice of deictic expressions and the discourse segment.

He has found out that *sono* NP and *that/that* NP mainly occurred in RETAIN and SMOOTH- or ROUGH-SHIFT centering transitions. This result can support the claim that anaphoric demonstratives are often used to indicate a referent that is somewhat unexpected and not currently in the focus of attention (Diessel, 1999). Demonstrative determiner has some special effect or implicature, where the referent has been activated but not focused on. He argued that the deictic centre can be shifted from the speaker to the addressee, depending on how the current discourse is organised: the typical evidence can be the use of the medial *so*-series in Japanese and *that/that* NP in English, because these are the linguistic forms that are accessible to the hearer’s domain. He finalized it with a suggestion of a further study to explain in what condition anaphoric demonstratives are employed, what types of discourse factors are correlated with the discourse segment by signalling the boundary, and how the interaction between grammatical or Zero Topic and deictic elements is interpreted.

Another interesting study was conducted by Koike (1988) to explore 'the Brazilian Portuguese request and the role of deixis in politeness'. It aims at discussing the linguistic strategies of conditional tense and second person
reference in requests to express politeness. The study assumes that
defocalization of the speaker's role makes the request more polite and less
rude. In other words, using certain expressions to denote humility or
modesty on the part of speaker is judged as polite. Furthermore, he extended
the idea to the formulation of a general 'Principle of Egocentric
Minimization in Politeness' which is stated as: "For greater degrees of
politeness minimize the speaker's egocentric role in the utterance". He went
on arguing by giving examples from Brazilian Portuguese and their
translation in English. He comments that the present tense coincides directly
with the deictic centre of present coding time, and thereby creating a more
direct illocutionary force and a corresponding less quality of politeness. He
concludes that the use of the conditional tense is the most appropriate form
to express the highest point of politeness in Brazilian Portuguese, English,
and Spanish. This is due to the temporal shift away from the deictic centre,
i.e. from the speaker's present moment of speaking. To evaluate the second
strategy, he examined the relationship between person deixis and politeness
by checking the interrogative and the declarative conditional / imperfect
subjunctive structure on data collected from native adult speakers from Rio
de Janeiro, Brazil. He found out that requests in declarative format are less
polite and have more illocutionary force than requests in question format,
since it is less imposing and offers more options. Examples he gave are as
follows:

- *Eu pediria que o senhor se sentasse ali*
  'I would ask that you sit there'
Furthermore, he extends his survey to examine the aspect of egocentricity of personal deixis. He explains that the increasing force can again be found in shifting away from the speaker's deictic orientation in terms of the personal deixis manifested in the framing of the request from the hearer's instead of the speaker's point of view to give greater control to the hearer. In other words, directives that are speaker-based explicitly express the speaker's will that the hearer perform X, for instance, 'Do X'. By this, the request is impolite and ruder as it sounds as a command and imperative rather than a request. He enumerates that speaker-based directives, a question asserting the speaker's opinion and negative interrogative requests are considered to be less polite and more focalized on the speaker rather than the hearer on one hand. On the other hand, when a request is hearer-based, the hearer, receiving the request, appears to have the choice as whether or not to do the action, and consequently, the hearer appears to have the control in the situation. An example he gave to illustrate this is as follows:

- *Podia fazer X?*
  "Could you do X?"

Accordingly, the speaker-based requests, being more egocentric, are less polite than those which are hearer-based. In other words, the more the speaker conveys that s/he is considering the hearer's wants and desires in producing the utterance, the more politeness s/he communicates.
At last, he arrived at the conclusion that the more polite directives are not only expressed in the conditional tense, but are also 'hearer-based', while the less polite are expressed in the present tense and are 'deictically-centred'. This supports the hypothesis that the greater the distance from the deictic centre is, in temporal or person dimensions, the greater the degree of politeness and the lesser the degree of illocutionary force.

As shown in this brief review of previous studies on deixis and its diverse types, the present survey is an attempt to examine the deixis of person, time, and place in English and Arabic with a view to establishing a framework of Arabic deictic system. Furthermore, this will help pick out the similarities and differences for pedagogic purposes. Regarding Arabic linguistics, this study is considered the first of its kind in this field.

As a part of the survey of deixis, it is noteworthy to mention the different uses of deixis that are dealt and explored by various scholars and linguists.

2.3.1 Different Uses of Deictic Expressions:

There are important distinctions in the uses of deictic expressions (henceforth, deictics) in which a deictic can be used in one or more three ways. Fillmore (1971b, 1997) calls these ways: gestural, symbolic, and anaphoric.
According to Levinson (1983), it is essential to distinguish deictic from non-deictic usages of deictic expressions. In this part, these three uses are discussed with a view to distinguishing their uses in different contexts.

2.3.1.1 Gestural Use:

This is the most basic function of deixis as it relates the referent in the real world to the linguistic form used to indicate that referent. Rauh (1983: 44) states that what characterizes this type is the presence and correlation of the deictic expression and the object referred to at the situation of the utterance in which utterance are considered as situation-bound. The association of visual and acoustic gestures with the utterances of deictic expressions is also possible.

Lyons (1995:307) refers to this type as ‘pure deixis’ whose expression meaning can be accounted for fully in terms of the notion of deixis. That is, they refer to the locutionary agent and the addressee without conveying any additional information about them such as the first-person and second-person pronouns in English, ‘I’ and ‘you’, are purely deictic. Similarly, the demonstrative adjectives and adverbs (in contrast with the demonstrative pronouns), ‘this’ versus ‘that’ and ‘here’ versus ‘there’, when they are used with spatio-temporal reference, are pure deictics: they identify the referent (an entity or a place) in relation to the location of the locutionary act and its participants.
Based on these prerequisites, it is possible to accompany utterances of deictic expressions by visual and acoustic gestures. For example,

- Harvey can only speak about *this loud*
- Don't do it *now*, but *NOW!*

In the same vein, Himmelmann (1996: 240) defines this type as situational use, which involves the notion of relative distance to some deictic centre and serves to establish a referent in the universe of discourse. Halliday emphasizes that the child’s semiotic acts are Gestural, rather than vocal, and that the earlier exophoric (i.e., deictic) expressions tend to be accompanied with a gesture of attention.

Fillmore (1971b: 223, 1997) refers to gestural use of deictics as the use by which the expressions are fully interpretable only if the addressee is able to perceive and monitor certain physical aspects of the communication act. That is, deictics used in a gestural deictic way can only be interpreted with reference to an audio-visual-tactile, and in general a physical monitoring of the speech event. Instances would be demonstrative pronouns used with a selecting gesture, as in:

- *This* one’s genuine, but *this* one is a fake

and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person pronoun with a certain gesture as in:

- I want *you*, and *you*, and *you*, to go there with me \(\text{(said while poking one’s arms in a group of people)}\)

Levinson (1983:67) remarks that it is also quite possible for the gestural usage to be combined with the non-deictic anaphoric usage too:
• I cut a finger: *this* one

Here *this one* refers to whatever *a finger* refers to, but simultaneously must be accompanied by a presentation of the relevant finger.

Fillmore (1971b:223) acknowledges that the majority of words in a language are incapable of being used gesturally, and that includes the distal time (deictic adverb). That is, in English, there are gestural uses for *'I', 'you', 'here', 'there', 'this', 'that',* and *'now',* but none for *'then'.* He furthermore asserts that there is just one word in English which is obligatorily accompanied by a gesture, and that is the colloquial size-indicator (*yea*), as in:

• It's about *yea* big  (said holding up hands to show size)

### 2.3.1.2 Symbolic Use:

Symbolic usage is what is called “deictic-centre expansion”. In this usage, the deictic centre itself, where the speaker is located, is a referent and it expands as far as the speaker can imagine, for instance:

• *This* city stinks.

Fillmore (1971b: 227) states that the basic symbolic use is the use by which locations are identified relative to their association with the speaker, or with the hearer, the use whose interpretation depends on the hearer’s knowing where the relevant interlocutor is. Thus, symbolic usage of deictic terms requires for their interpretation only knowledge of, in particular, the
basic spatio-temporal parameters of the speech event (but also, on occasion, participant-role and discourse and social parameters). Examples of this use are:

- *This city* is really beautiful
- *Is Johnny there?* (on the telephone)

Knowing the general location of the participants is sufficient in order to interpret the previous utterances.

Attempting to formulate the distinction between gestural and symbolic uses of deictics, Levinson (1983:65-66) states:

“gestural usages require a moment by moment physical (or vocal) monitoring of the speech event for their interpretation, while symbolic usages make reference only to contextual co-ordinates available to participants antecedent to the utterance.”

### 2.3.1.3 Anaphoric Use:

By anaphoric use of deictics, Fillmore (1997: 62-63) refers to it as that use which can be correctly interpreted by knowing what other portion of the same discourse the expression is coreferential with, for example:

- I drove the car to *the parking lot* and left it *there*

In the previous utterance, ‘*there*’ is used anaphorically, referring to the expression ‘*the parking lot*’ mentioned previously in the discourse.

Lyons (1977: 660) defines an anaphor as that anaphoric expression that refers to the referent of the antecedent expression with which it is correlated. Himmelmann (1996: 240) calls it ‘tracking use’ and defines it as the use of demonstratives for referents which have already been mentioned.
Text deixis and discourse deixis are sometimes used interchangeably while they are distinguished in a narrow sense. Levinson (1983: 62) seems not to differentiate the two types of use as he states that discourse deixis has the function to relate the encoding of reference to parts of the open discourse in which the utterance, which includes the text referring expression, is located. The two examples to illustrate this are as under:

- Puff puff puff: *that* is what it sounded like.
- *This* (in creaky voice) is what phoneticians call creaky voice.

These two examples fall into text deixis in a narrow sense. Text deixis is the literal reference to a physical text segment (Lyons 1977, Himmelmann 1996, Pederson and Wilkins 1996). Discourse deixis in a narrow sense is reference to a proposition expressed by the text (Himmelmann 1996, Pederson and Wilkins 1996). This use is parallel to what Lyons (1977) called ‘impure text deixis’ whose expressions’ meaning is partly deictic and partly non-deictic, such as the 3rd person in English: *he, she,* and *it.* Lyons (1977) construed this use as being located between anaphora and deixis, for example:

- I’ve never even seen him.
- *That’s* a lie.

Here, we do not know whether *that* refers to what is said in the first sentence or any referent outside the sentence.
2.4 Concluding remarks:

As shown in this chapter, a survey has been given about the contrastive linguistics and how it is important to the process of teaching and learning a foreign language. It tries to pick out the similarities and differences between two or more languages with a view to employing the findings to facilitate and design materials for the process of teaching and learning a foreign language. Moreover, this chapter displays a concise description of semantics and pragmatics and how they are distinguished in literature. It is appropriate to mention some works written on deixis in other languages as exposed in literature and the various types of deixis as discussed by linguists. In addition, the different uses (gestural, symbolic, and anaphoric) relevant to deixis are discussed to level the grounds for the upcoming discussion in the following chapters.