

Anadeixis and the signalling of discourse structure

Francis Cornish

▶ **To cite this version:**

Francis Cornish. Anadeixis and the signalling of discourse structure. Referential devices in the grammar-discourse interface. Cohesion, coherence and cognition, In press. hal-01925940

HAL Id: hal-01925940
https://univ-tlse2.hal.science/hal-01925940

Submitted on 18 Nov 2018

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

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

QUADERNS DE FILOLOGIA

LINGUISTIC STUDIES

REFERENTIAL DEVICES IN THE GRAMMAR-DISCOURSE INTERFACE.
COHESION, COHERENCE AND COGNITION

FACULTAT DE FILOLOGIA, TRADUCCIÓ I COMUNICACIÓ
UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA 2018

Cornish, Francis. 2018. "Anadeixis and the signalling of discourse structure". *Quaderns de Filologia. Estudis Linguïstic*. "Referential devices in the grammar-discourse interface. Cohesion, coherence and cognition". http://dx.doi.org/xx.xxxx.xxxx.xx

Anadeixis and the signalling of discourse structure*

Francis Cornish

CLLE-ERSS, Université de Toulouse Jean-Jaurès, CNRS, UT2J, France
Maison de la Recherche,
5, Allée Antonio Machado,
31058 Toulouse Cedex 9,
France

cornish@univ-tlse2.fr

Abstract

By "anadeixis" (a termed first coined by Ehlich, 1982) is meant, prototypically, the indexical functioning of certain context-bound expressions to target discourse entities which are either not yet topical, or whose erstwhile topical status has faded.

It is the discourse-structuring function of anadeictic indexicals that will be the particular focus of this study. The basis for the discussion will be two short whole texts, in two languages (French and English). This will make it possible to show how certain 'strict'-anadeictic and discourse-deictic references may signal the macro- (content structures) and super-structures (discourse-functional structures) that characterize them. Such references may serve either to foreshadow a transition between major discourse units within a given text, or to actually introduce one.

Keywords: anadeixis; context; discourse deixis; discourse structure; text.

* I would like to thank Anita Fetzer and Daniel García Velasco for their remarks on earlier drafts of this text, as well as the two anonymous referees from *Quaderns de Filologia* for their comments on the version submitted to the editors.

Francis Cornish

1. Introduction

In the literature on indexical reference (anaphora especially), the main preoccupation tends to be with the resolution of indexicals as a contribution to a **representation** of particular states of affairs, discourse entities, etc. The authors of such studies often adopt a truth-functional approach to the markers at issue — that is, the goal is to specify which amongst a set of candidate referents is the one to be assigned to a particular indexical. However, although this aspect is indeed significant and relevant, it by no means exhausts the area. Indeed, there is also the crucial interpersonal dimension (both interlocutive and intersubjective)[1], as well as the contribution indexicals may make to the structuring of the discourse associated with a given text in conjunction with a relevant context —the central concern of this chapter.

Furthermore, in all indexical references, it's not the individual linguistic marker used, in and of itself, which fulfils this function, but rather the indexical referential **procedure** (whether pure deixis, "anadeixis" or anaphora) that is chosen by the speaker/writer. The marker selected, together with the host predication as a whole, is but the means that is made available via the language system in order to realize the particular procedure used. This relation between the language system and the use made in context of the resources it offers the user is reflected in the well-known fact that the same expression types (here indexicals) may be used with different discourse functions, and that the same discourse function may be fulfilled by diverse (indexical) expression types.

We start by outlining certain analytic preliminaries (section 2) before dealing with the main issue to be developed in this chapter. Section 3 presents for analysis two short (written) texts, which are analyzed in terms of the discourse structure which may be associated with them, and then shows how the various anadeictically-functioning

[1] Cf. also Scott (2016: 70, 75-77, 80, 81) as far as 3rd person pronouns are concerned.

markers which head each component discourse unit serve to signal each such articulation. Section 4 extrapolates from the descriptive emphasis in section 3, and seeks to arrive at certain generalizations regarding the discourse-structuring signals involved.

2. Some analytic preliminaries

2.1 *The three-way distinction amongst **text**, **discourse** and **context***

The literature on discourse analysis frequently confuses or conflates the terms *text* and *discourse*. What I am calling *text* here embraces the entire perceptible trace of an act of utterance, whether written or spoken. As such it includes paralinguistic features of the utterance act, as well as non-verbal semiotically relevant signals such as gaze direction, pointing and other gestures, etc. —*i.e.* not just the purely verbal elements. *Text* is essentially linear, unlike *discourse* (see below). Thus, *text* may be viewed as the connected sequence of perceptible cues (i.e. the physical product of an act of utterance) provided by the speaker/writer for their addressee/reader to infer the *discourse* (the negotiated content) that may be associated with a given stretch of text in conjunction with a relevant *context*.

Discourse by contrast is the ever-evolving, revisable interpretation of a particular communicative event, which is jointly constructed mentally by the discourse participants as the text and a relevant context are perceived and evoked (respectively). This on-line interpretation is later converted into a mental discourse representation, capable of being stored in long-term memory. The units of a discourse do not necessarily correspond to syntactic constituents on the textual level. They are structured in terms both of background units, which serve to anchor the central discourse representations both modally and referentially, and of foreground units, which are capable of advancing the communication process. It is the structuring of a discourse in terms of hierarchical layers that makes possible the realization of these various discourse functions. By contrast, the textual trace of a connected sequence of utterance acts is short-lived, since once the discourse associated with it is constructed, that trace is not maintained in working-, let alone in long-term memory —at least, in the normal, usual use of language.

As for *context*, this crucial dimension comes in multiple aspects, the most important of which is undoubtedly the utterance situation: this acts

as the default anchoring point for the discourse to be constructed. Other aspects are the interlocutive relationship, ever-evolving throughout the communicative event, the domain of reference at issue (including the local or general world knowledge that goes with it), the socio-cultural frame in which the exchange takes place, the co-text surrounding a given indexical expression, the discourse constructed upstream, the occasion of the exchange, and the genre of the speech event that is assumed by the participants. The context of each utterance is created or re-created continuously throughout a given communicative event, and is not "pre-set" in advance of it (cf. also Laury, 2002: 84).

Below is an interesting (though extreme!) attested illustration of how context influences the interpretation(s) of a text (here a fragment):

(1) [Context announced by radio newsreader: Someone is attempting to reach the South Pole alone on foot, with no outside help]
Start of pre-recorded report: "One of my staff discovered signs of life…" (Cornish, 1999: 35, ex. (2.9))

This was the wrong pre-recorded report for the news item just announced. However, even before the mistake was admitted, so strong was the determining influence of the context announced for the item that I (and no doubt many other listeners as well!) rapidly made on-line a number of inferences in order to try to coherently integrate the information derived from this text fragment into the context given: that the individual involved had not been in (emergency) radio contact at all, that a search party had been sent to rescue him/her, and that one of the speaker's "staff" had noticed faint stirrings in the snow ("signs of life")…

To illustrate the distinctive contributions of the three dimensions of *text*, *context* and *discourse*, let's look now at another attested example, the headline of an article published in the Sunday broadsheet newspaper *The Observer* (19.08.07, p. 9):

(2) "It gets scoops. It makes money. What more must *The Mirror* do?"

This extract consists of three independent main clauses, the first two of which are parallel in structure (NP [$_{VP}$ V_{pres} NP]), each containing an identical inanimate subject pronoun. The third is a WH-interrogative serving to evoke a rhetorical question, negatively oriented. This,

together of course with the lexical content of the three clauses concerned, is the *text-level* structure of the utterance. Now, these pronouns are in a cataphoric relation with a referent evoked via the subject NP of the third independent clause, namely *The Mirror*[2]. This referential dependency suffices to make the first two indexical clauses discourse-pragmatically dependent on the third, "antecedent"-containing clause. A further factor enabling the discourse-level integration of the three clauses is the fact that the adverb *more* in the third requires a complement denoting a point of comparison (i.e. "more than **x**"). And indeed it is the ellipsis of the two propositions evoked via the two preceding clauses that provides this argument (i.e. "getting scoops and making money"). So there is anaphora here (in the strict sense[3]) in addition to cataphora, a factor which increases by that token the tightness of the connection at issue.

The *discourse-level* integration of the three independent clauses in (2) would make use of the rhetorical relation *Concession*. Informally, the discourse could be formulated as follows (resolving the rhetorical question implying an expected negative response in the third clause in this context): "In spite of the fact that *The Mirror* gets scoops and makes profits, it is still not clear what more than this it can do (in order to survive as a commercial enterprise)". The *contex*t facilitating this is clearly the reader's assumed prior knowledge that, at the time of publication, the British tabloid newspaper *The Mirror* was in serious financial difficulty, as well as their more general encyclopedic knowledge that a newspaper's "getting scoops" and "making profits" would normally secure its viability as a business concern.

Now, this three-way distinction is crucial for characterizing the way in which indexical reference operates. First, as pointed out earlier, the *text* only provides certain perceptible cues —in this case, what I call the "antecedent trigger" (a verbal fragment, non-verbal signal or percept: see Cornish, 2010: 227-9) and second, the indexical marker, each within its respective co-textual fragment—; but it is the *discourse* which makes available as well as accessible, via a complex interaction between co-text and context, a mental representation of the discourse object targeted thereby; this representation evolves with the ongoing

---

[2] See Mittwoch (1983) for further examples of this type, as well as a comparable theoretical position adopted on them.

[3] I.e. where the textual antecedent precedes the anaphor in the linear stream of text.

flow of the communication. The 'antecedent', then, is a discourse representation providing a provisional description in terms of what is predicated or inferred of the discourse referent to which it relates. Under this conception, there is no necessarily direct relation between the antecedent trigger and the indexical marker. See Cornish (2010) for a fuller discussion and illustration of all these factors.

2.2. *Deixis, anadeixis* and *anaphora*

Deixis and *anaphora* are indexical procedures whose *raison d'être* is to manage the coordination of the participants' attention focus throughout a discourse. It is through the construction, modification and access to the content of mental models of the ongoing discourse that users exploit them. These models are represented in working (and later stored in long-term) memory as the communicative event proceeds.

Prototypically, *deixis* acts to orientate the addressee's/reader's attention focus towards a new discourse object which s/he is invited to represent mentally, by default on the basis of the utterance situation — whose centre point (Bühler's, [1934] 1990 "origo") is the speaker's (and the addressee's) verbal and non-verbal activity. Deixis makes it possible to anchor the discourse to be constructed as a function of the text interpreted within a relevant context: as such, it establishes on each occasion of use a new context, by re-setting the values of the basic contextual parameters for the ensuing communicative process[4].

As for (discourse) *anaphora*, this procedure constitutes a tacit instruction to **maintain** the attention focus in force during the preceding act of utterance —in other words, the state of the discourse model pre-existing at the point of use of the anaphor which, as an integral part of its host predication, is used to realize this discourse-referring procedure. The anaphoric procedure is implemented via the use of indexical markers that are normally non-prominent phonologically (typically, 3rd person pronouns, null pronouns and reduced definite or possessive NPs). Anaphora, unlike deixis or "anadeixis" (see below), serves to signal the continuity of the previous discourse representation, updated

[4] These parameters are the deictic space and time, the discourse roles of current speaker and addressee assigned to one or other of the participants, and the source of the viewpoint currently at issue.

via what is predicated or inferred of the assumed referent of the anaphor involved.

Yet the relation between deixis and anaphora is not symmetrical. According to Lyons (1975), Bühler ([1934] 1990) and others, anaphora is dependent upon deixis, and is secondary and derivative in relation to it (both ontogenetically and phylogenetically). For deixis is the more elementary procedure. The true relationship holding between the two procedures is that of a cline, with a medium term dubbed "anadeixis" by Ehlich (1982). *Anadeixis* combines the deictic and the anaphoric procedures in various different proportions, according to the subtype of anadeictic reference chosen in any particular instance[5]. In my conception of this hybrid indexical procedure, there are at least three distinguishable subtypes[6]:

- **'Strict' anadeixis**[7]: this involves a subsequent reference to a discourse object evoked upstream (i.e. earlier) in a given discourse, but which is no longer —or which is not yet— topical at the point where the retrieval is effected. Ex: "*...The journalist (...) gets hold of a copy of the tape [a "cursed" video-tape said to bring death to anyone who watches it] and (...) traces it to its source.* ***This****(/#****It****) turns out to be a stable on an island...*" (Extract from a review of the film "The Ring" by Andrew Collins, *Radio Times* 7-13.08.04, p. 41);

- **Recognitional anadeixis**: the indexical targeting of a referent —which may be an event, often stereotypical — which is assumed to be mutually known by the interlocutors, hence represented in the shared part of their long-term memories. Ex: A to B: *Do you remember* ***that camping holiday we spent in Spain two summers ago****?*; and

- **Discourse deixis**[8]: the act of "cognitively targeting" a discourse representation accessible in working memory, and creating out of it via inference a partially new discourse entity. This entity will thus have both

[5] In all instances of anadeictic reference, there is a "pointing" dimension involved since, unlike with canonical anaphora, the intended referent is not the one that is currently salient and topical.

[6] The first and third of these subtypes, as well as canonical deixis and anaphora, will be further illustrated in texts (5) and (6) in §3 below.

[7] See the comparable notion of "anaphoric demonstratives" proposed by Diessel (1999).

[8] See Cornish (2007) for the distinction amongst 'strict' anadeixis, discourse deixis, and canonical anaphora.

new and given properties at the level of discourse. Ex: "*We intend to record the guest speakers, so **these** will be available to participants at the end of the Conference..."* (Welcoming speech by the Director of the Language Centre, *AFLS* conference, University of Edinburgh, 19.09. 91)

Figure 1 below presents the various indexical referring procedures presented above in the form of a Scale.

Deixis > [Discourse deixis > Recognitional anadeixis > 'Strict' anadeixis] > Anaphora
<----------anadeixis---------->

Figure 1: Scale of indexical referring procedures

Let us look now at a selection of the indexical markers that are capable of realizing the three main indexical referring procedures.

Let's take to begin with demonstrative NPs marked for the deictically-relevant distinction "proximal" vs. "distal". The proximal form *this (N)* is the marked member of the pair *this/that (N)*, the complementary member *that (N)* being the unmarked one. Used in context, the head noun of proximal demonstrative NPs normally corresponds to non-presupposed information concerning the intended referent. This noun, potentially accompanied by modifiers and/or complements, serves rather to classify the referent targeted in terms of the subjective perspective being adopted by the speaker/writer on it (cf. Maes & Nordman, 1995).

Demonstrative NPs introduced by the distal determiner *that*, on the other hand, enjoy a lesser degree of speaker-subjectivity in use, and involve setting up either a sphere of reference from which the speaker dissociates him/herself, or one in which speaker's and addressee's personal spheres are jointly aligned[9]. In the latter case, the entity targeted is presented as constituting already negotiated information, in interactional terms. This means that *that (N)* NPs are more readily suited to the anadeictic use, though of course pure deixis is perfectly well realizable thereby.

An interesting attested contrast in the uses of *this* and *that* (as

[9] Cf. also Fetzer (2011: 136) who characterizes the use of distal *there* in British political interviews in similar terms:

> […] *there* generally fulfils a discourse-deictic, anaphoric function, indexing particular contextual frames (or metaphorical social spaces), […] re-activating contextual frames which have already been construed by the interlocutors.

pronouns) occurred in a recent article in *The Observer on-line*:

(3) [Context: On attempting to catch her last train home one evening, a young teacher was refused a request for withdrawal from the cash dispenser to pay for the ticket, her bank account being empty. She mentioned this to a man nearby, and he went and withdrew £5, which he gave her to buy her ticket]

> "…But from time to time there's a chink of kindness from someone from the generation above us who have had it so much easier than us, and *this* was *that*." (Beth Ryan, "A quick note to say thank you to the stranger who gave me a fiver". *The Observer on-line* 25.02.18)

The pronoun *this* in line 3 of the text proper in (3) arguably realizes a pure deixis procedure, but in terms of 'vicarious' deixis (Bühler's ([1934] 1990) category "*Deixis am Phantasma*"; cf. Rubba, 1996): for this is an instance of the writer's re-representing the scene of the handing over of the £5 note in her mind's eye, and referring to it as if she were actually present at the event. And the pronoun *that* in the same line clearly refers anadeictically to the 'metadiscursive' characterization of this event just evoked in the preceding clause. This is a *text-deictic* reference.

As regards definite NPs, their head noun, in contrast to the lexical component of demonstrative NPs, does not normally represent speaker-based classifications of their intended referent. This is so since the category of entity which they denote is normally pragmatically presupposed of it. Moreover, definite expressions refer "inclusively", whereas demonstrative ones do so "exclusively": the use of the latter implies that there are other entities of the same type which are not included in the set of entities to which they refer (cf. the implication of a contrast habitually associated with the use of demonstratives). This property makes definite NPs, rather than demonstrative ones, more suitable for realizing canonical anaphora. But they may also be used to realize deixis and ('strict') anadeixis, as we will see in §3 below.

Finally, the use of unaccented 3rd person pronouns carries the implication, not only that their intended referent is pragmatically presupposed and is available for subsequent retrieval, but that it is at the centre of attention of the speech participants at the point of use (see the two inanimate pronouns in (2) above). There is therefore no need, in principle, to initiate a cognitively costly search on the addressee's

part in order to locate it. Such markers serve to signal the continuity as well as the means of integration of the ongoing discourse.

3. The discourse-structuring function of certain anadeictic markers

We are now ready to tackle the major goal of this chapter. Let us start with a short text from French (the discourse structure representation of this text in English precedes the text itself (see (5) below), to accommodate non-French language readers). The text is a review of an amusing account by two sociologists of the campaign by certain wealthy inhabitants of a well-to-do area of Paris to stop part of their area being taken over for use by poorer ones (more accurately, in fact, both the book reviewed and the review itself highlight the public/private ownership debate).

(4) Discourse structure of text (5)[10]

Unit	Discourse function
1.	(Para (i)): **Introduction of macro-topic**: a review of an illustrated survey by two French sociologists of a dispute involving rich inhabitants of the exclusive 16th Paris district and poorer inhabitants of the periphery regarding the use of the Bois de Boulogne.
	(1a) (Para (ii)): **Continuation of macro-topic outline**: **explanation of origin of the dispute**: the building of a special shelter for homeless people in the nearby Bois de Boulogne by the Town Hall and Préfecture, and the vociferous reactions to it by some of the 16th district inhabitants.
2.	(Para (iii)): **Presentation of two representative leaders of the protests, and the reason for these**: that the Bois de Boulogne public park has been "privatized" by this move. Yet one of these leading protesters is a member of an exclusive club which already takes up 7 hectares of the Bois…
	(2a) (Para (iv)): **Development of previous point about the hypocrisy of the protesters' campaign**: they have already set up 6 private clubs taking up 26 hectares of the park, including pigeon-shooting and polo activities. Moreover, when a contemporary art foundation was built in 2011 on theoretically "unbuildable" land in the park, no-one batted an eyelid…
3.	(Para (v)): **Brief historical evocation of similar protests**: already in

[10] Indentations signal a subordinate sub-unit embedded within a more central discourse unit.

1930, the wealthy 16th district inhabitants protested against a plan to build social housing, and transformed the results into luxury residences.

(3a) (Lines 5-8): **Other controversies** centred round a Romany circus, eventually installed in 2015, which was delayed by vigorous protests for some months; and the same scenario surrounded the building of social housing in the Porte d'Auteuil, finally opened in 2016.

4. (Para (vi)): **Coda**: **Overall evaluation of the book being reviewed**: a highly relevant, worrying, but nonetheless amusing account of the dispute, illustrated satirically by Etienne Lecroart.

(5) "Face aux pauvres les riches résistent": Book review of *Panique dans le 16e !* by M. Pinçon-Charlot and M. Pinçon (La Ville Brûle, 2017)[11]

(i) Le célèbre couple de sociologues spécialistes des riches, Monique Pinçon-Charlot et Michel Pinçon, livrent une « *enquête sociologique et dessinée* », avec la complicité du dessinateur Etienne Lécroart. Leur thème : la résistance farouche des riches à protéger leur entre-soi et à tenir les pauvres à l'écart de leur territoire, ici, le 16e arrondissement de Paris.

(ii) **L'enquête** débute par l'affaire du centre d'hébergement pour sans-abri, édifié en bordure du bois de Boulogne et inauguré le 5 novembre 2016, dans les locaux de l'université Paris-Dauphine. Sous le regard des caméras de télévision, les riverains ont couvert d'injures les représentants de la Préfecture et de la Mairie.

(iii) Pour les auteurs, **cette « *émeute des beaux quartiers* » avec ces réactions caricaturales, violentes, irrationnelles**, constituent (sic) « *un bijou sociologique* ». Les Pinçon-Charlot déroulent le CV des meneurs, tel Christophe Blanchard-Dignac, président de la coordination pour la sauvegarde du bois de Boulogne, ex-PDG de la Française des jeux, dénonçant « *la privatisation du bois de Boulogne* », alors que sa femme est l'une des membres triés sur le volet du Lagardère Racing Club, enclave privée de 7 ha pris sur le bois.

(iv) **TIR AUX PIGEONS ET POLO**
« *Le bois de Boulogne, c'est leur bois, leur pré carré* », écrivent les sociologues, qui rappellent que **ces personnes** ont créé six clubs privés sur 26ha, avec tir aux pigeons et polo… Mais lorsqu'il s'agit

[11] The paragraphs of text (5) are each marked with a lower-case Roman numeral; the anadeictically-functioning indexical expressions are in boldface, and the purely anaphoric expressions are underlined. Italics indicate extracts quoted from the book being reviewed.

de construire la Fondation Louis Vuitton d'art contemporain sur une parcelle inconstructible, personne ne s'y oppose ! Le projet devient légal grâce à un cavalier législatif glissé en pleine nuit, le 15 février 2011, dans une loi sur le prix du livre numérique.

(v) **Cette lutte pour conserver « leur » territoire** est ancienne, soulignent les auteurs. Déjà en 1930, un projet de construction de logements sociaux avait levé de vives oppositions. Les riverains issus de riches familles avaient réussi à transformer en résidences de luxe les immeubles Walter, aujourd'hui classés pour leur style Art déco. Leurs descendants aux noms célèbres (Guerlain, Lacoste, Dassault) y sont d'ailleurs toujours. **Le combat anti-pauvres** s'est aussi étendu —en vain— au cirque tzigane Romanès, installé depuis juin 2015. Tout comme de multiples recours et procédures ont paralysé huit années durant l'édification des logements sociaux de la porte d'Auteuil —inaugurés fin 2016.

(vi) Etienne Lecroart et ses crayons croquent en détail les tenues, accessoires, attitudes et expressions de **cette tribu de riches observée dans son milieu par le couple Pinçon-Charlot**. *Panique dans le 16e !* est une balade sociologique pertinente, inquiétante, mais marrante.

Isabelle Rey-Lefèbvre (*Le Monde*, 17-18.12.17, p. 27)

Now, it is noteworthy that each paragraph, apart from the very first, is headed (or near-headed) by an anadeictically-functioning definite or demonstrative NP (emboldened in text (5)) which encapsulates the function of these discourse (sub-)units.

Paragraph (ii) starts with the definite NP *l'enquête* ('the survey') in subject position, an anadeictic function of which the host clause predicates the property of "beginning" (i.e. the whole unit is about the start of the enquiry). This definite reduced NP, then, marks the topic of this macro discourse unit (paras (i) and (ii)), restricted by the verb *débute…* ('begins') to the very beginning of the survey. Though the NP *l'enquête* retrieves the referent already introduced via an indefinite NP in the first paragraph (*une enquête sociologique et dessinée*, 'a sociological and illustrated survey', line 2), it is not canonically "anaphoric" in function, but rather anadeictic: indeed, in its paragraph-initial position, it serves to boost the initial reference to the survey, setting it up as the macro-topic of the whole text[12].

[12] The definite lexical NP here would not be naturally replaceable by a simple 3rd person pronoun (?# *elle* 'it' F.SG.), which would clearly signal canonical anaphora. So

In paragraph (iii), initiating the second main unit of the discourse, the demonstrative NP *cette "émeute des beaux quartiers*" *avec ces réactions caricaturales, violentes, irrationnelles* ('this "riot by well-to-do districts" with these caricatured, violent and irrational reactions'), containing a quotation from the book being reviewed, conveys the irony of the authors in the implied contrast between the concepts of "riot" and "well-to-do districts" (of Paris) —a kind of oxymoron—, where the two juxtaposed concepts would normally be taken as antithetical. There is also metonymy in that the place entity 'well-to-do districts' is being substituted for 'the inhabitants of such areas'. The lexical content of this demonstrative NP thus constitutes a subjective, speaker-oriented classification, where the introducing determiner *cette* would be equivalent to English proximal *this* rather than distal *that*[13]. The NP as a whole, functioning discourse-deictically, encapsulates the characterization developed in the first two paragraphs, and at the same time points forward to the development of the third[14], which it heads and signposts.

The fourth paragraph, a subsidiary unit developing the third, more major one, is prefaced by a bold section heading in capitals ("Tir aux pigeons et polo", 'Pigeon shooting and polo'). However, it seems that this was inserted by the copy editor at a later stage in the publication process, and was not necessarily already included by the author of the review, Isabelle Rey-Lefèbvre. As such, it represents a mismatch between text structure and discourse structure (cf. the distinction drawn in §2.1 above). It consists of a piquant detail characterizing the group of well-to-do inhabitants of the 16th district, illustrating (via para (iv) as a whole) their hypocrisy in claiming that the Bois de Boulogne had been "privatized" by the building of a shelter for homeless people. It comes at exactly the middle of the text, where three paragraphs precede, and three follow.

In terms of discourse, however, the structure is not a "binary" one separating the first three paragraphs as one unit, and the last three as a second. For discursively speaking, the third paragraph is in fact an

---

arguably the NP *l'enquête* is not being used to realize a purely anaphoric function here.

[13] The French demonstrative determiners have lost the proximal/distal distinction found in their ancestors *cist* and *cil* in Old French: see *inter alia* Guillot (2015), De Mulder & Carlier (2006).

[14] Essentially a thumbnail sketch of two leading wealthy protesters.

integral sub-part of the second, which act together as a single major discourse unit. Hence there is no major break at this point in terms of the discourse being constructed by the reader. The topic of this sub-unit has to do with the "privatizing" activities within the park at issue carried out by the well-to-do inhabitants themselves (encapsulated by the demonstrative NP *ces personnes* 'these people' in lines 1-2 of para (iv)).

The fifth paragraph is headed by another demonstrative NP, namely *cette lutte pour conserver "leur" territoire* ('this struggle to preserve "their" territory'). Again, it encapsulates the issue developed up to this point, and together with the predicative component of the indexical clause (…*est ancienne* 'is long-standing'), adumbrates the topic of this third major discourse unit: the antecedents of the current dispute, implying that the issue runs deep in the past of the well-heeled inhabitants of the 16th Paris district. The definite NP *le combat anti-pauvres* 'the anti-poor campaign' in line 5 of this paragraph re-evokes the central theme of the text at this point, announced via the expanded proximal demonstrative NP *cette lutte ... territoire* already noted. Discursively, it serves to boost this topic-indicating reference for the duration of this central discourse unit, and so is not simply anaphoric, but rather 'strict'-anadeictic in function. Its occurrence here serves to subdivide Part 3 of the text, though clearly not creating thereby a separate main part of its own.

Finally, in para (vi), yet another demonstrative NP, now containing a more subjective classification of the group of protesters (*cette tribu de riches* 'this tribe[15] of wealthy people'), highlights the group itself, and as a conclusion or coda to the review mentions the draughtsman responsible for the satirical drawings in the book, and provides a positive overall evaluation of it at the same time.

Looking now at the purely anaphoric functions of certain other indexical markers in this text, these (essentially definite lexically-headed NPs and 3rd person pronouns) operate within discourse units rather than across them[16]. A case in point is the definite NP *les riverains*

---

[15] The word "tribe" in this context is of course highly pejorative, with its connotations "uncivilized" and "fiercely defensive of its own perceived interests".

[16] See also McCarthy's (1994: 270) attested English textual example (10), where "textual" segments (discourse units, in my terminology) are introduced mainly by definite NPs, and where 3rd person pronouns function exclusively within these segments. Definite lexical NPs may of course serve either to realize the functions of anadeixis, or of canonical anaphora.

'local inhabitants' in line 3 of para. (ii). This NP contracts an "associative-anaphoric" relation with the referent evoked via the embedded locative NP *(le*) *bois de Boulogne* in lines 1-2 of the same paragraph. There is also the variety of different evocations of the authors of the survey being reviewed, namely *les auteurs* 'the authors' in line 1 of para. (iii) and again in line 1 of para. (v), *Les Pinçon-Charlot* in line 2 of this paragraph, as well as *le couple Pinçon-Charlot* 'the P-C couple', line 2 of para (vi), and *les sociologues* 'the sociologists', line 1 of para. (iv).

Still further anaphoric definite NPs are (*les*) *meneurs* 'the ringleaders' (i.e. '…of the group of wealthy protesters'), line 3 of para. (iii), *le projet* 'the plan to construct the Louis Vuitton Contemporary Art Foundation on an "unbuildable" plot of land inside the Bois de Boulogne', line 4 of para. (iv), and also *les immeubles Walter* 'the Walter blocks of flats' in line 3 of para. (iv). This definite NP refers back to 'the social housing which was planned in 1930', referred to in line 2 of this paragraph, which was presumably built subsequently.

As for 3rd person pronoun references, these are relatively few in comparison with the number and variety of definite NP ones (itself a feature of written broadsheet journalism). These comprise the oblique clitic pronoun *y* in line 4 of para. (iv), referring to 'the plan to build the Louis Vuitton Contemporary Art Foundation on a theoretically "unbuildable" plot of land in the park', just evoked in the same sentence, and also in line 4 of para. (v), here referring to 'the Walter blocks of flats', already evoked in the line above.

Let us look now at a comparable short text in English, also dealing with a controversy:

(6) **SCIENCE & TECH** (*The New Review* supplement, *The Observer* 13.08.17, p. 16)[17]

(i) *Last week*, the children's commissioner, Anne Longfield, launched a campaign to help parents regulate internet and smartphone use at home. She suggested that the overconsumption of social media was a problem akin to that of junk-food diets. "None of us, as parents, would want our children to eat junk food all the time – double

[17] In addition to the conventions adopted for marking the discourse-deictic and anaphoric functioning of indexical markers in text (5), here we use italics to mark their pure-deictic function.

cheeseburger, chips, every day, every meal," she said. "For **those same reasons**, we shouldn't want our children to do the same with their online time."

(ii) A few days later, former GCHQ spy agency chief Robert Hannigan responded to the campaign. "The assumption that time online or in front of the screen is life wasted needs challenging. It is driven by fear," he said. "The best thing we can do is to focus less on the time they spend on screens at home and more on the nature of the activity."

(iii) **This exchange** is just one more example of how children's screentime has become an emotive, contested issue. *Last December*, more than 40 educationalists, psychologists and scientists signed a letter in the *Guardian* calling for action on children's "screen-based lifestyles". A few days later, another 40-odd academics described the fears as "moral panic" and said that any guidelines needed to build on evidence rather than "scaremongering".

(iv) Faced with **these conflicting expert views**, how should concerned parents proceed? Into **this maelstrom** comes the American psychologist Jean Twenge, who has written a book entitled *iGen: Why Today's Super-Connected Kids Are Growing Up Less Rebellious, More Tolerant, Less Happy — And Completely Unprepared for Adulthood — and What That means for the Rest of Us*.

(v) If **the book's title** didn't make her view clear enough, *last weekend* an excerpt was published in the American magazine the *Atlantic* with the emotive headline "Have smartphones destroyed a generation?". It quickly generated differing reactions that were played out on social media —**these** could be broadly characterized as praise from parents and criticisms from scientists. In a phone interview and follow-up emails, Twenge explained her conclusions about the downsides of the connected world for teens, and answered some of her critics. [The text of an interview with Jean Twenge follows this introduction (unsigned)]

The discourse structure of this text is represented in (7):

(7) Discourse structure of text (6)

Unit	Discourse function
1.	(Para (i)): **Introduction of macro-topic**: report and discussion of a controversy regarding the overuse by children of the internet and

smartphones at home. Presentation of the campaign launched by the children's commissioner to help parents to regulate this overuse.

2. (Para (ii)): **Presentation of an objection to the campaign by a former GCHQ director**: the problem is not one of the sheer time spent in front of screens at home, but of <u>how</u> this time is used by the child.
3. (Para (iii)): **Extrapolation from this exchange**: the debate now has wider currency, with two sets of academics making public appeals for each side of the argument in swift succession.
4. (Para (iv)): **But how should parents react to these conflicting positions on the issue?** A solution might lie in a book published on the subject by American psychologist Jean Twenge, which clearly supports the initial campaigners' position on the issue.
5. (Para (v)): **Coda**: **"the jury is out" on this debate**: an extract from the book in a magazine again yielded opposite reactions: praise from parents and scepticism from scientists…

Text (6), like text (5), presents a controversy. However, unlike the situation in text (5), in text (6) each textual paragraph corresponds to a unit within the overall discourse structure (i.e. there are no sub-units). Unit 1 (para (i)) begins with a temporal framing device, the pure-deictic expression *Last week* in unit-initial position, whose scope covers the entire paragraph. It was then (i.e. the week before the publication of this edition of *The Observer*: 6th-12th August 2017) that the awareness campaign launched by Anne Longfield, which is the overall topic of the text, began. It also contains a distal demonstrative NP, *those same reasons* (line 5), which functions discourse-deictically.

The second main unit (para (ii)) is likewise framed by a temporal expression (*A few days later*), but it is elliptical and hence purely anaphoric in function. Again, it has scope over the entire content of this paragraph (major discourse unit). This unit presents the other side of the argument, namely that the claim that children waste time over trivia in watching screens (internet and smartphones) is based on nothing but "fear". For according to Robert Hannigan, what is crucial in this is the quality of the activity being undertaken by the child.

Unit 3 (para (iii)) is introduced by a proximal demonstrative NP used discourse-deictically (*this exchange*) which, via the lexical head noun *exchange* changes gears, discursively, in moving from a focus on the specifics of each side of the debate (the first two units) to the debate as a whole. Indeed, it extrapolates from this exchange by individuals to whole sets (40-odd in each case) of academics, their respective arguments being contrasted via the use of temporal indexical expressions (respectively, the pure-deictic *Last December*, line 2, and

the elliptical-anaphoric *A few days later* (line 4)), as was also the case in the contrast made between units 1 and 2.

Unit 4 (para. (iv)) is headed by two, closely related discourse-deictic proximal demonstrative NPs, *these conflicting expert views* and *this maelstrom*. These expressions both signal interpretations by the author of the exchanges just presented, and clearly convey speaker-subjectivity[18], unlike the previous proximal demonstrative NP *this exchange* in paragraph (iii). They symbolize the parents' dilemma in deciding which set of experts to believe regarding this issue, the topic of this fourth main unit. There is also a temporally-demarcating demonstrative NP *last weekend* (line 1) functioning deictically to establish the time-span involved.

Finally, the last paragraph (v) deals with the impact of Jean Twenge's new book, clearly supporting the awareness campaign's position on the issue, whose long title was introduced in para. (iv). This title is re-evoked at the head of unit 5 via an anadeictic[19] definite NP *the book's title*. Finally, the proximal demonstrative pronoun *these* in line 4 refers 'strict'-anadeictically to the 'differing reactions to the extract from JT's book played out on social media' introduced in the immediately preceding sentence, a set referent which is not yet topical at the point of retrieval.

Regarding the purely anaphorically-functioning indexical markers in this text, the definite NPs expressing this relation are *the same* in para. (i), line 5, *the campaign* in para. (ii) (lines 1-2), *the activity* (line 4 of this paragraph), and *the fears* (para. (iii), line 4). All these definite NPs simply pick up referents that are highly salient at the point of use. There are more 3rd person pronouns than in the French text (5), however: the feminine singular pronoun tokens *she* para. (i) (lines 2 and 4), referring to 'the children's commissioner Anne Longfield', introduced in line 1 of this paragraph; *that* in line 3 of para. (i), *it* in line

---

[18] The second one in particular, whose lexical component is a (conventional) metaphor.

[19] A purely anaphoric functioning at this point in the discourse, at the head of this fifth main discourse unit, would not have been completely natural in this context: *viz*. *#If* it *didn't make her view clear enough*…. A more natural pronoun choice here would be the proximal demonstrative *this*, which would clearly fulfil a 'strict' anadeictic function (see the defining example given in §2.2 to illustrate this function). The discourse function of the definite NP *the book's title* at the head of para. (v) in text (6) is parallel to that of the French definite NP *l'enquête* 'the survey', heading sub-unit 1a in para. (ii) of text (5) above.

3 of para. (ii) and again in line 3 of para. (v), and *they* in line 4 of para. (ii).

4. Taking stock: Indexicals, anadeixis and discourse structure

Now, the discourse-deictic character of the majority of references of the demonstrative NPs in texts (5) and (6)[20] shows how demonstrative-based expressions occurring unit-initially in a discourse may serve to 'shift gears', discursively speaking, from a unit serving to introduce a given referent or discourse topic, to a new unit by re-classifying, encapsulating and reifying some particular aspect of what was predicated in an earlier unit in the discourse. In other words, the process of interpreting such indexicals involves looking backward over the preceding discourse as well as forward to the new unit to come. It's this that makes them so useful for realizing this particular discourse function.

The temporal-deictic as well as other temporal expressions and also anadeictic definite NPs that initiate a paragraph in written texts have several of the key properties that have been assigned to framing adverbials (see Charolles, 1997 and below). Examples of the latter from text (5) are *l'enquête* heading unit 1 (para. (ii)), and *Le combat anti-pauvres* (line 5 of para. (v)), while in text (6), the temporal-deictic (adverbial) NP *Last week* at the head of unit 1, *A few days later* heading unit 2, and *Last December* and again *A few days later* together subdivide unit 3. All these expressions serve the same essential framing discourse function: signalling a boundary with regard to the respective preceding segment, and at the same time the start of a new unit or sub-unit falling within the time interval or topic segment which they indicate. Moreover, they provide or imply a topic frame within which the predications falling within the discourse-unit span up to the next unit-demarcating framing expression are to be understood and integrated (though the temporal expressions just mentioned do not, of course, signal the topic of the discourse span which they introduce).

Like framing adverbials, discourse-deictic demonstratives may also mark the end of a preceding discourse unit and the start of a new one

[20] Respectively, *cette "émeute des beaux quartiers".... irrationnelles*, *ces personnes, Cette lutte pour conserver « leur » territoire* and *cette tribu de riches*; and *This exchange,* and *these conflicting views*.

(that is, they may signal boundaries between units: the *textual segmentation* function, claimed to be a property of the use of framing adverbials); and second, as we have seen, where they are full NPs, they take wide scope over the sentences as utterances that immediately follow them, in terms of their descriptive content (the *integration* or *indexation* function)[21]. Like true framing adverbials, these demonstrative expressions occur at or near the beginning of the discourse unit they serve to mark out. Moreover, as is generally the case with demonstrative NPs, their descriptive content is not pragmatically presupposed of their referent, but serves to (re-)classify the previous discourse material the expression operates on, or implicitly predicates some new property of it (e.g. *these conflicting expert views* in (6), line 1 of para (iv); cf. also Maes and Noordman, 1995). So they are doing more than simply demarcating discourse units and creating scope over a given span of the discourse, unlike purely framing devices. At the same time, discourse-deictic demonstratives show properties of connectives, linking up with the previous unit[22].

This is a reflection of their (residual) anaphoric dimension. It is their essentially deictic dimension that is responsible for the forward-looking character of such references —since all uses of demonstratives (whether pure deictic or anadeictic) result in the conveying of new information in context: introducing a new referent, or a new perspective on an existing referent. The user's obligatory search via the immediate context of utterance of the demonstrative for an 'index' (or demonstratum) in order to ultimately yield a referent for it, means that its use will mark a break in the continuity of the discourse at that point. This break corresponds to the boundary demarcation which certain uses of demonstrative expressions may realize, and, as already pointed out, the new information to which they give rise in context accounts for their forward-looking dimension. Definite NPs, even when used anadeictically, do not have this property, however. As with 3rd person

---

[21] See Charolles (1997) and Fagard & Sarda (2014) for justification of these two functions in the case of framing adverbials.

[22] In fact, Diessel (1999) claims that this use actually gives rise, diachronically, to grammatical connectives. This use would presuppose that these formerly discourse-deictic demonstratives have become grammaticalized, since according to Sarda *et al.* (2014), connectives are exclusively backward-looking as well as grammaticalized markers, whereas framing adverbials are referential (not grammatical) and forward-looking in scope.

pronouns, when used anaphorically (or part anaphorically, as the case may be), the implication of the pragmatically presupposed status of their intended referent means that they are exclusively backward-looking, discursively speaking.

All these intrinsic properties make demonstratives in particular especially effective devices for realizing the specific discourse-structuring functions we have seen in this chapter: they may herald a shift from a unit or a series of units focusing on a specific instance to a more general, subsuming cultural frame, and hence prepare the reader for a transition to a new discourse unit: *cette lutte pour conserver "leur" territoire* in text (5) heading unit 3, and in text (6), *this exchange* introducing unit 3 and *these conflicting expert views* introducing unit 4, para. (iv); they may actually effect the transition from one major discourse unit to another by encapsulating the essential discourse content of the preceding unit and making it into the topic of the following one: *cette "émeute des beaux quartiers"* [...] *irrationnelles* heading unit 2 in text (5); and finally, they may switch the focus of attention from units dealing with background details (here on two leading protesters) to the broader group which these individuals were heading: *ces personnes* in line 2 of para. (iv) also in text (5).

5. Toward a conclusion

The most important implication of the preceding discussion is that it is crucial to systematically distinguish between that which pertains to the language system, on the one hand, and what has to do rather with the use made by communicators in context of the resources which that system affords the user, on the other. In the present case, it's the various types of indexical markers, each with its particular bundle of morpho-syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic features, that fall within the language system. Their use, as we have seen, is a function of the different indexical referring procedures (deixis, anadeixis and anaphora) which they help to realize.

The distinction between anadeixis and canonical anaphora makes it possible to restrict the scope of the latter referring procedure. As we have seen, these procedures do not possess the same conditions of use. For discourse anaphora serves to ensure the referential continuity holding within and amongst certain discourse units, providing thereby a significant cue to their integration and unity (cf. Fox, 1987). 'Strict'

anadeixis, for its part, serves (among other functions) to signal a transition between discourse units, often between minor ones, by boosting a previous reference which is either not yet topical, or whose prior topicality has faded somewhat at the point of use. Discourse deixis may also perform this function, which it achieves by synthesizing the discourse contribution of the preceding span of text and heralding that of the major discourse unit which its exponent expression introduces. Its mode of discourse functioning thus points, Janus-like, both upstream and downstream simultaneously.

Now, a number of the extant models of how indexicals function, in terms of the relative levels of accessibility of their intended referent (cf. Ariel, 1990) or of the cognitive status which each such marker is claimed to encode lexically (Gundel *et al.* 1993), or in terms of neo-Gricean scales set up as a function of the likely contrasts a user might choose to mark between given indexicals (Levinson, 2000), seem over-rigid in that they fail to take into account the considerable degree of flexibility in context which indexical markers clearly manifest.

All these models neglect to take account of the wider relevance in indexical markers' discourse functioning of the nature of the indexical referring procedure (whether of canonical anaphora, anadeixis or canonical deixis) which is harnessed in context by speakers or writers. For in the final analysis, it's the choice between one or other of these procedures which determines the particular value that indexicals may manifest: the level of accessibility or the cognitive status associated with the use of any given indexical in context (its "representational" value, in essence) will flow from the procedure selected by the user.

References

Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun-Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.

Bühler, Karl. [1934] 1990. *Theory of Language: The Representational Function of Language.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Charolles, Michel. 1997. "L'encadrement du discours : Univers, champs, domaines et espaces". *Cahier de Recherche Linguistique* 6: 1-73 (http://www.lattice.cnrs.fr/).

Cornish, Francis. 1999. *Anaphora, Discourse and Understanding. Evidence from English and French.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cornish, Francis. 2007. "English demonstratives: discourse deixis and anaphora. A discourse-pragmatic account". In Nilson, Randi A.; Aba Appiah Amfo, Nana & Borthen, Kaja (ed.), *Interpreting Utterances:*

Pragmatics and its Interfaces. Essays in honour of Thorstein Fretheim. Oslo: Novus Press, 147-166.

Cornish, Francis. 2010. "Anaphora: Text-based or discourse-dependent? Functionalist *vs*. formalist accounts." *Functions of Language* 17.2: 207-241.

De Mulder, Walter & Carlier, Anne. 2006. "Du démonstratif à l'article défini : le cas de *ce* en français moderne". *Langue Française* 152: 96-113.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives. Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ehlich, Konrad. 1982. "Anaphora and deixis: same, similar, or different?" In Jarvella, Robert J. & Klein, William (ed.), *Speech, Place and Action. Studies in Deixis and Related Topics.* Chichester: John Wiley, 315–338.

Fagard, Benjamin & Sarda, Laure. 2014. "From local adverbials to discourse markers: three case studies in the diachrony of French". In Sarda, Laure; Carter-Thomas, Shirley, Charolles, Michel & Fagard, Benjamin (ed.), *Adverbials in Use: From predicative to discourse functions.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 203-238.

Fetzer, Anita. 2011. " '*Here is the difference, here is the passion, here is the chance to be part of great change*'. Strategic context importation in political discourse". In Fetzer, Anita & Oishi, Etsuko (ed.), *Context and Contexts. Parts meet whole?* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 115-146.

Fox, Barbara A. 1987. *Discourse Structure and Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guillot, Céline. 2015. "From Old French and Middle French to Contemporary French". In Jungbluth, Konstanze & Da Milano, Federica (ed.), *Manual of Deixis in Romance Languages*. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 546-568.

Gundel, Jeanette.K.; Hedberg, Nancy & Zacharski, Ron. 1993. "Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse". *Language* 69(2): 274-307.

Laury, Ritva. 2002. "Interaction, grounding and third-person referential forms". In Brisard, Frank (ed.), *Grounding. The epistemic footing of deixis and reference.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 83-111.

Levinson, Stephen C. 2000. *Presumptive Meanings. The theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature.* Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.

Lyons, John. 1975. Deixis as the source of reference. In Keenan, Edward L. (ed.), *Formal Semantics of Natural Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 61- 83.

Maes, Alfons & Noordman, Leo G.M. 1995. "Demonstrative nominal anaphors: a case of nonidentificational markedness". *Linguistics* 33:

255-82.

McCarthy, Michael. 1994. "*It, this* and *that*". In Coulthard, Malcolm (ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 266–275.

Mittwoch, Anita. 1983. "Backward anaphora and discourse structure". *Journal of Pragmatics* 7(2): 129–139.

Rubba, Johanna. 1996. "Alternate grounds in the interpretation of deictic expressions". In Fauconnier, Gilles & Sweetser, Eve (ed.), *Spaces, Worlds, and Grammar*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 227-261.

Sarda, Laure; Carter-Thomas, Shirley, Charolles, Michel & Fagard, Benjamin. 2014. "Adverbials: from predicative to discourse functions". In Sarda, Laure; Carter-Thomas, Shirley, Charolles, Michel & Fagard, Benjamin (ed.), *Adverbials in Use: From predicative to discourse functions.* Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain, 13-38.

Scott, Kate. 2016. "Pronouns and procedures: Reference and beyond". *Lingua* 175-176: 69-82. doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2015.07.005.