

CONTENTS

Presidential address:

- P. Ivić, Nature and functions of the prosodic phenomena in languages..... 229

I. PHONETICS AND PHONOLOGY

- S. A. J. WOOD—T. PETTERSSON, Vowel reduction in Bulgarian: the phonetic data and model experiments 239
P. AUER, On deixis and displacement 263
J. MARTINET, Un traitement fonctionnel de la liaison en français 293
E. RONNEBERGER-SIBOLD, Verschiedene Wege der Phonemisierung bei deutsch (regionalsprachlich) ζ , x 301

II. MORPHOLOGY AND MORPHOSYNTAX

- F. COULMAS, Wörter, Komposita und anaphorische Inseln ... 315
S. OLSEN, Das »substantivierte« Adjektiv im Deutschen und Englischen: Attribuierung vs. syntaktische »Substantivierung« 337

(continued inside back cover)

The appearance of the code at the bottom of the first page of an article in this journal indicates the copyright owner's consent that copies of the article may be made for personal or internal use, or for the personal or internal use of specific clients. This consent is given on the condition, however, that the copier pay the stated per-copy fee through the copyright clearance center, for copying beyond that permitted by Sections 107 or 108 of the US Copyright Law. This consent does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as copying for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or resale.

© 1988 Mouton/de Gruyter, Berlin; Societas Linguistica Europaea

Printed in Hungary

ISSN 0165—4004

FOLIA LINGUISTICA

Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae

Tomus XXII/3—4

1988

SONDERDRUCK
OFFPRINT
TIRAGE A PART

MOUTON/DE GRUYTER

SOCIETAS LINGUISTICA EUROPAEA

Since the elections of 1987 in Berlin the following persons now serve as officers or members of Committees:

<i>President:</i>	Paul Valentin, Paris
<i>Vice-President:</i>	Thomas V. Gamkrelidze, Tbilisi
<i>Secretary/Treasurer:</i>	Werner Winter, Kiel
<i>Editors:</i> FoL:	Wolfgang U. Dressler, Wien
FoLH:	Jacek Fisiak, Poznań
<i>Executive Committee:</i>	Ruta Nagucka, Kraków Gilbert Lazard, Paris Francisco Marcos Marín, Madrid E. F. Konrad Koerner, Ottawa Harm Pinkster, Amsterdam Richard J. Watts, Bern Fred Karlsson, Helsinki
<i>Publications Committee:</i>	Jacek Fisiak, Poznań Martin Harris, Salford Irene Philippaki-Warbuton, Reading Wolfgang U. Dressler, Wien Jadranka Gvozdanović, Amsterdam Ferenc Kiefer, Budapest
<i>Nominating Committee:</i>	Georg Bossong, München Martti Nyman, Helsinki Anna Giacalone Ramat, Pavia Martin Harris, Salford Anders Ahlqvist, Gaillimh

Correspondence concerning membership and other administrative matters should be sent to: Prof. Werner Winter
Olshausenstr. 40-60
D-2300 Kiel
West Germany

Fees and payment modalities:

The annual membership dues are DM 35.00; the admission fee is DM 9.00. Payment should be made not later than 1 March of the year for which membership rights are desired to the following account:
Postal checking account nr. 2428 67-201, Postscheckamt Hamburg (Professor W. Winter, Kiel).

If payment is made in a currency other than German marks, the equivalent of DM 35.00 (or DM 9.00, respectively) should be increased by ten percent to cover conversion charges.

ON DEIXIS AND DISPLACEMENT*

PETER AUER

0. INTRODUCTION

Delimiting human language against other symbolic codes, Benveniste writes: "Le caractère du langage est de procurer un substitut de l'expérience apte à être transmis sans fin dans le temps et l'espace, ce qui est le propre de notre symbolisme et le fondement de la tradition linguistique."¹ Indeed, it is one of the most central characteristics of human language that it is able to free itself from the 'bonds' of the immediate spatio-temporal surroundings of its production. This ability is an ontogenetically and phylogenetically late development² and the condition for literacy. But of course, interaction among adult humans is not always independent³ of the *Umfeld*, or situation, either. On the contrary: although adult humans are capable of using language without the help of situational props, they very frequently do not care: 'informal' situations — whatever that may be — allow the use of the onto- and phylogenetically older, 'more natural' forms of speech, more or less heavily relying upon the situation. (In fact, Bernstein's distinction between social networks that require the use of a "restricted" and those that require the (additional) use of an "elaborate" code⁴ may be rephrased in terms of the degrees of situation boundedness these networks require/allow.) It follows that situation-bounded speech is not a stage in the ontogenesis or phylogenesis of language that is abandoned as soon as situation-transcending means have been acquired. But what exactly does the situation-boundedness of some forms of language and the situation-independence of others consist of? The present paper investigates this question. The first part deals with deixis; for the standard linguistic answer to the question of what changes when language becomes independent of

the situation is that deictic elements become replaced by non-deictic ones. However, there is wide disagreement not only over the semantic and pragmatic working of deixis, but also over the mere extensional definition of what counts as deixis and what doesn't. Recent research in the field has tended to continuously widen the scope of deixis. Contrary to this tendency, I will argue for a narrow, traditional concept of deixis as related (not exclusively, but essentially) to participants, time and place. At the same time, I will argue for the necessity to distinguish deixis from the much wider notion of situated (vs. displaced) language. Whereas deixis belongs to grammar, displacedness and situatedness define pragmatic modes of language and therefore refer to the interactional level. Part 2 of the paper deals with the situated and the displaced pragmatic mode in more detail. It develops a number of features of the two modes. In part 3, it will be shown on the basis of transcripts of natural conversations how participants move in and out of the two modes, with indeterminate passages inbetween. Finally, part 4 discusses the relationship between our situated and displaced mode, and the distinction between pragmatic and syntactic mode, as developed by Givón and others.

1. SOME PROBLEMS WITH DEIXIS

What counts as deixis? One of the basic problems discussed in the modern literature on the subject is the question if other linguistic items than those referring to participants, time and place of the interaction, and to events, things, and persons in the visual field of participants, should be considered as deictic. For instance, some linguists talk of *social deixis* and thereby refer to registers, politeness forms, honorifics and similar linguistic structures.⁵ Another candidate for deixis is *mood* (subjunctive, dubitative, etc.), that is, the categories through which the speaker conveys how he or she perceives certain facts, or reality in general. It has been maintained by some authors⁶ that mood reflects the speaker's world view, that therefore the selection of a modal category depends on the speaker and consequently, that mood is a deictic dimension. Rauh (1984) even has a *thematic dimension* of deixis, including case, word order, diathesis and the like. She argues that the speaker conveys his or her perspective via this dimension. Thus, there is less agreement over a definition of deixis today than 20 years ago.

The reason for this undesirable state of affairs is that deixis is often confused with context-dependence or speaker-dependence (subjectivity, auctorial principle) in general. Take for example a definition of deixis such as "the name given to uses of items and categories of lexicon and grammar that are *controlled* by certain details of the interactional situation in which the utterances are produced" (Fillmore 1982: 35), or "Deixis ist immer dann beteiligt, wenn ein Kodierer qua Sprache etwas, das als 'nonego' bezeichnet wurde, mit sich, 'ego' in *Beziehung setzt*" (Rauh 1984: 1) (my spacing). The problem with such definitions is that a situation may "control" many and "relate to" almost all linguistic choices. We therefore have to specify the relationship between language and situation in order to capture the notion of deixis, and in order to prevent it from collapsing with context-dependence in general. In accordance with the more traditional literature and, for instance, with Lyons (1977: 637), I propose to specify the relationship as a *referential* one. Deictic linguistic structures, together with their non-verbal complements, single out and/or identify certain objects. There are obviously other types of relationships between linguistic items and the context. Some of them are

- auctoriality:⁷ a relationship between the speaker and his/her utterances by which an attitude towards it is expressed, that is, his or her subjective view of what is being related. This is where the grammatical category of mood belongs.

- recipient design:⁸ a relationship between the utterance and its recipient, that is, all features of the utterance that are tailored by the speaker to the specific needs (background knowledge etc.) of the addressee. In this case, the speaker does not refer to an individual but activates schematic knowledge from already established common grounds for the present interaction. The process is that of contextualization,⁹ not that of identifying. This is where so-called social deixis belongs: it is an inferential process that activates social categories and category-bound activities.¹⁰

A grammatically oriented criterion for delimitating deictic from nonreferential, but otherwise context-dependent categories such as honorifics or mood, is the existence of corresponding non-deictic means to carry out the same task. All deictic expressions of a language have *umfeld*-independent counterparts. These counterparts are equally context-bound, but they relate to the participants' background knowledge. Thus, pronouns or demonstratives corre-

spond to names or descriptions, temporal and local expressions to *umfeld*-independent fix points (calendar, clock, landmarks, etc.). On the contrary, in a language that has honorifics, there is no way to avoid them. And in a language such as Turkish which has a dubitative, there is no way to report whatsoever event without indicating one's own attitude towards it; the absence of the dubitative is not semantically neutral, but displays the report as that of an eyewitness. Non-deictic situation-dependence cannot be done without, whereas deixis may be replaced by *umfeld*-independent (but of course otherwise context-dependent) means.

1.1. The Bühler connection

I have discussed the scope of deixis; but there is another fundamental conceptual problem: on what linguistic level is deixis to be analyzed? The question has been dealt with in Bühler's writings. As is well known, Bühler argues in his *Sprachtheorie* that in order to fulfill what he calls the *Darstellungsfunktion* (referential function), natural languages have one deictic field (*Zeigfeld*) and many symbolic fields (*Symbolfelder*). (He also refers to a third field, the pictorial field (*Malfeld*) in passing but concludes that the iconic elements are not important enough in language systems to justify enumerating this field in line with the other two.) The symbolic fields of language cover, according to Bühler, all types of relations between the lexical elements which are important for the interpretation of a given utterance, syntagmatic and paradigmatic. The deictic field is made up of the deictic words of a language (*Zeigwörter*), which, in turn, are organized with respect to the *origo*, that is, the HERE, the NOW and the ME of the speech situation. Whereas symbol words become meaningful because of their relation to neighbouring elements of the symbolic fields in which they stand, deictic words are meaningful because of their position in the deictic field, which is determined by various non-linguistic signalling techniques such as pointing, bodily position, etc.¹² Both the symbolic fields and the deictic field are part of language-as-a-system.

Linguistic elements of a language (such as Italian, from which extracts will be discussed below) that take part in *deixis ad oculos* may be personal pronouns (first and second person *io*, *tu*, *noi*, *voi* and their paradigms; less prototypically, because of their alternative anaphoric usage,¹³ the third person *lui*, *loro*, *lei* etc.),

including 'dropped' (zero) pronouns (*sono venuto* 'I came' etc.); demonstratives (*questo* = HIC, *codesto* = ISTE, *quello* = ILLE) and demonstrative articles, including (again, less prototypically) the definite article; tense and aspect (*presente*, very likely *passato prossimo* and *futuro*); local, temporal and modal adverbials (*adesso* 'now', *qui* 'here', *là* 'there', *domani* 'tomorrow', *due giorni fa* 'two days ago', *lassù* 'down there', *così* 'so' etc.); some prepositions (*al di qua* 'on this side of', *al di là* 'on that side of') and sometimes (usually very few) verbs of motion (*venire* 'to come').¹⁴

Non-referential linguistic structures that depend in their interpretation on the *Umfeld* are not part of the deictic field for Bühler. This can be seen in his en passant discussion of imperatives, which he subsumes under *Aktionssignale* (signs for action) and of summonses, which he calls *Appellwörter*. Both imperatives and summonses are most intimately interwoven with the situation, and even dependent on the *origo*. In fact, summonses can be formally identical with deictic signs such as the second person pronoun, and the imperative involves the two most important roles in interaction, that of the speaker and that of the addressee. But their function is different: only the *Rezeptionszeichen* identify, together with the nonverbal components whose reception they are supposed to facilitate, whereas *Aktionssignale* require action, and are therefore pragmatically different. *Appellwörter* are, as Bühler puts it, "Auf-takte im Nahverkehr" (p. 115), they establish copresence and thereby have the function of preparing interaction as such, not of establishing or maintaining reference.

Bühler's discussion of ellipsis, particularly his notion of *empraxis* (154ff), is also important here. Again, he does not include it among the deictic signs, although in his examples, *empraxis* makes a sentence most dramatically depend on the spatio-temporal surroundings. Take an utterance such as *Firenze andata e ritorno* (slightly adapted from Bühler), said by a person at the counter in the Milano station. It is evident for everybody who knows what trains are and how stations function that this person wants to go on a train to Firenze and later come back to Milano, and that he or she wants to buy a ticket because this is necessary in order to do so in accordance with the law. It is utterly superfluous to go to the counter and say *vorrei comprare un biglietto per andare in treno a Firenze* etc. It is the *Umfeld* of the utterance, the fact of its being formulated at the station's counter that provides that information.

The utterance is empractic because it is embedded in a series of activities such as entering the station, approaching the counter, looking at the person behind it.

Empraxis means that in a great many cases, language is intertwined with non-linguistic social activities. Indeed, these non-linguistic activities are often more central than the linguistic ones. The latter are restricted to points in interaction where more than one interpretation of the non-verbal activities is possible. They are, as Bühler says, linguistic islands: "Sprachinseln tauchen im Meere des schweigsamen aber eindeutigen Verkehrs an solchen Stellen auf, wo eine Differenzierung, eine *Diakrise*, eine Entscheidung zwischen mehreren Möglichkeiten getroffen werden soll und bequem durch ein eingestreutes Wort getroffen werden kann" (156). According to Bühler, empractic utterances may contain linguistic elements from both the deictic and the symbolic fields of a language. The notion of empraxis must therefore deal with a different dimension: whereas deixis refers to a limited set of elements of a language, that is, to its system, which, as we have seen, for Bühler is organized in two fields (*Zweifeldertheorie*), empraxis is a pragmatic property of linguistic utterances, that is, one of language use.¹⁵

A number of *umfeld*-dependent linguistic structures have been mentioned that are not deictic according to our narrow definition of deixis which restricts this notion to elements of a linguistic system that have to be interpreted with reference to the *origo* set by the speaker, and that have referential (identifying/locating) function. The collection includes imperatives, summonses, empractic utterances. We may add optatives, many rituals such as greetings, apologies, and others. It is useful to find a cover term for speech that is *umfeld*-dependent but not necessarily made up of deictic signs. The term *situated language* is proposed for that purpose here. Situated language is defined much wider than deixis. It is a structural property of language-as-interaction, whereas deixis constitutes a structural field of language-as-a-system. The use of deictic elements is part of situated language, but situated language is not dependent on the use of deictic elements (compare the example in the station).

It has been said before that the deictic signs of a linguistic system have counterparts whose semantic interpretation is *umfeld*-independent. For a deictic adverbial such as *qui* ('here') one finds a prepositional adverbial using a proper name such as *in Viareggio*,

for the deictic temporal adverbial *domani* ('tomorrow') the synthetic counterpart *il giorno dopo* ('the day after'), for the adverbial of manner *così* ('so') one might get *come un circolo* ('like a circle') etc. Just as language provides non-deictic counterparts for deictic signs, situated language has an *umfeld*-independent counterpart which will be called *displaced language*.¹⁶ In displaced passages of interaction, the *origo* may be left on any of its dimension, or on all simultaneously. Whereas an element of a language system is either deictic or non-deictic,¹⁷ an utterance can be more or less *umfeld*-dependent. Displacement as a property of conversational talk is therefore a matter of degree.

1.2. Excursus: Three remarks on deictic signs

Deixis as part of grammar has been of considerable interest for linguists over the past decade.¹⁸ I will only make three observations that directly bear on our problem.

a) It makes sense to distinguish between deictic elements of a language and their actual usage. But the distinction is not coextensive with that between deixis and situated language. For deictic signs can be used in displaced language for analogical deixis,¹⁹ and genuinely non-deictic two-place predicates such as *a destra di* ('to the right of') or *sopra di* ('on top of') may be used deictically if their implicit point of reference is the *origo*.²⁰

b) Of the three dimensions of Bühler's *origo* (speaker, time, place), the EGO is the most important, followed by place and time. The hierarchisation of place and time can be justified on historical grounds, as Bühler and also Kurilowicz (1972) have done, and is reflected in the pervasive use of originally locating expressions in reference to time (*fra due giorni* — lit. 'between two days' — etc.). The primacy of the EGO can be shown on pragmatic grounds. In our culture, there are pre-patterned communicative situations in which at least one of the three dimensions of the *origo* is systematically distorted or dissolved: telephone conversations, letters and interpreting. The prototypical situation for deixis is obviously face-to-face interaction.²¹ Here, the person who says *I* is the speaker, *here* is here, and *now* at least overlaps with the time of the speech event. In telephone calls, the use of spatial deixis becomes problematic, for co-participants do not share a visual field. In letters, the time dimension and often the place dimension of the *origo*, too,

are duplicated, as witnessed by formulae such as *when you read this letter . . .* But both displacements do not seem to hamper communication in a substantial way, although they certainly diminish directness. The EGO dimension still works. This is not the case in interpreting. Professional and lay interpreters are faced with the tremendous problem of the distortion of the EGO dimension of the *origo*. Although time and place are shared and unproblematic, the *I* used by the interpreter does not necessarily — not even usually — refer to himself or herself, but to the participant whose utterance is being translated. Author of the message and speaker-translator are two different persons. It is for this reason that lay interpreters usually avoid the first person pronoun in their translations and replace it by a *he said . . .* or *she said . . .*

c) It is wrong to say that deictic signs always draw a recipient's attention to a certain thing, or person, or time, or place. In many cases, his or her attention has been secured already. For instance, the repeated use of the first person pronoun or of the respective verb morphology is certainly not introducing the speaker as a new referent to be identified by the *io* every time it recurs. Similarly, tenses do not focus the recipient's attention on a particular point in time, but the repeated use of the same tense usually only conveys the message that a certain point in time that has been established before is still the one relevant for the interpretation of the utterance. On the other hand, there are deictic signs that introduce new referential information and focus the recipient's attention on an item that has not been mentioned before. This is usually the case with place or time adverbials or with demonstratives and demonstrative articles. In other words, the distinction between given and new information,²² that is, the distinction between information that is supposed to be in the addressee's consciousness already and information that is not, crosscuts the distinction between deictic and non-deictic signs. Weinrich (1964, 1971: 14) has introduced the term *obstinato* signs for deixis to given information. *Obstinato* signs have to be repeated throughout a passage of the text, or turn, that maintains reference, because the grammar of the respective language (as the *ars obligatoria*) prescribes it. Demonstrative deictic signs introduce new referents. They do not instruct the recipient to maintain attention to the already-focused referent, but switch attention to a new focal referent.²³

2. SITUATED VS. DISPLACED LANGUAGE

In this paragraph, some important features of the two pragmatic modes — displaced and situated language — will be discussed. This will be done on the basis of some conversational extracts from a type of interactive episode which is specifically rich in such transitions: lunch interaction between five persons. Such interactions are embedded in sequences of non-verbal social activities, but also provides the opportunity for displaced language activities such as narratives, descriptions, arguments, etc., that is, speech activities that have no immediate end other than talk. In the present case, B(rigitte) — the host — and A(nita) are adults, Fiorella (12), Daniela (14) and Rino (9) are the bilingual children of an Italian family living in Constance.²⁴ However, these ethnographic details are irrelevant to my argument.

Let us look at the following extract in which passages of situated and of displaced language are rather neatly separated, although some displaced passages are more *umfeld*-independent than others.²⁵

Situated language is to be found in passages I, III, V and VII, displaced language in II, IV, VI and VIII. The basis of the distinc-

Ex (1) (A I, 51)

- | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------|---|
| I | situated | 01 b: | allora buon appetito |
| | | 02 a: | grazie [altretta:nd
(lento)] |
| | | 03 D: | [graz — |
| | | 04 a: | ci vuoi tu il sugo sopra; (0.5) te lo
(f)] |
| | | 05 | metto; (0.7) |
| | | 06 D-R: | willsch Soße; — — |
| | | 07 a: | e — aspetto un po che (.....) dentro — eh?
(5.0) |
| II | displaced | 08 | che [si mette sulla (carta) — (alla tedesca) |
| | | 09 | [alla tedesca si mette sotto — sopra la pasta; — |
| | | 10 b: | [si ? |
| | | 11 a: | also hab ich doch recht gehabt = |
| | | 12 F: | ((p)) |
| | | 13 b: | = [ja/ |
| | | 14 a: | [ah io ci metto un po [ancora
[si ? |
| III | situated | 15 b: | ich möchte |
| | | 16 F: | ((P)) |
| | | 17 b: | [hn ? |
| | | 18 F: | (möcht i au [no solche Nudeln) — —
(PP)] |
| | | 19 D: | [credo ch/ |
| | | 20 a: | scusa (..)
(PP)] |
| | | 21 b: | eh — niente — ma (0.5) normalmente tutto si |

- IV displaced 22 mangia insieme con l'insalata 'h h
23 a: tutto [questo
24 b: [h h
25 si.
26 a: e l'insalata si mette poi qua dentro —
27 b: no — ma puoi prendere un piatto separat[o
28 a(?): [h h h [no ma
29 di (codesto) si metterebbe tutto assieme
30 teoricamente? —
31 b: no: no a/ dipende un po' ah diciamo all/ al livello
32 di ogni giorno la metti insieme ma al livello di
33 una [(.....) cultura] — [prendi un altro pia[tto
34 a: [ma (....) queste] [h h [ah si —
35 D: gut —
36 b: e buon[o?
37 a: [sehr gut —
38 F: und *wiel* —
39 b: ja?
40 (1.0)
41 D: bisch (n) ne gute Köchin
42 a: ((f))
43 chi ha scelto questo pranzetto
44 D: hn 'h (2.0)
45 b: ((p))
46 chi era —
47 D: ich —
48 a: tu
49 D: ja — ja, (3.0)
50 ((pp))
51 F: noi non stiamo (....) (3.0)
52 ((pp))
53 a: ma quanto è buona la pasta (3.0)
54 (1.0)
55 h h h —
56 b: è buona; tu hai già assaggiatola —
57 a: si ho assaggiato. (1.0)
58 (1.0)
59 b(?): hm ((p)) (3.0)
60
61 a: e oggi non siete andati a scuola o siete usciti
62 prima;
63 D: siemme [us'
64 F: [no: siamo andate a scuola.
65 a: hn? —
66 b: dove avete (...) la la — la Schultasche
67 D: ca[sa
68 b: ((pp))
69 [in avete a casa — —
70 D: ich hatte heute um 11.20 aus; — — [weil
71 b: [eff[hn: (...)
72 D: der Lehrer krank isch;
((continues about father of D/F: why he didn't come, that
he is unemployed, etc.))

Rough translation.

- I situated 01 b: well then buon appetito
02 a: thank [you
03 D: [thanks —
04 a: do you want the sauce on top; (0.5) I'll give you; (0.7)
06 D-R: do you want sauce; — —
07 a: hey — wait a little so that (.....) inside — won't you
08 (5.0)
II displaced 09 [it is put on top of the (....) — (the German way)
10 b: [the German way it is put under — on top of the pasta; —
11 a: [really?
12 F: [so I was right =
13 b: = [yes
14 a: [oh I'll put (= give? take?) another [little bit
15 b: [were you?
III situated 16 F: I want
17 b: hn?
18 F: (I want of [these noodles too)
19 D: [I think th/
20 a: sorry (....)
21 b: it's alright — but (0.5) normally one eats all (that?)
22 together with salad h h
23 a: all [that
24 b: [h h
25 yes.
IV displaced 26 a: and the salad, you put it in here —
27 b: no [— you can take a separate pl[ate
28 a(?): [h h h [no I mean
29 of (this) would one put together everything theoretically? —
31 b: no: no a/ it depends a little bit ah let's say on/ on the
32 everyday level you put it together but at the level of
33 a [(.....) culture] — [you take another [plate
34 a: [but (....) these] [h h [oh I see — —
35 D: good
36 b: is [it good?
37 a: [very good —
38 F: re:ally —
39 b: is it?
40 (1.0)
41 D: you're a good cook
42 a: who chose this little lunch
43 (2.0)
44 D: hn 'h (...)
45 b: who was it —
46 D: me —
47 a: you
48 (3.0)
49 D: yes —yes,
50 (3.0)
51 F: we are not (.....)
52 (3.0)
53 a: oh how good it is this pasta
54 (1.0)
55 h h h —
56 b: it is good; have you tried it already —
57 a: yes I have tried it.
58 (1.0)
59 b(?): hm
60 (3.0)

VIII

displaced

- 61 a: and today you didn't go to school or did you leave earlier;
 62 D: we [left
 64 F: [no: we went to school.
 65 a: hn? —
 66 b: where do you have (....) the the — the schoolbag
 67 D: ho[me
 68 b: [in you have it at home — —
 69 D: today school was over for me at 11.20; — — [because
 70 b: [eln: (...)
 71 D: the teacher is ill;
 (etc.)

tion is the necessity for the recipient to use information that is part of the situation in order to understand what the speaker says, this is, in the first place, a referential problem. However, there are a number of additional characteristics of the two modes that derive from their referential basis, and which make it possible to classify passages as situated or displaced, although reference is only peripherally involved in them. The following is a list of the most important referential and non-referential characteristics delimitating displaced from situated language.

1) *Ease of analytic accessibility.* This first characteristic is not one of the modes themselves, but one of the analyst's access to language in one of them. It is notoriously difficult with situated passages to make out on the basis of an audio transcript what exactly is happening. More than in displaced passages, one has the impression that what the transcript conveys is at best half the issue, and often it is just impossible to reconstruct the interaction. Indeed what we understand when reading e.g. lines 1—7 of the transcript, is largely due to the fact that, as members of a culture that is sufficiently similar to that of the participants, we share a schematic knowledge of behaviour in the situation 'having lunch together'. This knowledge, which can be thought of as being organized in the format of 'scenarios', tells us, among other things, that in the beginning of such a situation, food is distributed (whereas in restaurants, it may be served on individual plates); this, in turn, explains to a certain degree what happens in line 4: Anita is offering sauce (*sugo*) to Rino. Obviously, audio transcripts of displaced passages abstract from non-verbal, interactionally relevant information, too. But in these passages, the non-verbal part only accompanies verbal

interaction.²⁶ So an increase in interpretive difficulties encountered by the conversation analyst but not shared by coparticipants is typical for situated language.

2) *Empraxis.* Situated language is prototypically *empractic*. It is only a — sometimes minor — part of a total of activities. Because of its *empractic* nature, it typically has consequences for the following non-verbal activities whereas displaced language usually is responded with by other verbal activities. For instance, our initial lines 4—6 deal with the distribution of food and have immediate consequences for that matter, whereas Anita's and Brigitte's little exchange about German eating habits in II/IV may serve to give information, or display affiliation with Italian and disaffiliation with German culture, but has no (non-verbal) consequences.

3) *Use of grammatical deixis.* The essential interdependence of situated language and non-verbal activities is also apparent from the frequent use of deictic signs. In passage I of our transcript, *ci* (1. 4) deictically refers to the plate (?), *te* ('you') to the addressee (Rino), *metto* ('I put') qua verb paradigm to the speaker (a.) etc.²⁷ Another deictic linguistic element is the definite article as used in *il sugo* ('the sauce') in its non-generic sense referring to the *sugo* on the table. What *il sugo* refers to can only be understood with reference to the *Umfeld* and on the basis of the actions (holding the pot, looking at the sauce, etc.) in which it is embedded. (Compare this use of the definite article with the one in line 10 (*la pasta* 'the noodles'). Exactly because the pragmatic mode has been changed from situated to displaced here, *la pasta* is not the spaghetti that are present in the *Umfeld*, but the generic *pasta*. This change of mode is established, in the present case, by the *alla tedesca* ('the German way') and the impersonal reflexive verb form *si mette* ('one puts').)

Note that some utterances that clearly belong to situated language do not contain deictic linguistic elements at all (lines 1, 2, 35—39). On the other hand, deictic elements occur in displaced language, for instance, in Fiorellas *also hab ich doch recht gehabt* ('so I was right'). The first person *ich hab* and the tense (perfect) are deictic linguistic elements, but nevertheless, the utterance accomplishes a displacement on the time axis.²⁸ The use of grammatical deixis therefore moves participants' otherwise displaced utterances closer

to the speech situation. A similar, but also different example of displaced language shaded by situated language is the *qua* ('there') in 1. 28: *e l'insalata si mette poi qua dentro* ('and the salad you put it in here'). *Qua* has a pseudo-referent in the *Umfeld* and is probably accompanied by a non-verbal gesture. However, the inside of the plate that is designated by *qua dentro* ('in here') is not the one before coparticipants' eyes but the generic plate full of spaghetti and *sugo* that Anita and Brigitte are talking about. The visually available object only serves as an example. In this form of analogical deixis, the *Umfeld* becomes relevant for referential work, although the displaced mode is not abandoned.

4) *Typical speech activities*. Connected to empraxis and deixis, situated language shows a preference for certain types of speech activities and displaced language a preference for other types of speech activities. Among the prototypical situated language activities are those that are followed by a non-verbal response, such as requests and commands for action, summonses (appealing for action by recipient), requests for permission or order (clearing the way for action by the speaker). Thus, Anita's *ci vuoi tu il sugo sopra* ('do you want the sauce on top') in 1.4 clears the way for a future action by herself, whereas Fiorella's *ich möchte* ('I want') in 1. 16 requires another participant's action. Activities such as compliances, refusals, etc. are second pair parts for these first activities, and equally belong to situated language. Also, arguments and discussions about what to do next belong here. A second very important class of activities associated prototypically with situated language is that of ritual exchanges, and of face-supportive or face-threatening activities in general. These activities are intimately related to both the speaker and the addressee, that is, to the two central personae of the communicative situation. They define, maintain, readjust etc. social relationships between coparticipants for the encounter. In our extract, the initial exchange of wishes (*buon appetito — grazie altrettanto — grazie*) belongs to that class, as well as the compliment and evaluation sequences in V and VII. More general, all activities that try to exert a direct control on coparticipants' next activities by allocating the turn to them, and by imposing on them a next activity type (in conversation analytic terms, all first pair parts belong here), are more typical for situated language than for displaced language.²⁹

Speech activities prototypically related to displaced language are generic statements such as 1. 21/22 (*normalmente tutto si mangia insieme con l'insalata* 'normally one eats all (that?) together with salad'), but also reports, narratives, descriptions, recipes, fantasies, etc.

5) *Turn-taking*. There is a difference in turn-formating, which is a corollary of the affinity between displaced language and representational speech activities such as the ones just mentioned. Narratives, descriptions, etc. usually require more than one utterance to be performed. They typically have to provide for a suspension of the relevance of possible turn transition points. From the perspective of turn-taking, they are what H. Sacks has called "big packages". Contrary to that, situated language tends to make use of many if not all possible transition points. Speaker contributions are often relatively short.

6) *Subjectivity*. Typical situated speech activities such as compliments, greetings and other ritual exchanges involve the EGO and the TU, but only marginally, or not at all, other referents. They are self-contained in the most basic interactional constellation — that of a speaker and a recipient. This leads to a more general sixth characteristic feature of displaced vs. situated language: The more speech is governed by the auctorial principle and by recipient design, the more it makes reference to the specific participants in the given situation, and therefore is situation-bound. No utterance is completely free of traces of the speaker's subjective view, and of the individual recipient to which it is addressed. But in certain genres, this subjectivity is considered to be inappropriate, whereas others are characterized by it. (Cf. scientific discussions and love talk.) Equally, some utterances may be tailored to one specific recipient, whereas others only make use of background knowledge available to large groups of people.

In prototypical situated speech, a given utterance is organized so as to make use of the individual background knowledge of a specific recipient. This may coincide with other features of situated language — e.g. with speech activities such as teases. But subjectivity may also diminish the displacing effect of speech activities such as narratives or other "big packages", typically associated with displaced language. Thus, story telling may have exclusively

phatic purposes; and in fact, personal narratives always have this function to a certain degree.³⁰

Against the background of the six features, let us have a more detailed look at extract (1). Lines 01—03, the initial exchange of wishes, is purely ritual and refers to no elements other than those in the situation (the participants and the beginning of the meal contextualized by the routine). Lines 04—08 are the linguistic islands, to use Bühler's expression, that stand out among the non-verbal, empractic activities involved in the distribution of food. All utterances have immediate non-verbal consequences, the intervening silence in the audio-transcript is most probably filled with non-verbal activities as well. The whole sequence is difficult to interpret with these non-verbal activities not documented.

The first passage of displaced language comprises lines 09—13. Here, the topic 'eating habits in Germany and in Italy' is taken up for the first time (continued in lines 22—34). The displacement is from the present situation, not into another situation in the past or future, but into the generic. Nonetheless, the referent of line 9 — *the sugo* — has to be inferred from the situation, and is not made explicit. Throughout the displaced passages II and IV, elements of the *Umfeld* are made use of through analogic deixis, beginning with this case of a zero pronoun (ellipsis). Whereas the *sugo* remains unspecified, the *pasta*, although available in the surroundings as well, is mentioned (generic *la* article). Fiorella's line 12 (*also hab ich doch recht gehabt* 'so I was right') displaces into another situation which is presumably known, at least by b. (who answers in the positive, l. 13). It therefore makes use of individual background knowledge and brings in subjectivity, although the passage is basically displaced. Lines 14—21 (up to *niente* 'it's alright') return into the situated mode, dealing again with the distribution of food, and including an incomprehensible excuse/acknowledgement sequence (lines 20f). Thus, both types of activities typically associated with the situated mode are present: those that have non-verbal consequences and those on the politeness/face-work level. B. resumes talk about eating habits (up to line 34). The third situated passage (l. 35—41) is a compliment sequence, and therefore primarily relevant for participants' face-work. No referents other than those in the visual-physical surroundings are introduced. The evaluated food remains unspecified and has to be inferred in l. 35—39. But the final *bisch* (n) *ne gute Köchin* ('you're a good

cook') is less situated than the rest: contrary to the compliments concerning the meal, the utterance contains a situation-independent attribution to the cook. The next utterance by a. (l. 42) is not unambiguously classified either: *chi ha scelto questo pranzetto* ('who chose this little lunch') holds a middle position between situated and displaced language. The possible referents of *chi* are to be found among the co-participants, and *questo* also refers deictically. But the perfect points to the past; the utterance invites a narrative sequence or utterance that would clearly belong to the displaced mode. However, Daniela restricts her answer to a meagre *ich*, remaining as much as possible in the situation, although again referring to time past. L. 51 is unintelligible and cannot be attributed to either mode.

The first utterance of passage VII is clearly situated, taking up the compliment sequence of V with reference to the actual meal. The two following utterances (question / answer-sequence in 56/57) again move out of the situation; however, displacement takes place on the time axis exclusively. No *umfeld*-independent time in the past is introduced, the NUNC remains the anchor of temporal reference. The final passage VIII is the beginning of a reporting about the day at school. A definite place (the school) and a definite time interval (this morning) are established, elements of situated language are restricted to the persons (for copresent Daniela and Fiorella are the *dramatis personae* in the narrative sequence).

Before looking at some other examples for moving in and out of displaced language, two final remarks on the distinction between the two modes. The *first* is that the transition between the two modes does not necessarily but frequently correlate with topic change. In our transcript, passages II and IV have the same topic, and so have V and VII, but what is important to note is that every transition from one pragmatic mode to the other occurs at a point in conversation where a topic change *could* have taken place. The interpretation for this correlation in the given context is that of situated language as a buffer between topics dealt with in displaced language. In fact the *Umfeld* is an omnipresent (re)source from which a new topic can be generated when the old one is worn out. (Note that the weather, the classic buffer topic, is also usually generated out of the speech situation.) The more 'important' the non-verbal part of an episode, the more it will interrupt displaced language and cut off running topics. (For instance the arrival of

a customer who wants to be served in a shop will usually terminate displaced talk about private affairs among the personnel.)

Second, it might be necessary to underline again here that one difference between situated and displaced language certainly does not hold: it is not the case that situated language is context-dependent whereas displaced language is not. Statements such as that proper names (a typically non-deictic referential means) are context-independent whereas pronouns are context-dependent are wrong. It is not the quantity, but the quality of its relationship to context that distinguishes situated and displaced language. By using the first referential mode, coparticipants construe around them the social territory on which they interact and which is defined by an area of immediate sensual accessibility. By using the second mode, participants allude to, rely upon, constitute, make relevant etc. elements of knowledge that cannot be taken from the visual surroundings but, as part of (generic or specific) social knowledge, have to be taken from memory.³¹

3. MOVING IN AND OUT OF DISPLACED LANGUAGE

The discussion of the first example has shown that it is possible to delimit stretches of displaced language against those of situated language in conversation relatively easily, although intermediate passages do occur. I now want to look at these transitions in more detail.

Even in dense displaced language — in panel discussions, university lectures, in the most fervent arguments or the most fascinating story tellings — the symbolically erected structures of 'textworlds' displaced from the situation may be disrupted by the trivialities of the 'real' world of face-to-face interaction. A telephone that rings and must be answered, a cigarette that is to be lighted, intrusions on the other's territory — by chance touching or hitting — that must be apologized for and many other little things can distract, or threaten to distract, coparticipants' attention for a short moment to the spatio-temporal surroundings in which they have built up these displaced 'textworlds'. Such trivialities are mostly dealt with as time outs, a status that underlines the hierarchisation of displaced and situated language in the given contexts.

As the moment in which they come up often cannot be predicted and as they have to be dealt with immediately, they are potential

interruptions to displaced language. Treating them as time outs keeps the disruptiveness to a minimum. There are typical linguistic means for this, above all a marked decrease in loudness. Explicit markings are rare, apart from small apology tokens such as *scusa* (or *sorry*).

Minute flashes of prosodically bracketed situated language occurring almost unpredictably in displaced language are one extreme of the possible hierarchisation of displaced and situated language. The other is represented by activity-centred episodes — carrying up a piano to the third floor and the like. Whereas displaced language can never be totally sheltered from possible *umfeld*-generated dis-

Ex. (2) (A I 48)

- 16 a: ancora? —
17 R: un po
((pp)) (3.0)
18 D: Fi:orella::
19 ((ppp))
20 F: Da:nie:l [a::
21 a: adesso face [iamo così
((pp)) [h h h h h
22 D(?): piatto di Bri:g:itte
23 a: non tro [ppo
24 b: D(?): [pro:nto
25 a: h h h h h h
26 (5.0)
27 hai saputo qualcosa di Mario? —
→ 28 io
29 a: ch?
30 b: no
31 ((etc.))

Rough translation

- 16 a: more? —
17 Ri: a litte
18 (3.0)
19 D: Fi:orella::
20 F: Da:nie:l [a::
21 a: [now let's do it [like this
22 D(?): [h h h h h
23 a: Brigitte's plate
24 b: not too [much
25 D(?): [ready
26 a: h h h h h h
27 (5.0)
→ 28 any news from Mario? —
29 b: you mean me?
30 a: yeah?
31 b: no
((etc.))

Ex. (3) (A I 55)

- 23 D: gute Köchin;
(p)
24 (2.0)
25 a: complimenti alla cuoca?
26 D: mhm,
27 a: ah
28 b: h h h h
29 (2.0)
→30 b: allora; chi racconta; — Fiorella (.) che
31 cosa hai fatto nella scuola oggi?
32 (6.0)
33 F: scritto
34 a: hai guardato il maestro
(etc., follows report on school day)

Rough translation

- 23 D: good cook;
24 (2.0)
25 a: compliments to the cook?
26 D: mhm,
27 a: ah
28 b: h h h h
29 (2.0)
→30 b: now then; who is going to tell us; — Fiorella (.) what
31 have you done in school today?
32 (6.0)
33 F: written
34 a: you were looking at the teacher
(etc.)

turbances, situated language without any displacements is nothing exceptional. Our lunch episode stands somewhere in the middle. Formally, it is activity centered, but as in our culture, eating without having a conversation has become a strange thing, it can be expected that, in addition to verbal activities related to the coordination of non-verbal activities such as preparing and distributing the food, displaced talk on other topics will come up sooner or later. Apart from lines 61ff in the first datum, this happens in the following two extracts.

In both cases, the beginning of the displaced passage certainly is not disruptive for the preceding situated one. On the contrary, the latter shows distinct features of closings, such as long silence preceding the first displaced/displacing utterance, continuers, agreement tokens, laughter and similar activities that do not develop the old topic any further.³² But the new, displaced topic is not tied to the old, situated one. It starts where a new topic can legitimately start without being anchored semantically in what has been said

before. The displacement is done in the first utterance. Thus, *hai saputo qualcosa di Mario?* 'any news from Mario?' (A I 48: 28) introduces a non-present person via a proper name, *Fiorella che cosa hai fatto nella scuola oggi* 'Fiorella what did you do in school today' (A I 55: 30f) displaces from the time and the place of the *origo*. (In addition, the turn-initial *allora* (roughly 'well') marks the transition formally, *chi racconta* ('who is going to tell us') names the verbal activity that is supposed to be carried out now.³³)

Smoother transitions take up an element of the on-going talk and use it for an intermediate utterance that contains situated and displaced elements. Often, a certain detail of the situation is generalized to a more abstract statement that can be used for the generation of a fully displaced narrative, descriptive, or argumentative passage.

Ex. (4) (B I 14)

- 16 F: ah ich weiß gar nich wo [ich anfangs soll! — —
17 b: [hier!
18
19 a: [h h h h
20 b: [h h h h quante ce n'è ancora =
21 a: = anche voi — [ma io ho già mangiahhhtohhh
22 b: [h h h h [si anche io
23 a: [h h h h
24 F: [no::
25 D: ed io/
26 b: he h — —
27 F: (im Lokal) —
(p)
→28 b: ah- mi piacciono molto i gelati [h h h h
29 a: [h h h h
30 F: [h h h h möchte Sie
(f)
31 von mir?
32 nee,
33 R: ich bin ganz (.....) bin schon satt
34 b: mm — — è pecc [ato
35 F: [Dani wirds essen
36 b: Daniela — [tu
37 R: [Daniela — willsch du?
38 a: a te piacciono — —
39 D(?): si — però —
40 a: si ma anch'io come loro vedi? — — su quattro ore (0.5)
41 b: e 'h h [h h
42 a(?): [ehh:
→43 F: beim Essen daheim bin ich immer die letschte; — —
44 b: soso
(f)
45 F: müssen sie immer auf mich warte — bis ich fertig bin
46 ?:
47 hm
(3.0)

Rough translation

- 16 F: ah I really don't [know where to start! — —
 17 b: here!
 18 [hn hn hn h
 19 a: [hn hn how much there is still left! —
 20 b: you too — {but I have already ea(hh)t(hh)en h h
 21 a: {yes so have I
 22 b: [h h h h h h [h h h h h h h h
 23 a: [h h h h
 24 F: [no::
 25 D: and I/
 26 b: he h — —
 27 F: (in the restaurant) —
 → 28 b: ah — I really like ice cream [hn hn hn hn
 29 a: [hn hn [hn
 30 F: {do you want of
 31 F: mine?
 32 b: no,
 33 R: I am really (. . .) I am full already
 34 b: mm — — that [s a pity
 35 F: [Dany is going to eat it
 36 D: Daniela — {you
 37 R: [Daniela — do you want (it)?
 38 a: you like them — —
 39 D: yes — but —
 40 a: yes but me too like them you see? — — () (0.5)
 41 b: e hn [hn
 42 a(?): [chn:
 → 43 F: when we eat at home I am always last; — —
 44 b: I see
 45 F: they always have to wait for me — until I am finished
 46 ? hn
 47 (3.0)

Fiorella's *beim Essen daheim bin ich immer die letschte* ('when we eat at home I'm always last') (MG B I 14: 43) makes use of the definition of the present situation as 'eating' and generates the locally and temporally displaced topic 'eating at home' out of it. Brigitte's *mi piacciono molto i gelati* ('I really love ice cream') only moves out of the *Umfeld* on the time axis without establishing another situational context. Both utterances are less prepared by silence and other closing techniques than the two abrupt transitions discussed before. They can afford it, for they do not leave the old topic entirely. Note that both of them have the potential of being followed up by a personal narrative.

4. SITUATED AND DISPLACED LANGUAGE: A COMPARISON WITH OTHER DICHOTOMIES ON THE INTERACTIONAL LEVEL

The relevance of the dichotomy "situated vs. displaced", as introduced in this paper, becomes more obvious when it is compared to other dichotomies currently discussed in linguistics, in particular, to Ochs Keenan's distinction between planned and unplanned discourse (first introduced in Ochs Keenan 1977) and Givón's distinction between a pragmatic and a syntactic mode (Givón 1979a & b).

Ochs Keenan argues that child language is characterized by the use of unplanned language, and that adults are also using unplanned language in addition to planned discourse in certain circumstances. Unplanned discourse is characterized, according to the author, by the following features (1977: 16ff):

- "speakers rely on the immediate context to express propositions";
- "speakers rely on morpho-syntactic structures acquired in early stages of language development";
- "speakers tend to repeat and replace lexical items in the expression of a proposition";
- "the form and content of sequentially arranged social acts tend to be more similar."

Whereas c) and d) are not relevant for the distinction between situated and displaced language and b) does not apply (for although child language is more situated than adult language can be, the corresponding grammatical morphemes, such as deictic *I* and *you*, are acquired relatively late), a) seems to overlap with the situated mode. It needs some further discussion.

Let us look at Ochs Keenan's examples for this feature. She gives three cases of reliance on immediate context:

- Referent deletion. Although she mentions "reliance on non-verbal means to supply the missing information, e.g. the use of pointing, reaching, holding up, eye gaze, etc." (p. 16), her data extracts all suggest that what is involved here is textual ellipsis; this ellipsis must be resolved, not by recurrence to the situation, but by recurrence to the cotext, as in the following example:

(Two Girls, Schegloff ts.)

B: uh how's school goin.

A: oh: same old shit.

- B: Hhhh (really?)
 A: have a lotta tough courses.

Although the first person personal pronoun is a deictic symbol, and can be part of situated talk, its omission in the present case is only possible, because prior talk has established A as the person-being-talked-about (cf. the initial line by B., to which the last line is tied via the schematic relationship between *school* and *courses*). The reconstruction of the last sentence as *I have a lotta tough courses*, against competing *they have/ we have/ you have a lotta tough courses*, won't succeed for the utterance spoken in isolation, even in a known *Umfeld*. In addition, it is quite unlikely that the *I*-ellipsis would be accompanied by a nonverbal sign.

b) Topic prominence vs. subject prominence. The occurrence of hanging topics (*the mo-modern art the twentieth century art, there's about eight books*- same extract as above) and other dislocations splitting off the topic from the proposition, is doubtlessly independent of the *Umfeld*. It follows, instead, principles of natural, iconic linguistic serialisation (as opposed to syntactic serialisation).
 c) Implicit linkage of propositions without marking of the semantic relationship holding between them. (*I don't like this house. It looks strange* is an example for an implicit causal relationship given by Ochs Keenan.) This is yet another case of semantic implicitness that can be resolved, not by situational knowledge, but by "knowledge of the world and our expectations concerning the sequencing of talk to relate the two propositions" (p. 22).

It becomes apparent that Ochs Keenan's context-dependence of unplanned discourse is, at least in all of her examples, dependence on background knowledge and on the co-text, but not situational embeddedness in the sense discussed in the present paper. In fact, when she states that "reliance on context to communicate information falls towards the unplanned pole and reliance on syntax falls towards the planned pole" (p. 16.), it is clear that her two types of discourse are much more similar to the pragmatic vs. syntactic mode, than to situated vs. displaced language. For them, Givón gives the following description (1979b: 223):

pragmatic mode	syntactic mode
—topic-comment structure	—subject-predicate structure
—loose conjunction	—tight subordination
—slow rate of delivery (under several intonation contours)	—fast rate of delivery (under a single intonational contour)
—word-order is governed mostly by one <i>pragmatic</i> principle: old information goes first, new information follows)	—word-order is used to signal <i>semantic</i> case-functions (though it may also be used to indicate pragmatic-topicality relations)
—roughly one-to-one ratio of verbs-to-nouns in discourse, with the verbs being semantically simple; no use of grammatical morphology	—a larger ratio of nouns-over-verbs in discourse, with the verbs being semantically complex; elaborate use of grammatical morphology
—prominent intonation-stress marks the focus of new information; topic information; topic intonation is less prominent	—very much the same, but perhaps not exhibiting as high a functional load, and at least in some languages totally absent.

Givón goes on to show that his dichotomy characterizes pidgins vs. creoles, child vs. adult language, and informal vs. formal language.

Yet, the same linguistic communication forms — child language, informal language (one might add, oral language) and pidgins or pidginized varieties — also display the features of situated language, much more than those of displaced language.³⁴ It must be concluded that we are dealing with two theoretically independent, empirically often co-occurring dimensions of 'non-formal language'. Peirce's classic distinction between symbol, icon and index (Peirce 1960ff) may be mapped onto the distinction between displaced/syntactic, pragmatic and situated mode. The basic relations between language and situation that are the referential basis of situated language are relations of pointing, or indexing; the relations between language and co-text or world knowledge that make out the pragmatic mode are often iconic (e.g. expression of posteriority by simple juxtaposition of two propositions). Language that is neither supported by

indexical relations to the *Umfeld*, nor by iconic relations to 'the world', and that is therefore heavily arbitrary and culture-bound, is displaced/ syntactic.

Address of the author: Peter Auer
Fachgruppe Sprachwissenschaft
Universität Konstanz
D-7750 Konstanz (FRG)

NOTES

* A first version of this paper was read at the International Pragmatics Conference, Viareggio, September 1985. I wish to thank the members of the regular Konstanz colloquy on Soziolinguistik und Gesprächsanalyse for their comments and criticism.

¹ 1952/1966: 61.

* Cf. Bühler (1934: 366 f): "Es gibt im Anwendungsbereich der menschlichen Sprachzeichen einen Befreiungsschritt, der vielleicht einmal im Werdegang der Menschensprache zu den entscheidendsten gehörte. Wir vermögen ihn zwar nicht historisch zu rekonstruieren, wozu so gut wie jeder Anhalt in der Linguistik von heute fehlt, können ihn aber systematisch bestimmen als die Befreiung, soweit sie geht und möglich geworden ist, von den *Situationshilfen*: es ist der Übergang vom wesentlich *empirischen* Sprechen zu selbständigen (selbstversorgten) Sprachprodukten."

³ Let me note here that I am very reluctant to take over the conventional way of talking of language as situation "dependent". It seems much more appropriate to conceive of the relationship between talk and situation as a reflexive, dialectic one, in which language defines the relevant *Umfeld* just as it is influenced by it. Indeed, the *Umfeld* is no physical datum, it is produced by those who act in it, by exactly their acting. Phenomenologists such as A. Schütz have noticed and discussed this point in some detail (cf. Schütz & Luckmann 1975: 73 ff, particularly their discussion of *Reichweite*), but the linguistic dimension of the problem has remained almost untouched.

⁴ Cf. Bernstein 1965/1971: 125 f.

³ Cf. e.g. Rauh 1984, Levinson 1983.

⁶ For instance, Rauh 1984 and Jakobson 1950 (1976), if we equate his notion of "shifters" with that of deixis.

⁷ I owe this expression to Voloshinov's discussion of reported speech (citations), cf. Voloshinov 1930. Also cf. Benveniste's notion of "subjectivité" (1958).

⁸ Cf. Sacks & Schegloff 1979.

* Cf. Gumperz 1982, 1985. For a summary, cf. Auer 1985.

¹⁰ It is an entirely different issue that from the use of certain polite or impolite forms, reference to a co-present participant can be inferred or excluded (cf. Coulmas 1980 for Japanese). Reference is not established by these polite forms, but only via the inferential process that is based on the knowledge activated by them.

¹¹ Omitted by the author.

¹² For Bühler, all deictic words are *Rezeptionszeichen* (reception signs) that lay the sensual ground for the reception of non-linguistic signs such as gestures which necessarily accompany them. Recently, Schegloff (1984) has shown that gestures are often completed or, at least, have reached their acme before the corresponding deictic word occurs. This contradicts Bühler's conception of deictic words as reception preparing. Almost the opposite seems to be true: the gesture is sequentially prior, and the deictic word provides the syntactic and semantic slot in which it is supposed to fit in.

¹³ Cf. Benveniste 1959, Ehlich 1982.

¹⁴ Cf. Di Luzio 1981 for the Italian pronominal system and Hottenroth 1985 for an overview of the Italian local deictic system.

¹⁸ Apart from Bühler, Pike and a few others, linguists have done little research on empraxis — a gap that can only partly be explained by technical difficulties in the observation and documentation of non-verbal structures before the invention of the video camera, and by linguists' reluctance to share a field of research with micro-sociologists and psychologists. Harris (1981: 157f) correctly observes that not recognising the "chronological integration between linguistic and non-linguistic events" (which he calls co-temporality, p. 157) has meant to "obscure . . . (the) experiential basis" of language and "any convincing explanation of how displacement works" (p. 158).

¹⁶ The term displacement is intended as a translation of Bühler's *Versetzung* here. Displacement is also one of the design features of language mentioned by Hockett (1958: 579).

¹⁷ Of course, most deictic signs include symbolic information, such as the pronouns information about sex. But independent of how much symbolic information is being conveyed, deictic signs are all equally dependent on the *Umfeld* for interpretation.

¹⁸ Cf. e.g. Fillmore 1971, Wunderlich 1982, Jarvella & Klein (eds) 1982, Rauh (ed.) 1983.

¹⁰ For instance, a description of a displaced object may contain a characterization of the size of this object that uses *così grande* and the corresponding movement of the hands. Or the historical present may be used to narrate in the past.

²⁰ Cf. Fillmore 1982.

²¹ Luckmann (1984: 56) describes this type of interaction, based on Schütz, as "zeichengebundene Kommunikation bei einem Höchstmaß an Unmittelbarkeit und Wechselseitigkeit, also unter der Bedingung voll synchronisierter Bewußtseinsströme der Beteiligten."

²² Cf. Chafe 1976.

²³ Ehlich (1983 etc.) argues that the distinction between maintained and changed referential focus delimitates anaphor from deixis proper. However, it seems that there is little if any difference between the repeated use of *io* and that of the third person pronoun interpreted with reference to an afore-mentioned expression. In order to avoid the unwanted conclusion that the first person pronoun is anaphoric, the definition of anaphor has to include 'reference to the text' or something similar as a defining feature. Maintained vs. changed referential focus distinguishes text deixis (expressions such as *see above*, *in the following* etc.) from anaphor.

²⁴ The data were collected in the DFG-project "Muttersprache italienischer Gastarbeiterkinder" in the Sonderforschungsbereich 99, Konstanz, Director A. di Luzio.

²³ Transcription conventions are largely those in use in Conversation Analysis. / = break-off; = = latching, hh = laughter, - = silence not exceeding 0.5 sec., 0.5 etc. = silence of 0.5 etc. sec., °xxx° = piano.

²⁰ In Ekman & Friesen's terminology (1981: 71 ff), we are dealing with affect displays, **regulators**, adaptors and some illustrators (iconic and intrinsic ones) in displaced language, but with deictic illustrators, emblems and of course non-representational social activities in situated language. These non-verbal activities are more central to our understanding of what is going on.

²⁷ *Sopra* 'on top of' (in 1. 4) of course is not deictic but only empiractically abridged. As two place predicate, its interpretation depends on establishing the food (the spaghetti) as the point of reference. From this point of reference, the *sugo* is *sopra*. *Lo* 'it' is clearly anaphoric.

²⁸ In the southern German variety the children's use of the imperfect *hatte* is rare, that is, the use of the perfect is not, or only in a very weak way, in a systematic contrast with the imperfect in given case of *recht haben*.

²⁹ The corresponding second pair-parts may be in the mode of displaced language — take narratives as answers to certain questions such as 'how did it happen?'

³⁰ Streeck (MS) demonstrates this function very clearly in his analysis of the *Unterhaltungskunst* (art of conversation/ art of entertainment) of some elderly ladies in Mannheim who perform stories rather than telling them.

³¹ My distinction between deictic and displaced language draws upon Bühler's writings, specifically on his notion of *empraxis*. The other pioneer in research on context is E. Benveniste. In an article of 1970 (1974), he introduces the notion of *énonciation*, 'l'acte même de produire un énoncé' (80). He then gives a list of linguistic elements that depend on this 'conversation individuelle de la langue en discours' (81). It includes the personal pronouns, demonstratives, tenses referring to the speech situation, questions, 'intimation' (imperatives, vocatives, etc.), but also assertions and modality. The temporal aspect is also treated in an earlier paper (1959/1966), where Benveniste assigns French tenses to two systems, which are the basis of *historic* and *discursive* talk ('*récit*' vs. '*discours*'). The '*récit*' is said to be free of any influence by the speaker; it is exclusively written and refers to past events. Deictic signs such as *je*, *maintenant*, *ici* are absent. The only possible tenses are the *passé simple*, the *imparfait* and the *plusqueparfait*. The *discours* is written or oral, it presupposes a speaker and a hearer, uses deictic signs and all tenses with the exception of the *passé simple*. (Later, his opposition has been taken up and elaborated in Weinrich's famous distinction between *erzählte und besprochene Welt* (1966).)

It is obvious that both Benveniste's notion of *discours* and that of the *énonciation* have to do with the present notion of situated language. Yet there are some fundamental differences. The main problem with Benveniste's approach is for me the fact that the act of using a linguistic system (*l'énonciation*) is the basis of all linguistic texts, written or oral, displaced or not. This is reflected in Benveniste's own *façon de parler* '*énonciation historique*' and '*énonciations de discours*' (1959/66: 241 f), which should be contradictory if '*récit*' ('*historique*') were restricted to speech free of any elements of the linguistic production. What can be opposed to *énonciation* is the linguistic system (*langue*), or the linguistic text as the reified document of a process of *énonciation*. But *l'énonciation* is not contrastable with *récit* or, in our terms, with situated language. Benveniste's *récit*, on the other hand, is much too restricted (remember it is exclusively written!) to be useful for an analysis of conversational data. Contrary to Bühler, Benveniste does not distinguish between deictic signs as part of a linguistic system and situated language. *Je*, *tu*, *demain* and the like have no reality outside discourse for him (1970/1974: 84). But clearly, a pronoun such as *je* is part of the French language and can be semantically described. Its semantic content is the instruction it gives to the recipient to find a referent in the *Umfeld* who is identified by the voice of the speaker. The *Zeigfeld* exists for any language, as independently of its usage.

³² For the organisation of topical closings, cf. Maynard 1982 and Button & Casey 1984.

³³ In the lay uses of the term, 'narration' seems to be roughly equivalent to a big package.

³⁴ For instance, it has been shown in a study on the linguistic behaviour of Italian migrant children in German (Auer & Di Luzio, in press) that on the discourse semantic level, their language is characterized by the features of the situated and the pragmatic mode.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Auer, Peter. 1985. "Kontextualisierung". *Studium Linguistik* 19.
- Auer, Peter & Aldo Di Luzio. (In press). Discourse semantic characteristics of the language of Italian migrant children in Germany. To appear in *Fortschritte der Semantik* (ed. A. v. Stechow).
- Benveniste, Émile. 1952 (1966). "Communication animale et langage humain." *Diogenes* I. Reprinted in Benveniste 1966: 56–82.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1958 (1966). "De la subjectivité dans le langage." *Journal de Psychologie* 7–9 (1958). Reprinted in Benveniste 1966: 258–266.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1959 (1966). "Les relations de temps dans le verbe français." *BSL* LIV, 1. Reprinted Benveniste 1966: 237–250.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. *Problèmes de linguistique générale* Paris: Gallimard.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1970 (1974). "L'appareil formel de l'énonciation." *Langages* 17. Reprinted in: Benveniste, E. *Problèmes de linguistique générale* II. Paris: Gallimard, 79–88.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1965 (1971). "A socio-linguistic approach to social learning." In: Julius Gould (ed.) *Penguin survey of social sciences*, Harmondsworth: Penguin. Reprinted in B. Bernstein, *Class, codes and control*, Vol I., London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 118–139.
- Bühler, Karl. 1934. *Sprachtheorie*. Jena: Fischer.
- Button, Graham & Neil Casey. 1984. "Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitors." In: J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds) *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: CUP, 167–190.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. "Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view." In: Charles N. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 25–56.
- Conlmas, Florian. 1980. "Zur Personaldeixis im Japanischen." *Papiere zur Linguistik* 23, 3–19.
- Di Luzio, Aldo. 1981. "Bemerkungen zur Struktur und Funktion der Personalpronomina 3. Person Subjekt im Italienischen." In: Christoph Schwarze (ed) *Italienische Sprachwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Narr, 45–60.
- Ehlich, Konrad. 1982. "Anaphora and deixis: same, similar, or different?" In Jarvella & Klein (eds), 315–338.
- Ehlich, Konrad. 1983. "Deixis and Anapher." In Rauh (ed.) 1983, 79–97.
- Ekman, Paul & Wallace V. Friesen. 1981. "The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: categories, origins, usage, and coding." In: Adam Kendon (ed.) *Nonverbal Communication, Interaction, and Gesture*. The Hague: Mouton, 57–105.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1971 (1975). Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis. IULC.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1982. "Towards a descriptive framework for spatial deixis." In: Jarvella & Klein (eds), 31–59.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979a. "From discourse to syntax: grammar as a processing strategy." In: Givón (ed.) *Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 81–111.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979b. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, John. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Gumperz, John. 1985. "Ethnography in urban communication." In: Peter Auer & Aldo di Luzio (eds) *Interpretive Sociolinguistics*. Tübingen: Narr, 1–12.
- Harris, Roy. 1981. *The language myth*. London: Duckworth.
- Hockett, Charles. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hottenroth, Monika. 1985. "Die Bezeichnung räumlicher Verhältnisse im Italienischen." In: Christoph Schwarze (ed.) *Bausteine für eine italienische Grammatik*. Tübingen: Narr, 1983.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1950 (1971). "Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb." *Selected Writings II*. The Hague: Mouton, 130–147.
- Jarvella, Robert J. & Wolfgang Klein (eds). 1982. *Speech, Place and Action*. Chichester: John Wiley.

- Kurylowicz, Jerzy. 1972. "The role of deictic elements in linguistic evolution." *Semiotika* 5. 174-183.
- Levinson, Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Luckmann, Thomas. 1984. "Das Gespräch." In: Karlheinz Stierle & Rainer Warning (eds), *Das Gespräch*. München: Fink, 49-63.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Maynard, D. W. 1980. "Placement of topic changes in conversation." *Semiotika* 30/3-4, 262-290.
- Ochs Keenan, Elinor. 1977. "Why look at unplanned and planned discourse?" In: E. Ochs Keenan & T. L. Bennett (eds) *Discourse Across Time and Space*. Los Angeles (= Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5), 1-41.
- Peirce, Charles S. 1960-66. *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Ed. by Charles Hartshorne, Paul Weiss & Arthur Burks. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rauh, Gisa. 1984. *Aspekte der Deixis II: Deiktische Dimensionen und die Verwendung deiktischer Ausdrücke*. LAUT A. 123.
- Rauh, Gisa (ed.) 1983. *Essays on Deixis*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Sacks, Harvey & Emanuel Schegloff 1979. "Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons in conversation and their interaction." In: George Psathas (ed.) *Everyday Language*. New York: Irvington.
- Schegloff, Emanuel. 1984. "On some gestures' relation to talk." In: J. Maxwell Atkinson & John Heritage (eds), *Structures of Social Action*. Cambridge: CUP, pp 266-296.
- Schütz, Alfred & Thomas Luckmann. 1975. *Strukturen der Lebenswelt*. Neuwied: Luchterhand.
- Streeck, Jürgen. MS. *Die leichte Muse des gewöhnlichen Gesprächs. Über die Unterhaltungskunst einiger älterer Frauen*. Manuscript, Free University of Berlin. 1985.
- Voloshinov, Valentin. 1930 (1975). *Marxismus und Sprachphilosophie*. Frankfurt: Ullstein.
- Weinrich, Harald. 1964 (1971). *Tempus. Besprechende und erzählte Welt*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1982. "Sprache und Raum." *Studium Linguistik* 12: 1-19, and 13: 37-59.

CONTENTS

(continued)

- J. ROORYCK, Formal aspects of French nonlexical Datives ... 373
- K. B. KYOTA—P. SWIGGERS, Concomitance-mediated plurals and grammatical person hierarchy in Yaka 387
- A. M. ZWIOCKY, Direct reference in heads 397

III. CONTRIBUTIONS ON OTHER TOPICS

- A. MARTINET, De l'expression libre des rapports syntaxiques... 405
- F. ČERMÁK, On the substance of idioms 413
- F. MENZ—R. WODAK—H. GRUBER—B. LUTZ, Power struggles and the media: a case study 439
- M. CLYNE—J. HOEKS—H.-J. KREUTZ, Cross-cultural responses to academic discourse patterns 457
- LIBRI 477
- Announcement 493

FOLIA LINGUISTICA

Correspondence concerning *Folia Linguistica* should be addressed to the editor:

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang U. Dressler,
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft
Liechtensteinstraße 46a,
A-1090 Wien, Austria

for matters pertaining to *Folia Linguistica Historica* the Editor,
Prof. Jacek Fisiak, Institute of English, Adam Mickiewicz University,
PL-61-874 Poznań, Poland, should be contacted.

The STYLE SHEET for contributions to *Folia Linguistica* is enclosed periodically with the journal, it is also available from the editor.

For fees and payment modalities, see inside front cover.

PLEASE WRITE NAMES AND ADDRESSES IN BLOCK CAPITALS