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ON DEIXIS AND DISPLACEMENT*  

PETER AURK

0. INTRODUCTION

Delimiting human language against other symbolic codes, Benveniste writes: "Le caractère du langage est de procurer un substitut de l’expérience épique 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." 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 development and the condition for literacy. But of course, interaction among adult humans is not always independent 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" code may be rephrased in terms of the degrees of situation boundedness these networks require/allow.) It follows that situation-bounded speech has 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 more 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 situativeness define pragramatic 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 deixis. For instance, some linguists talk of social deixis and thereby refer to registers, politeness forms, honorifics and similar linguistic structures. 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 authors 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, deixis and the like. He 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: 25), or “Deixis ist immer dann beteiligt, wenn ein Sprachberer a Sprache etwas, das als ‘nonge’ bezeichnet wurde, mit sich, ‘ego’ in B e z i e h u n g s e s t z e t ” (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: 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: 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, 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.

A grammatically oriented criterion for delimiting deixis 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 word-bound or context-bound 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 (calendars, clocks, 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 Bühl er 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 Bühl er's writings. As is well known, Bühl er argues in his Sprachtheorie that in order to fulfill what he calls the Darstellungsfunktion (referential function), natural languages have one deictic field (Zeitfeld) 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 Bühl er, 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 symbolic 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. 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 deictes ad oscula may be personal pronouns (first and second person io, tu, noi, voi and their paradigms; less prototypically, because of their alternative anaphoric usage, the third person lui, loro, lei etc.), including 'dropped' (zero) pronouns (sono venuto 'I came' etc.); demonstratives (questo = HIC, 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 (addesso 'now', già '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').

Non-referential linguistic structures that depend in their interpretation on the Umfeld are not part of the deictic field for Bühl er. This can be seen in his en passant discussion of imperatives, which he subsumes under Aktionszeichen (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 Aktionszeichen require action, and are therefore pragmatically different. Appellwörter are, as Bühl er puts it, "Auf- take im Nahverkehr" (p. 116), they establish copresence and thereby have the function of preparing interaction as such, not of establishing or maintaining references.

Bühl er's discussion of ellipsis, particularly his notion of emphasis (154ff), is also important here. Again, he does not include it among the deictic signs, although in his examples, emphasis makes a sentence most dramatically depend on the spatio-temporal surroundings. Take an utterance such as Firenze andata e ritorno (slightly adapted from Bühl er), 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, linguistico islands: "Sprachinseln tauchen im Meer der schweigsamnen aber eindeutigen Verkehrs an solchen Stellen auf, wo eine Differenzierung, eine Distanz, eine Entscheidung zwischen mehreren Möglichkeiten getroffen werden soll und besagen durch ein eingesetztes Wort getroffen werden kann" (186). According to Bühler, empractic utterances may contain linguistic elements from both the deictic and the symbolic field 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 (Zweifelder-Theorie), 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 Viaggio.

for the deictic temporal adverbial domani (‘tomorrow’) the synthetic counterpart il giorno dopo (‘the day after’), for the adverbial of manner cosi (‘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 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 hierarchization of place and time can be justified on historical grounds, as Bühler and also Kurkowiak (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 shifts. 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 delictic 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 I 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 has been established before is still the one relevant for the interpretation of the utterance. On the other hand, there are delictic 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, that is, the distinction between information that is supposed to be in the addressee's consciousness already and information that is not, crosses the distinction between delictic and non-delictic signs. Weinreich (1964, 11071: 14) has introduced the term *obstimato* signs for deixis to given information: *Obstimato* 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 delictic 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.35

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: a 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(rita) are adults, Fiorella (12), Daniela (14) and Rino (9) are the bilingual children of an Italian family living in Constanza.34 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.35

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, L, 61)]

---

01 b: allora buon appetito
02 a: 
03 D: 
04 n: el voudra sa il sago sopra; (0.5) te lo
05 (F)
06 metto; (0.7)
07 D-R: viliach Solis; 
08 e — metto un po ché (......) dentro — eh?
09 (0.9)
10 ---
11 b: che me metto sulla (carta) — (alla toiletta)
12 ---
13 F: alle toiletta si mette sotto — sopra la paste;
14 ---
15 l: ---
16 F: ---
17 ---
18 b: ---
19 F: ---
20 ---
21 b: ---
---
manca insieme con l'insalata b b
tutto questo
b b

Vi
42 a: chi ha scelto questo pranzetto (2.0)
44 D: hm ' (2.0)
45 b: chi era —
46 D: ich —
47 a: tu
48 D: ja — ja —
49 F: noi non stiamo (.....)
50 (2.0)
51 F: ma quanto è buona la pasta
52 (2.0)
53 b: b b b
54 b: ha bisogno; tu hai gia assaggiata —
55 a: si ha assaggiato.
56 (1.0)
58 b(f): hm
59 (2.0)
60 a: a oggi non sono andato a scuola e siete usciti
62 prima;
63 D: siamo 'un'
64 F: sì, siamo andata a scuola.
65 a: hm —
66 b: dove svette (.....) la la — la Schulteanche
67 D: nona
68 (1.0)
69 b: 'Non avete una casa —
70 D: ich hatte heute um 11.20 aus; — — — — well
71 D: der Lehrer krank isch;
(continues about father of D/F: why he didn't come, that he is unemployed, etc.)
interaction. So an increase in interpretive difficulties encountered by the conversation analyst but not shared by coparticipants is typical for situated language.

2) Emphasis. Situated language is prototypically emphatic. It is only a — sometimes minor — part of a total of activities. Because of its emphatic 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 (I. 4) deictically refers to the plate (it), te (‘you’) to the addressee (Rino), metto (‘I put’) qua verb paradigm to the speaker (a), etc. 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 noodle’). 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 cìlla tedesca (‘the German way’) and the imperative 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—36). On the other hand, deictic elements occur in displaced language, for instance, in Fiorella’s 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. The use of grammatical deixis therefore moves participants’ otherwise displaced utterances closer
to the speech situation. A similar, but also different example of
placed language is the uso (‘there’) in 1. 23: ‘io non sa ne gno
dentro’ (‘the plate you put it in here’). This has a pseudo-referent in the
Unfald and is probably accompanied by a non-verbal gesture. However, the inside of
the plate that is designated by gua 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 Unfald becomes relevant for referential work, although the
placed mode is not abandoned.

4) Typical speech activities. Connected to emphasis 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 recursion), requests for permission or order (clearing the
way for action by the speaker). Thus, Anita’s ‘il 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 möcht (‘I want’) in 1. 16
requires another participant’s action. Activities such as compliance,
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-threaten-
ing 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 ap-
petito — 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 copartici-
pants’ next activities by allocating the turn to them, and by im-
posing on them a next activity type (in conversation analytic terms,
al first pair parts belong here), are more typical for situated lan-
guage than for displaced language.23

Speech activities prototypically related to displaced language are
generic statements such as 1. 21/22 (‘normalmente tutto si mangia
insieme con Pinate o ‘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 re-
presentational speech activities such as the ones just mentioned.
narratives, descriptions, etc. usually require more than one utter-
ance to be performed. They typically have to provide for a suspen-
sion 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 compli-
ments, 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 utter-
ance 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 characterised 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 tesas. But subject-
itivity 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.36

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 refer 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, emotivistic 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 pasti, although available in the surroundings as well, is mentioned (generic la article). Fiorella’s line 12 (also hab ich doch recht gehab’t so I was right)47 displaces into another situation which is presumably known, at least by b. (who answers in the positive, 1. 13). It therefore makes use of individual background knowledge and brings in subjectivity, although the passage is basically displaced. Lines 14—21 (up to nieste ‘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/facework level. B. resumes talk about eating habits (up to line 34). The third situated passage (1. 35—41) is a compliment sequence, and therefore primarily relevant for participants’ facework. No referents other than those in the visual-physical surroundings are introduced. The evaluated food remains unspecified and has to be inferred in 1. 35—39. But the final blöch (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. (1. 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 deixically. 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 persona (for copresent Daniela and Fiorella are the dramatic 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 class 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, coparticipante construes around them the social territory on which they interact and which is defined by an area of immediate sensorial 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 created 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, coparticipante’s 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 moments 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 excuse (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 unmediated displaced language.
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 or 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. 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 scoperto 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."

Smotherer 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. (3) (A I 55)
23  D:  giunta Kichin;
     (p0)
24  a:  complimenti alla cuoca?
25  D:  mhm,
26  a:  ah
27  b:  b b b b
28  b:  (2.0)
29  b:  allora; chi racconta; — Fiorella (. .) che
30  a:  cosa hai fatto nella scuola oggi?
31  b:  (8.0)
32  F:  scritto
33  a:  hai guardato il maestro
     ((etc., follows report on school day))
```

```
Ex. (4) (B I 14)
16  F:  ah ich weiß gar nicht wo ich anfange soll — —
     (p1)
18  a:  [b b b b]
19  a:  [b b b b] quante co z‘t ancora —
20  b:  = anche voli — na io ho già raggiunbbbbb
21  b:  [b b b b] si anche io
22  a:
23  a:
24  F:
25  D:  ed io/
26  b:  [b b]
27  F:
     (im Lokal) —
     (p1)
28  b:  ah mit pescione molto i gelati [b b b b b]
29  a:
30  F:  möchte Se
     ((p1)
     (p2)
31  b:
32  b:
33  R:  ich bin ganz (.) . . . . . . . . . . bin schon satt
34  b:
35  b:
36  F:
     [Dann wird essen]
37  b:  Danielle —
     (Im Lokal) — willst du?
38  b:
39  D(1):
40  a:  a te piacevolo — —
41  b:  [b b b b]
42  a:
43  F:
     [Dann wird essen]
     (p1)
45  F:
     (p1)
46  F:
     (p1)
47  (2.0)
```
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):

a) “speakers rely on the immediate context to express propositions”;

b) “speakers rely on morpho-syntactic structures acquired in early stages of language development”;

c) “speakers tend to repeat and replace lexical items in the expression of a proposition”;

d) “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 delete 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:

a) 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 recurrences to the situation, but by recurrence to the context, as in the following example:

(Two Girls, Schegloff ts.)
B: uh how’s school goin.
A: oh: same old shit.
Although the first-person 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 utterances 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 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 Chomsky.) This is yet another case of semantic implicature 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 Chomsky’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):

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. 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 1906ff) 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.
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NOTES

1 A first version of this paper was read at the International Pragmatics Conference, Vicenza, September 1986.
I wish to thank the members of the regular Konstanz colloquium on Sociolinguistics and Heuristics for their comments and criticism.

2 a) 1986: 61


4 Let me note here that I am very reluctant to talk about 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 set it in, and it may vary among the participants in the situation.

6 Cf. e.g. Rahn 1984, Levison 1983.

7 For instance, Rahn 1984 and Jakobson 1956 (1978), if we equate his notion of 'thieves' with that of deixis.

8 I owe this expression to Vel Critz's discussion of reported speech situations, cf. Vel Critz 1950. Also cf. Benveniste's notion of 'subjective'.

9 Benveniste 1952.

12 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. Cook 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.
13 Writhe by the author.

14 For Bühler, all deixis words are Receptivität (reception signs) that lay the seminal ground for the construction 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 same before the corresponding deixis word occurs. This contradicts Bühler's conception of deixis words as reception preparing. Almost the opposite seems to be true: the gesture is sequentially prior, and the deixis word provides the syntactic and semantic slot in which it is supposed to fit in.
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