

Konrad Ehlich
Universität München

Anadeixis – Anaphora

Mi 14.00 –15.00

Karl Bühler's precise determination of the category "deixis" in 1934 is an important achievement within the development of 20th century linguistics. According to Bühler's determination, the category "deixis" is tied to the very linguistic action within which the deictic is employed. Linguistic action is foremost a genuinely oral event that is fundamentally reliant on, and determined by, sensory perception. Different languages provide different groups of deictics that are tied to the different dimensions in relation to which deictic procedures can be used (actants involved in the speech action, discourse space, discourse time, objects in perception space etc.).

Speech action has not traditionally been a category of interest to grammarians. Linguistics finds its main object in the sentence or, when transcending the limits of a single sentence, in a nexus of sentences (i.e. "text"). The sentences serving as examples for linguistic investigation are generally devoid of any context of use, and thus bear no relation to linguistic action at all. This is why they are hardly able to illustrate the role deixis plays in linguistic interaction. The same applies to nexus of sentences, which enter linguists' perception basically in the form of written texts. In written texts – which are, by themselves, a means to overcome a *dilated* speech situation – deictics are, *eo ipso*, devoid of any speech situation. In such isolated texts, deictics are used in a non-immediate and highly abstract way the description of which calls for several steps of analytic abstraction.

Written texts are spatial structures of linear order that easily lends itself to an interpretation in the terms of 'prior' and 'later'. Elements 'prior' or 'before' can be referred to by a class of linguistic means for which grammatical tradition provides the general term "anaphora". This term is, however, ambiguous in several respects. In grammatical description it is mainly used to denote the "3rd person" of the personal pronoun, and of comparable pronouns. However, in languages that make a clear distinction between object deixis and the 3rd person of the personal pronoun, object deixis and personal pronoun do not have the same function by any means – even though the differences are sometimes of subtle nature. It is these differences that are neglected, or even analytically camouflaged, when deictics are characterised as "anaphoric". It is as if deictics lost their deictic quality whenever they are employed to refer back within a text. This confusion – which already appears in later parts of Bühler's work – is recurrent in more recent discussions.

This paper presents an analysis of object deixis in textual environments and proposes the term "anadeixis" for these text-specific usages. The aim is to do justice to these deictic structures while, at the same time, contrasting their functional analysis with a conceptually precise understanding of anaphora. In conclusion, the paper discusses consequences for the linguistic analysis of language-specific functional differences between deixis and anaphora.