

VARIATION IN THE USE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE AND THE DEMONSTRATIVES AS COHESIVE DEVICES

by
Leif Kvistgaard

This paper examines the factors that motivate the choice between the definite article and the demonstratives in anaphoric noun phrases. It is shown that the strong cohesiveness traditionally associated with the demonstratives can be ascribed to the fact that the demonstratives, contrary to the definite article, require that an antecedent is directly and saliently present in the linguistic context. At one end of a gradient only a definite article is possible, at the other end only a demonstrative. In those cases where both a definite article and a demonstrative are possible it is argued that the choice between them is based on the extent to which the anaphor-antecedent relation is – or is represented by the addresser as being – 'at issue'.

1. Introduction

The problem I want to address in this paper is how we account for the choice between different types of noun phrase, specifically the choice between noun phrases with demonstrative determiners as in (1) and (2) and noun phrases with the definite article as in (3) and (4):

- (1) *The central theme of history was seen to be the development of civil and religious liberty. This was fortunate, for England seemed to have been especially marked out by the hand of God for the execution of this divine mission. RBISS 99*
- (2) *...Otis had been on his way to the Ambassador Hotel during the night that Kennedy was shot. Once, a year after that assassination, he had turned to a friend and said... DHPB 290*
- (3) *Since Bronx courts this year started handing out stiffer sentences for robbery of elderly people, arrests for the offense have dropped 40 %. TIMED 35*
- (4) *Last week after arriving in France on his first trip outside the Soviet Union since assuming his new job, Breznev frequently*

behaved as though he had indeed been elevated to a higher position – that of emperor. The Sovjet Party Chief began jostling imperiously with program and protocol during the three-day meeting as soon as he had been installed in Chateau Rambouillet... TIMEC 6

The questions that I want to at least begin to answer are questions like the following:

Why is only a demonstrative possible in (1)?

Why is only a definite article possible in (4)?

Why is there a choice between the definite article and a demonstrative in (2) and (3), and what are the factors that motivate the choice of one or the other?

The use of the demonstrative determiners and the definite article that I shall discuss is their ANAPHORIC use, that is, the use in which a demonstrative or the definite article contributes to establishing a link between one expression in a text, commonly referred to as the ANAPHOR, and another expression, commonly referred to as the ANTECEDENT, on which the anaphor is dependent for its interpretation. This use of the definite article and the demonstrative determiners is, of course, one of a great number of devices contributing to textual cohesion.

I shall confine myself to discussing examples in which the antecedent is indeed an ANTECEDENT, i.e. I shall leave out of consideration examples of what is often referred to as cataphoric reference, in which the anaphor precedes the antecedent.

Furthermore, I shall not discuss the choice between the two sets of demonstratives, THAT/THOSE and THIS/THESE. Whatever the factors are that determine this choice, I shall assume that the choice is secondary to the choice between definite article and demonstrative.

I shall try to argue two points. The first is that there are two constraints on the use of the demonstratives which underlie the common assumption that the demonstratives are more tightly cohesive than the definite article.

My second point will be that in those cases where these two constraints do not rule out the use of a demonstrative the choice

between demonstrative and definite article is determined by the extent to which the addresser regards or chooses to regard the relation between anaphor and antecedent as being 'at issue'. If the addresser regards this relation as being at issue, he will use a demonstrative. If not, he will use a definite article.

2. Constraints on the use of the demonstrative determiners

I have suggested that the tight cohesiveness of the demonstrative determiners compared to the definite article can be ascribed to the fact that demonstratives are subject to two constraints which do not apply to the definite article. The first of these constraints is given in (i):

- (i) *The definite article is compatible with both a DIRECT and an INDIRECT antecedent. The demonstratives, on the other hand, require a direct antecedent.*

(i) refers to the well-known fact that with an anaphoric noun phrase containing the definite article the antecedent may not only be an expression that directly provides the referent as in (3). The antecedent may also in various ways provide a background against which the identity of the referent of the anaphor can be inferred, cf. e.g. Christophersen 1939 and Hawkins 1978. This is the case in (5):

- (5) *They had hardly been walking an hour when they saw before them a great ditch that crossed the road and divided the forest as far as they could see on either side. It was a very wide ditch, and when they crept up to the edge and looked into it they could see it was also very deep, and there were many rocks at the bottom. The sides were so steep that none of them could climb down, and for a moment it looked as if their journey must end. BWO 70 71*

Here 'a great ditch' provides an indirect antecedent for 'the edge', 'the bottom', and 'the sides'. With the demonstratives, however, the antecedent must be direct. Thus a demonstrative would be possible in (3) in 'the offense', but not in (5) in 'the edge', 'the bottom', and 'the sides'.

As for the second constraint, I shall have to rely on a tentative

formulation which is given in (ii):

- (ii) *The use of a demonstrative anaphor requires that the antecedent is saliently present in the linguistic context. The definite article, on the other hand, is less sensitive to the saliency of the antecedent.*

Obviously, the formulation of this constraint leaves a great deal to be desired with respect to precision. But let me try to indicate the direction in which a definition of the relevant concept of saliency should be sought.

One way that one might attempt to define saliency would be in terms of grammatical distance, to be measured in terms of the number of words, phrases, clauses or paragraphs separating an anaphor from its antecedent. However, mere distance is not the relevant variable, or, at least, not the only relevant variable. Consider example (6) (In the remainder of this paper I shall follow the convention of marking antecedents with underlining and anaphors with non-italic bold):

- (6) *The six votes are required for an amendment to the city's 1980-81 appropriation ordinance that contains more than 30 budget items totaling more than \$70 million.
Buried among those items is the sum of \$503,753 for the city's rent board.
One of the six votes necessary for the approval of **the amendment** will have to come from one of the four moderate Berkeley Democratic Club council members. IG 1*

The native speakers that I have consulted agree in feeling ill at ease with a demonstrative in the anaphor 'the amendment'. It would be tempting to suggest that it is the intervening paragraph that blocks a demonstrative. That this is in fact not the case can be illustrated with an example like (7):

- (7) *Regent Vilma Martinez expressed concern over cuts in the programs to improve undergraduate education.
"I don't think there is any investment in the future that is more important than investing in people," she said.
Brown said later that UC officials had made the decision to drop those programs after state officials told them to pare \$30 million*

from the budget request. IG 3

Here again anaphor and antecedent are separated by a paragraph, but this time the anaphor not only can have but actually does have a demonstrative. One way of refining the notion of distance is to think of it in terms of content rather than number of grammatical elements. This solution would seem to find some support if we consider (6) and (7). In (7) what intervenes between anaphor and antecedent is in some sense 'about' the referent of these expressions. In (6), however, this is not so. As one might expect, a demonstrative is much better if (6) is reformulated so as to downplay what intervenes between anaphor and antecedent as in (8):

- (8) *The six votes are required for an amendment to the city's 1980-81 appropriation ordinance that contains more than 30 budget items including \$503,753 for the city's rent board.
One of the six votes necessary for the approval of **the/that/this amendment...***

These observations would seem to suggest that the relevant notion of saliency can be defined in terms of what could perhaps be called 'topical distance'.

Givon, in his *Syntax*, presents statistical evidence on what he calls 'referential distance' ('RD'), making an eight-way distinction between constructions and their compatibility with distance. His results are as follows:

Construction	Mean RD (# of clauses)	Variation
a. zero anaphora <i>(The man finished and left)</i>	1.0	100% at mean
b. unstressed pronoun <i>(The man finished and then he left)</i>	1.0	95% at mean

c. stressed pronoun	2.5	90% between 2-3
d. Y-movement (<i>She has two brothers, Tom and Jerry. Jerry she can't stand</i>)	2.5	90% between 2-3
e. definite noun	7.0	25% at 1.0 35% at 5.0-19 40% at 20+
f. modified definite noun	10.0	55% at 5.0-19 45% at 20+
g. Left-dislocated definite noun (<i>John, I never saw him there</i>)	15.0	60% at 20+
h. repeated definite noun	17.0	75% at 20+

These data lead Givón to distinguish between what he calls 'minimal gap, small gap, gap-irrelevant and long gap devices'. If this distinction is applied to demonstrative noun phrases, they are minimal gap devices.

Thus demonstrative noun phrases would seem to represent an interesting exception to Givón's 'grammatical code-quantity principle'. Givón argues 'that zero anaphora and unstressed pronouns are the *smallest* code units in the grammar'. Stressed pronouns, names, full nouns and other noun phrase types are much larger' (1994:917).

The grammatical code-quantity principle states that 'information that is *already activated* requires the *smallest* amount of code' (1994:917).

As we have seen, with demonstrative noun phrases we are dealing precisely with information that is already activated, but demonstrative noun phrases are not 'small' - in Givón's sense they are even 'bigger' than definite noun phrases.

One more point should be made. Consider an example like (9):

(9) *In 1945 he bought a car and a boat. He later sold the/*this/*that*

boat to a friend of his.

In this example, the impossibility of a demonstrative cannot be ascribed to any separation of the anaphor and antecedent. Rather, the problem is that the other member of the conjoined noun phrase, in which the antecedent occurs, is as salient as the antecedent. This suggests that not only should the anaphor not be separated from its antecedent by material that is more salient than the antecedent. The antecedent must also be clearly more salient than any other material in its immediate neighbourhood.

With the discussion of these two constraints on the anaphoric use of the demonstratives we are able to specify what it is that makes the demonstratives more tightly cohesive than the definite article:

(iii) *In using a demonstrative determiner in an anaphor, an addresser informs the addressee that the antecedent on which the anaphor depends for its interpretation is directly and saliently present in the linguistic context.*

In using an anaphor with a definite article, the addresser merely informs the addressee that the information necessary for the interpretation of the anaphor is somehow recoverable from the linguistic context. Thus the antecedent may be direct or indirect, salient or non-salient.

3. *What are the factors that determine the choice between demonstrative and definite article?*

The second question that I want to address concerns the nature of the factors that determine the choice between the demonstrative determiners and the definite article in those cases where a demonstrative is not blocked by the two constraints discussed in section 2.

I suggested earlier that this choice is determined or conditioned by the extent to which the addresser views the relation between anaphor and antecedent as being 'at issue'. In this section, I want to discuss a number of factors that influence how the addresser regards the anaphor-antecedent relation. I shall try to show that these factors can be seen as defining a continuum or gradient. At one extreme, a demonstrative determiner is obligatory. At the other extreme, only

the definite article is possible. It is in the area between these extremes that we find variation in the use of the demonstratives and the definite article. The conditioning factors that I shall discuss are the following:

- (a) Contrast between the referent of the anaphor and other objects satisfying the description contained in the anaphor.
- (b) Encoding in the anaphor of information that is not present in the antecedent.
- (c) 'Noteworthiness' of the referent of the anaphor.
- (d) 'Accessibility' of the antecedent.
- (e) Addresser empathy.
- (f) Selectivity of anaphor.

As I shall try to show, (a) makes a demonstrative obligatory. (f) makes the definite article obligatory. With (b), (c), (d) and (e), on the other hand, there is variation in the use of the demonstratives and the definite article.

Before looking at each of (a) to (f) in turn, I should emphasize that they are by no means mutually exclusive. Thus in many examples, several of the factors may be at work at the same time.

3.1. Contrast (a)

Consider first (10):

- (10) *We have seen that native speakers use more than one code or set of rules. Thus the process of description must be carried out on more than one set of data if it is to be relevant to practical tasks like teaching. Furthermore, as we shall see, a knowledge of the nature of the learner's mother tongue is relevant in planning a language teaching operation. Thus, linguistic theory must be applied to that language as well. SPCIAL 144*

In this example the demonstrative would receive contrastive stress if spoken. A contrast is established between the shared referent of the anaphor and antecedent (a learner's mother tongue) and another object satisfying the descriptive content of the anaphor ('language') dealt with in the linguistic context (the target language in a foreign language teaching situation). In this example the anaphor-antecedent relation is at issue in the sense that the link between anaphor and antecedent is crucial for the addressee's ability to find the intended referent of the anaphor.

I have described the use of a demonstrative as obligatory. What I mean by this is that the mere substitution of the definite article for the demonstrative would make the example ungrammatical. However, this should not be taken to suggest that the relevant contrast can only be expressed using a demonstrative. If the descriptive content of the anaphor is augmented (e.g. by adding a restrictive modifier like 'that the learner has as his mother tongue'), the definite article becomes possible. What this shows is that it is the noun phrase as a whole that creates the tie between anaphor and antecedent. Thus in an example like (10) there is a 'division of labour' between determination and description. The addresser may choose to provide more linkage in his description, reducing the demands made on determination and vice versa.

3.2. Encoding in the anaphor of information not present in the antecedent (b)

In the situation described in (b), the anaphor-antecedent relation is at issue in a slightly different way. Here the use of a demonstrative is called for, not because it enables the addresser to avoid repeating information already present in the antecedent, but because it allows him to encode new information in the anaphor.

Consider first examples (1), (11) and (12):

- (1) *The central theme of history was seen to be the development of civil and religious liberty. This was fortunate, for England seemed to have been especially marked out by the hand of God for the execution of this divine mission. RBISS 99*

- (11) *Any theory that becomes the ideology of a political movement or the*

official doctrine of a state must lend itself to simplification for the simple and to subtlety for the subtle. There is no question that Marx's thought presents these virtues in the highest degree. RAMCST 114

- (12) *We can at least begin to speculate coherently about the acquisition of certain systems of knowledge and belief on the basis of experience and genetic endowment, and can outline the general nature of some device that might duplicate aspects of this achievement. NCFROS 148*

The use of a demonstrative is, as we have seen, a signal to the addressee that the antecedent, which must be recovered in order to determine the reference of the anaphor, is directly and saliently present in the linguistic context. The definite article, on the other hand, merely signals that the reference of the anaphor is somehow identifiable on the basis of the preceding linguistic context. In examples like (1), (11) and (12), the more precise instructions provided by the demonstratives are obligatory or almost obligatory. The reason is that the description used in the anaphor is so different from that used in the antecedent, that without the strongly cohesive link provided by the demonstratives the addressee would not be able to establish the link between anaphor and antecedent without which the reference of the anaphor is indeterminable.

However, the mere fact of there being information present in the anaphor that is not present in the antecedent is not enough to make a demonstrative obligatory. This can be illustrated with an example like (13):

- (13) *Outside is the bedlam of reporters baying for scraps of information about the ordeal of Annie Glenn – and resenting the fact that "Life" has exclusive access to the poignant drama. TWRS 40*

In (13), new information is added, but the addresser assumes that a definite article is sufficient. The difference between examples like (1), (11) and (12), on the one hand, and (13) on the other seems to be related to the difference noted by Bolinger (1977) between using a definite article and a demonstrative with what he calls 'epithets'. Consider example (14):

- (14) *The thing of it, the thing of it is, Wh-Whitman, it's just t-tinkering, you mustn't s-s-suppose Life, ah, owes you anything, we just g-get what we can out of the b-bitch. JUC 112*

Obviously, the anaphor in (14) does encode information not present in the antecedent. Bolinger suggests (1977:51) that the effect of using a demonstrative instead of the definite article in an example like (14) is that of 'adding an underlying predication'. With the definite article, (14) suggests that the addresser takes it for granted that the addressee agrees that 'life is a bitch'. With a demonstrative, on the other hand, the addresser takes less for granted. The meaning conveyed is then something like: 'I tell you, life is a bitch'. It seems to me that the idea of the presence vs. absence of an underlying predication is equally applicable to examples like (1), (11) and (12) on the one hand, and (13) on the other. The use of demonstratives in (1), (11) and (12) is tantamount to an acknowledgement by the addresser that he has buried a new assertion in the anaphor which he cannot take it for granted is obvious to the addressee. In (13), on the other hand, the addresser assumes that Annie Glenn's ordeal is immediately recognizable to the addressee as a 'poignant drama'.

Shared knowledge is involved not only in the use of epithets and examples like (13), but also in cases like (15) involving 'elegant variation':

- (15) *Reagan is not making Carter's job any easier. While the **Republican** still clings to his conservative views on key issues, he was taking no extreme positions last week. TIMEA 12*

Note that in (15) it is crucial that the addressee knows who is who. In other examples, however, the whole point of encoding information in the anaphor which is not present in the antecedent is precisely to convey information that the addressee might not be familiar with. This is the case in an example like (16) involving what could be called 'information-dropping':

- (16) *West Yorkshire police eagerly announced that Sutcliffe's arrest meant that they were finally "scaling down" their search for the Ripper. The five-year man-hunt has cost more than £8 million... TIMEB 40*

The use of the definite article in examples like these suggests that the choice between the definite article and the demonstratives in cases where the anaphor encodes information not present in the antecedent is not so much a question of whether the addresser assumes the addressee to be familiar with this information but rather whether he assumes that the addressee might question the information.

To sum up, then, the choice between the definite article and the demonstratives in cases where the anaphor encodes information not present in the antecedent is determined by the status ascribed to that information by the addresser. If he regards the information as information that involves an interpretation, evaluation or assessment of the referent that might be considered controversial by the addressee, he chooses a demonstrative. Otherwise he chooses a definite article, unless, of course, he has other reasons for using a demonstrative.

3.3. 'Noteworthiness' of the referent (c)

The term 'noteworthiness' is a term that I have borrowed from Ann Borkin. In a sense, the examples with demonstratives that I have discussed so far have all involved noteworthiness of the referent. But in those examples, it was possible to attribute this noteworthiness to a particular characteristic of the anaphor: either the referent of the anaphor was contrasted with other objects satisfying the description contained in the anaphor, or the anaphor encoded additional information on the referent. In the examples that I want to consider now, neither of these conditions obtains.

Consider first examples like (17) (I use constructed examples to make comparison easier):

(17) *In 1955 John bought a house. It was this house that he later sold to his brother.*

Ann Borkin has suggested that cleft constructions like that exemplified in (17) 'simply underscores the noteworthiness and perhaps unexpectedness of the fact that the focussed element (in (17) "this house") should complete the defocussed presupposition (in (17) "that John sold a house to his brother")' (Borkin ?:17). And she goes

on to say that 'what seems to be stressed is the remarkableness of the identification' (?:17-18). It seems to me that this characterization tallies well with the suggestion made earlier that a demonstrative is chosen when the addresser regards the anaphor-antecedent relation as being 'at issue'. In (17) a demonstrative is obligatory. This seems to be generally the case in examples with marked thematic structure. Thus a demonstrative is obligatory also in (18) and (19) with fronted object and fronted adverbial, respectively:

(18) *In 1955 John bought a house. This house he later sold to his brother.*

(19) *In 1955 John bought a house. In this house he was to spend the happiest years of his life.*

Noteworthiness is also seen clearly in examples with 'same' like (20), in which there is a choice between demonstrative and definite article:

(20) *...the majority of educationalists and teachers refuse squarely to be concerned with linguistic advice. As an argument for this non-involvement, they point to the complexities and disparities among the rival theories. In almost the same breath, however, these same authorities and teachers quite happily admit that in order to teach modern mathematics it is necessary to have studied its theoretical bases. ERLT 65*

And it can also be seen in examples like (21):

(21) *Up above the centrifuge arm there was a balcony, and **this balcony** was known as the Throne Room, because arrayed upon it was a lineup of green plastic sheets with high backs. TWRS 171*

In examples like these, the use of the demonstrative functions as an instruction to the addressee that the addresser wants the addressee to pay special attention to the referent of the anaphor even though there are no indications in the relation between anaphor and antecedent that such special attention is called for.

3.4. Accessibility of antecedent (d)

I shall deal briefly with (d). Consider example (22):

- (22) *Had Kissinger, as alleged, really longed for "a brutal episode of battle" that would result in a convincing Israeli defeat? Had he really tried to delay arms shipments to that country during the Yom Kippur war? JHGG 365*

This is the kind of example that has been discussed extensively in the literature on anaphoric islands. I want to make two comments on this kind of example. The first is that if the claim that the demonstratives are only compatible with a direct antecedent is correct, the possibility of using 'that' in examples like (22) would seem to indicate the need for a level of lexical representation where such a direct antecedent is available.

The second point is more pertinent to my main theme. If the demonstratives are more tightly cohesive in the sense that I have discussed one would expect that they can be used to instruct an addressee to search a second time in cases where it is perhaps not obvious that a direct antecedent is available. In an example like (22) both a definite article and a demonstrative are possible. But a demonstrative seems to be obligatory in an example like (23), originally discussed by Claudia Corum:

- (23) *All linguistic journals should be sent to that department. Corum 1973:90*

3.5. Addresser empathy (e)

So far I have been discussing examples in which it was possible to ascribe the use of a demonstrative rather than a definite article to contextual factors that cause the anaphor-antecedent relation to be, in some way, 'at issue'. Consider now an example like (24):

- (24) *If a new metaphor enters the conceptual system that we base our actions on, it will alter that conceptual system and the perceptions and actions that the system gives rise to. LJML 145*

In this example there is no contrast to other referents satisfying the same description as that contained in the anaphor. The anaphor does not encode information not present in the antecedent. The antecedent is readily accessible. And the referent of the anaphor does not seem to be noteworthy in any way. As one would expect, a definite article is possible.

With examples like (24) we reach the area where the use of a demonstrative rather than a definite article simply becomes a question of giving the addressee as many clues as possible for identifying the antecedent and thus the referent, not because there are any specific reasons for assuming that this identification will be problematic, but simply as a precautionary measure, 'to be on the safe side'.

This use of demonstratives is extremely common in argumentative prose where it allows the addressee to concentrate on the line of argument. But it has also found its way to the less exacting prose of much journalism, including newscasting, so that it is now almost a trademark of that genre. (2) is a case in point:

- (2) *...Otis had been on his way to the Ambassador Hotel during the night that Kennedy was shot. Once, a year after that assassination, he had turned to a friend and said... DHPB 290*

And in (25) the penchant for using demonstratives is given free play:

- (25) *My advice would be to wait until after you retire and then redeem your shares of that fund. If you're like most people, your income will drop after retirement and you will be in a lower income tax bracket. Unless the value of that fund's shares drops – and it is unlikely that that will happen – you should realize a profit when you redeem. That profit will be subject to capital gains tax. After retirement, that tax bite will be lower. SFEC 2*

3.6. Selectivity of anaphor (g)

We have now reached that end of the gradient where the definite article becomes obligatory. Consider again example (4):

- (4) *Last week after arriving in France on his first trip outside the Soviet Union since assuming his new job, Breznev frequently behaved as though he had indeed been elevated to a higher position – that of emperor. The Soviet Party Chief began jostling imperiously with program and protocol during the three-day meeting as soon as he had been installed in Chateau Rambouillet... TIMEC 6*

(4), as I indicated at the beginning, is an example in which the definite article cannot be replaced with a demonstrative. However, the demonstrative is not blocked by either of the constraints (i) and (ii) that I discussed earlier.

An explanation of the ungrammaticality of a demonstrative in (4) thus has to be sought elsewhere. In fact, an explanation follows naturally from the suggestion that a demonstrative anaphor is a signal to the addressee that the anaphor-antecedent relation is 'at issue'. Whether this relation is regarded as being at issue is, as we have seen, partly a question of contextual factors, partly a question of the extent to which the addresser wants to make identification of the antecedent as easy as possible for the addressee even in cases where a demonstrative is not called for by the context. However, there are limitations on the addresser's freedom of choice. The limitation is that the addresser is not free to mark the anaphor-antecedent relation as being at issue if the anaphor in itself is sufficient to identify the referent. This is exactly what is the case in (4). 'The Soviet Party Chief' can be used to refer to one and only one individual at any given time, namely the person that holds a particular office. Thus, in a sense, using a demonstrative would send the addressee on a wild-goose chase. The same kind of phenomenon can be seen in (26):

- (26) *In this approach, traditional in most parts of the English-speaking world and still quite wide-spread, every attempt is made in the schools to prevent the child from speaking his non-standard variety, and each non-standard feature of which the teacher is aware is commented on and corrected. For example, **the child** will be told that ... PTS 80*

Since the second occurrence of 'the child' refers generically, the relation between the two occurrences of 'the child' does not play a role in enabling the addressee to identify the referent of the second

occurrence. Two more points should be made here. The first is that in examples like (26) it is not the fact that the second occurrence is generic that makes a demonstrative impossible. This can be seen if (26) is changed as in (27):

- (27) *...every attempt is made in the school to prevent the dialect-speaking child from speaking his non-standard variety, and each variety, and each non-standard feature of which the teacher is aware is commented on and corrected. Thus **this child** almost has to learn a new language when he starts school.*

In (27) 'this child' still refers generically, namely to the class of dialect-speaking children. The difference is that this expression is now dependent on the earlier noun phrase for its interpretation.

What examples (4), (26) and (27) show is that for an anaphoric noun phrase to be compatible with demonstrative determination, it must be possible to interpret the noun phrase SELECTIVELY. What I mean by this is that the demonstratives require that the ACTUAL reference of the noun phrase does not coincide with its POTENTIAL reference. In (4) and (26) actual and potential reference are identical. In (27), on the other hand, the relevant noun phrase refers only to a subset of its potential referents. In fact, given the definition of anaphora as involving the dependence of one expression on another, one might suggest that (4) and (26) do not involve anaphora though they do involve coreference.

3.7. Summary

Let me conclude by briefly summarizing the points that I have made. I have tried to show that the strong cohesiveness traditionally attributed to the demonstrative determiners can be ascribed to the fact that they are restricted in distribution compared to the definite article: the demonstratives, contrary to the definite article, require that the antecedent is direct and saliently present in the linguistic context.

These restrictions on the use of the demonstratives make them more tightly cohesive in the sense that by using them, an addresser gives the addressee more precise instructions about where and how to

find the antecedent. This in turn means that one might expect to find the demonstratives rather than the definite article in cases where the anaphor-antecedent relation is at issue. I have tried to show that whether this relation is marked as being at issue is partly a question of the relation between anaphor and antecedent, partly a question of addresser choice. Thus at one end of a continuum we find cases in which the use of a demonstrative is clearly motivated by contextual factors. At the other end of this continuum, we find cases in which the use of a demonstrative merely reflects the addresser's decision to make identification of the antecedent as easy as possible.

Givon (1984:399) has characterized the notion of 'definite' in terms of what he calls 'the communicative contract' as follows:

'Speakers code a referential nominal as definite if they think that they are entitled to assume that the hearer can – by whatever means – assign it unique reference.'

Thus, if you like, one might characterize the demonstratives as one among many means which make it possible for communication to be that 'cooperative' exercise, cf. also Grice (1975).

ATP (The Labour Market Supplementary Pension Scheme)
Kongens Vænge 8
DK-3400 Hillerød

List of sources of examples

- BWO: L. Frank Baum, *The Wizard of Oz*, Rand McNally and Co., New York 1957.
 DHPB: David Halberstam, *The Powers That Be*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York 1979.
 ERLT: Eddy Roulet, *Linguistic Theory, Linguistic Description and Language Teaching*, London 1975.
 IG: *The Independent and Gazette*, 18 January 1981.
 JHGG: Joseph Heller, *Good as Gold*, Pocket Books, New York 1976.
 JUC: John Updike, *Couples*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1968.
 LJML: George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, the University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1980.

- NCFROS: Noam Chomsky, *For Reasons of State*, Fontana, Bungay, 1970.
 PTS: Peter Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1974.
 RAMCTS: Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1965.
 RBISS: Robin Blackburn (ed.), *Ideology in Social Science*, Fontana, Bungay, 1972.
 SFEC: *The San Francisco Examiner and Chronicle (Section C)*, 30 September 1980.
 SPCIAL: S. Pit Corder, *Introducing Applied Linguistics*, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1973.
 TIMEA: *Time Magazine*, 13 October 1980.
 TIMEB: *Time Magazine*, 19 January 1980.
 TIMEC: *Time Magazine*, 4 July 1977.
 TIMED: *Time Magazine*, 11 July 1977.
 TWRS: Tom Wolfe, *The Right Stuff*, Bantam, New York, 1979.

References

- Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. *Pronouns and Repeated Nouns*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
 Bolinger, Dwight. 1979. *Pronouns in Discourse*. Talmy Givón (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax. Syntax and Semantics 12*. New York: Academic Press, 1979. 289-309.
 Borkin, Ann. no date. *What are clefts good for?* Unpublished ms. University of Michigan.
 Christophersen, Paul. 1939. *The Articles: a Study of their Theory and Use in English*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
 Corum, Claudia. 1973. *Anaphoric Peninsulas*. In *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting*. Chicago Linguistic Society. 89-97.
 Givon, Talmy. 1984 and 1990. *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction*. 2 vols. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
 Grice, H.P. *Logic and Conversation*. In P. Cole and J.L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press.
 Hawkins, John A. 1978. *Definiteness and Indefiniteness. A Study in Reference and Grammaticality Prediction*. London: Croom Helm.

Acknowledgements: The research reported in this paper was done while I was a visiting scholar in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley. I am grateful to the American Council of Learned Societies, the Danish Research Council for the Humanities and Odense University for making my stay there possible. I am indebted to Mike Davenport, Hans Hartvigson, John Dienhart and Fritz Larsen for comments on an earlier version of this paper, which was read at the Second Scandinavian Symposium on Syntactic Variation in 1982 and published in 1983 in 'Papers from the Second Scandinavian Symposium on Syntactic Variation' edited by Sven Jacobson, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. This revised and updated paper was read at the Tenth Annual Hans Hartvigson Symposium held in March 1994 at Odense University