

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENDOPHORIC DEMONSTRATIVES IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH\*

by  
Gong-Dae Kim

This article compares the informative values of endophoric demonstratives using associative anaphora in French and in English. In French, we have ten types of endophoricities available, but in English only seven. For active information, there are four uses of demonstratives: summary or definition, feeling, homogeneous contrast and generalization, based on the degree of identity between the referred and the referring. As for semi-active information, there are also four uses: whole-part, part-whole, particularity/quality, and fuzzy object inferable as a concept on the basis of all available knowledge correlating the referring with the referred. For inactive information, there are two uses: figuration and vague idea, based on the degree of reclassification between the referred and the referring. English, however, does not use feeling, fuzzy object, and vague idea.

## 1. Introduction

The basic aim of this study is to clarify the informative value of English endophoric demonstratives by comparing them with three kinds of French demonstratives, i.e. demonstrative determiners *ce (cet, cette, ces)*, gender and number variable demonstrative pronouns *celui (celle, ceux, celles)*, and demonstrative pronouns that are invariable as to gender and number (*ceci, cela, ça*) in the discourse. As for French demonstratives, we have systematically classified ten types of functions in a recent article (Kim 2005). The ten types of French associative anaphora<sup>1</sup> are as follows: ① part-whole, ② whole-part, ③ particularity or quality, ④ feeling, ⑤ summary or definition, ⑥ figuration, ⑦ homogeneous contrast, ⑧ generalization, ⑨ fuzzy object, ⑩ vague idea.

We examined French endophoricity with respect to the three kinds of demonstratives as follows (see Table 1):

Demonstratives	Determiners		Variables		Invariables			
	Simple	Complex	Simple	Complex	Ceci	cela	ça	ce
Endophoricity								
Part-whole	+							
Whole/part	+		+					
Particularity or quality	+							
Feeling	+			+		+	+	+
Summary or definition	+	+		+	+ -	+	+	
Figuration	+	+		+		+ -	+	+
Homogeneous contrast	+			+				
Generalization	+						+	+
Fuzzy object						+	+	
Vague idea						+ -	+ -	+ -

Table 1

In Table 1, the sign '+' means that the demonstrative presents the corresponding characteristic in relation to endophoricity; an absence of the sign means that it does not. The sign '+-' indicates that the demonstrative presents the corresponding characteristic as just a part in relation to endophoricity.

In order to examine these ten types of endophoricity more precisely and systematically, in particular the relationships between an anaphor<sup>2</sup> and antecedent-trigger<sup>3</sup> or a cataphor and subsequent referent, we first translated French examples into English, establishing an appropriate criterion for choosing *this* or *that*. Even though we seriously tried to find authentic English examples, there were not enough of them to compare with those in French. Therefore, in order to get the most objective result, we added some authentic English examples. We also examined the informative values of ten kinds of demonstratives used in associative anaphora, comparing French with English.

The notions 'topic' and 'comment' are to be generally understood as presupposing that a discourse unit has the property of being, in some sense, directed at a restricted set of entities and not at all entities that make up a discourse unit. This restricted set of entities is what a discourse unit 'is about'; this constitutes the topic of a discourse. The complementary notion 'comment' refers to what was newly asserted about the topic. According to Halliday (1967), old or given information is not necessarily previously mentioned, but can be derived from the previous mention of an addressee. And Kuno (1972) also comments that old information can be predicted because the speaker thinks it is present in the hearer's consciousness or in the context.

According to Renkema (1993), Prince (1981) suggested the following distinctions (see Table 2):

New	Inferable	Evoked
brand new		situational
unused		textual

Table 2

Renkema explains that new information (=comment) is inactive, but old and evoked information (=topic) is active. A concept is semi-active (inferable) when it is quickly activated on the basis of all available knowledge. Based on the above, we hypothesize the following, and will subsequently evaluate the validity of our hypothesis:

[Hypothesis]:

- (1) If the degree of identity is maximal correlating the referring with the referred, the information is active and old.
- (2) If the degree of reclassification is maximal correlating the referring with the referred, the information is inactive and new.

This paper has been organized as follows. In Section 2, we consider the types of endophoric demonstratives with active information. In Section 3, we examine those with semi-active information. In Section 4, we examine those with inactive information. In Section 5, we present the uses of these endophoric demonstratives in tabular form. Finally, in Section 6, we conclude our study.

## 2. *Active information*

### 2.1. Summary of definitions

We can summarize and define a fact or a saying by using a demonstrative determiner in order to refer to what an addressor has mentioned.

- (1) *Nous savons qu'avec une lentille convergente on peut former l'image d'un objet sur un écran; cette image est renversée. Refaisons **cette expérience** avec une loupe.* (Charaudeau 1992:223)

[We know that we can reverse the image of an object on a screen with a convergent lens; the image thus formed is upside down. Let's redo **this/\*that experiment** with a magnifying glass.]

In (1), *this experiment* refers to the addressor's uttering as follows: 'the reversing of the image of an object on a screen by means of a convergent lens'. This example is in the present tense; native speakers of English like to use *this* rather than *that*. As the referring is anaphoric with the previous sentence, the referred element is given and evoked. In this case, we can say that the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, example (1) is active information.

We added two authentic English examples, as follows:

- (2) In a column in a previous issue of this paper my attention was drawn to the following statement by a well-known lesbian professor: 'Naturally a woman with an I.Q. of 120 is homosexual.' **This statement** is not only nonsensical and insulting but also dangerous. (Renkema 1997:269)
- (3) If they chose the subjects that they wanted, most students would, of course, pick easier subjects such as art, gym, music, etc. I think **this doing** is partly the schools' fault. (Ibid. 1997:283)

In (2), *this statement* refers to the well-known lesbian professor's statement. And in (3), *this doing* refers to the speaker summarizing the students' picking easier subjects. Not only in the above two examples but also in many other examples, *this* is generally preferred in this type of summary.

It is possible to examine the French complex form of the variable. *Celle-là* is preferred in order to designate a fact or a mentioned utterance in colloquial speech, as follows.

- (4) *Un civil me demande?*  
 -*Oui, mon capitaine.*  
 -*Par exemple, **celle-là** n'est pas ordinaire!* (Veland 1996:289)  
 [A civilian asks to see me? -Yes, sir, captain. -Well, ?**this/that** is not normal!]

The demonstrative *that* (*celle-là*) in (4) shows that the speaker includes the meaning of *that utterance* or *such a matter* (*pareille affaire*).<sup>4</sup> In this case, *this* is acceptable, but *that* sounds more immediate. In the case of 'summary or definition', the referring demonstrative *this* in (4) means *this fact* near the interlocutor, in the present tense. In the variable demonstrative example, as the referred to is also already given and evoked, just like in example (1), the degree of identity between the

referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we have active information here.

Among the many examples of *that*, two are shown below (5-6):

- (5) What do you think of **that**? Bob smashes up my car, and then expects me to pay for the repairs. (Quirk et al. 1985:376)
- (6) After the procedure is completed, one arranges the materials into different groups again. Then they can be put into their appropriate places. Eventually they will be used more and the whole cycle will then have to be repeated. However, **that** is part of life. (Renkema 1997:60)

In (5), the referring *that* refers cataphorically to the latter part of the utterance, the speaker summarizing it with indignation. Consequently, we can express the summary type and the feeling type not only individually, but also in combination. In this cataphoric case, we have new and inactive information, as the referred follows after the referring. In (6), as the referring *that* is anaphoric with the preceding sentences in their entirety, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, the information is active.

We found that the French invariables *cela* and *ça* have the characteristics of a summary or a definition containing a concrete or particular fact, as shown in the following examples.

- (7) *Fabriquer un poumon avec un morceau d'oesophage, **cela** ressemble beaucoup à faire une jupe avec un rideau de grand-mère.* (Maillard 1989:230)  
 [To reconstruct a lung, using a piece of the esophagus, **that's** like making a skirt out of grandmother's curtain.]
- (8) *Si on interdit par exemple la vente des cigarettes les jeunes en trouveront par n'importe quel moyen, même s'il faut qu'ils volent. **Ça** incitera à commettre des 'bêtises'!* (Apothéloz 1995:242)

[If, for example, we forbid the sale of cigarettes to young people, they will find some other way to get them, even if they have to steal. **This (=That)** will incite them to do stupid things.]

In (7), *that* is anaphoric to *To reconstruct a lung, using a piece of the esophagus*, and summarizes it as *making a skirt out of grandmother's curtain*. And in (8), *this/that (ça)* is anaphoric to the entire first sentence.

As to the demonstrative *this (ça)*, there are three reasons for its more frequent use in summary or definition. First, *this (ça)* means simply *this interdiction, this measure, or this decision* by expressing a concrete action or a particular fact. Second, we should note that the discourses are in the present tense, as in (7), or in the future tense, as in (8). Third, the referring demonstrative *this* is near the speaker, textually speaking: *what I have just mentioned*. In the invariable demonstratives, the referred are already given and evoked in the previous sentence, so the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we are looking at active information.

## 2.2. Expression of feeling

As stated by Kleiber (1988b), the demonstrative is used to refer to the antecedent-trigger in order to more precisely express a feeling, be it joy, sadness, surprise, etc. Here are some examples:

- (9) *La pauvre mère, subitement ramenée dans le passé, regarda ses invités et éclata en sanglots. Il y avait une place vide, la place de son fils. **Ce/Son/??Le désespoir** glaça et ennuya la société.* (Kleiber 1988c:59)

[The poor mother looked around at the guests, who suddenly brought back her past, and she burst into tears. There was a vacant seat there. It was for her son. **\*This/\*That/Her despair** made the get-together cold and uncomfortable.]

- (10) *Les enfants rirent à en perdre haleine. Cette/Leur/??La joie était grande.* (Kleiber 1988b: 221)  
 [The children laughed until out of breath. \*This/\*That/Their joy was great.]

In the two examples above, (9-10), each first part contains a basic presupposition to provoke a feeling. And in the second parts, the speaker specifies the feeling: despair in (9), joy in (10). Kleiber (1988c) claims that in French, in order to evoke the feeling of the speaker more naturally, one uses the possessive determiner and the demonstrative determiner more frequently than the definite article. But in English, we see that native speakers no longer use the demonstrative determiner.

Therefore, in order to describe a subjective feeling, the possessive determiner is the most natural and proper. In addition, when an addressor wants to express what he has just said with a positive feeling, he uses *this*; but in order to indicate a negative feeling toward what an addressee said or towards the referred, he uses *that*.<sup>5</sup> Since the first parts already have provoked a feeling, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we have to do with active information.

The French complex form of variable pronoun has the characteristic of either a positive or a pejorative feeling, correlating the utterance with the referred as follows:

- (11) *Pierre est venu me voir hier. Celui-là est un sacré numéro.* (A. Zribi-Hertz. Anaphora lecture in 1990 at the University of Paris 8)  
 [Pierre came to see me yesterday. ?That/ He is one weirdo.]
- (12) *Bush fait circuler sa photo sur internet: celui-là n'a pas fini de nous étonner.* (Ibid. E-mail: 2004)  
 [Bush circulated his picture on the Internet: ?that/he still surprises us.]



The demonstrative *that* in (11) is anaphoric with the NP *Pierre*, who is 'one weirdo'. In this case, the pronoun *he* is much more natural. And *he* in (12) correlates with the antecedent NP *Bush*. In this case, too, the pronoun *he* is better than the demonstrative *that*. As Zribi-Hertz comments (pers. comm.), *celui-là* in (11-12) has, first, the effect of putting the referred at a distance that is jointly responsible for the depreciatory connotation. Second, the slangy expression *un sacré numéro* also connotes pejoratively. Third, the choice of *celui-là* in the subject is in phase with this characteristic: placing the referred at a farther distance than *ce*, which is not specified.

Consequently, we can say that (11) expresses a feeling by a combination of elements.<sup>6</sup> For (12), the case is almost the same as in (11). The English *that* in (11) renders the sentence only marginally acceptable. Even though there is a disparaging use of the determiner *that* in expressions like *that Pierre* (or *those Pierres*), the pronoun *that* has no such overtones (Quirk et al. 1985:289).

Therefore, the personal pronoun *he* is better in (11) and (12) as well. For informative value, as the referring is anaphoric with the previous sentence, the referred element is given and evoked. And the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we have active information here.

We found that the French invariable pronouns (*cela*, *ça* and *ce*, with the exception of *ceci*), are also anaphoric, particularly with human objects regarding the expression of feeling. Here are two examples:

(13) *Voyez-vous le duc amenant **cela**, présentant **cela** chez l'altière Frédérique! ... Un marchand de vin de Bercy!* (Sandfeld 1965:277)

[Can you see the duke bringing **that man**/\***that**/?**this**, introducing him to haughty Frederica! ... A wine merchant from Bercy!]

(14) *Calmez-vous, Monsieur Narcisse. Elle vous aime bien tout de même ... mais **ça** n'a pas vécu, n'est-ce pas? **Ça** ignore ce qui fait plaisir et ce qui ne fait pas plaisir.* (Ibid.)

[Calm down, Mr. Narcisse. She loves you all the same ... but **?that woman/she** has not lived, right? **She/\*That** doesn't know what pleases her and what doesn't.]

In (13), *cela* is cataphoric with the subsequent *un marchand de vin de Bercy* with the characteristic of disdainful feeling. In the English translation, the simple forms *this* or *that* are not suitable for referring. According to Quirk et al. (1985:289), only the form of demonstrative determiner NP *that man* could be used. In this cataphora, there is new and inactive information, as the referred follows after the referring, just like in (5). In (14), *ça* is anaphoric with the antecedent *elle*, expressing the speaker's feelings of compassion.<sup>7</sup> In such cases, too, only the personal pronoun *she* is suitable, because we find the coreferential anaphor *she* in the previous sentence. But in the last sentence of (14), it is again possible to express feeling with the personal pronoun *she*. As the referring is anaphoric with the previous sentence, the referred element is given and evoked. The degree of identity between the referred and the referring is maximal. Therefore, the information is active.

### 2.3. Homogeneous contrast

It is possible to capture a particular notion by contrasting the extracted attribute of the referring element with that of the referred. We first examine a coordinative NP and then an example in which the NP is constructed with words like 'kind', 'sort', and 'class' preceding the substantives.

(15) *Je vis un garçon et une fille sur le quai. Ce garçon et cette fille étaient blonds, alors que ceux que j'avais rencontrés jusqu'à présent étaient bruns.* (Kleiber 1988a:70-71)

[I saw a boy and a girl on the wharf. **\*This/That boy and that girl** were blond, while those whom I had met previously had brown hair.]

- (16) *Au surplus, quoi qu'il arrive, ne comptons jamais que **cette espèce de courage** que Dieu dispense au jour le jour, et comme sou par sou. C'est ce courage-là qui nous convient, qui s'accorde le mieux à l'humilité de notre état.* (Guénette 1995:180)

[In addition, whatever happens, let us just count on **?this/?that/ the kind of courage** that God brings us day by day, a penny at a time. This courage is more suitable to us and most in harmony with our humble state.]

In (15), an addressor contrasts the referring *that boy and that girl* whose hair is blond with *those [boys and girls]* whose hair is brown that he/she had met previously. According to Corblin (1985b:126-127) and Kleiber (1988a: 67-83), it is the homogeneous contrast in the same domain or category that constitutes the oppositional notion between 'that boy against the others' and 'that girl against the others'. In this case, the referring correlates with the referred in direct and pure anaphora. Also here, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal; therefore, we have active information.

Referring to example (16), Guénette (*ibid.*, my translation) commented:

what the addressor wants to express, it is rather a particular type of 'courage'. That which specifies 'the courage', or puts it in opposition to other types of courage, is clarified in the text by a relative clause of which the contents are characterized by using *the kind of courage (cette espèce de courage)*.<sup>8</sup>

Example (15) is in the past tense. Moreover, it describes an objective situation without the addressor's emotion; therefore, native speakers of English prefer to use *that*. As (16) is in the present tense and, in addition, the addressor recognizes God as a familiar existence, *this* could be used here, but *the* is preferred. (16) is cataphoric, as the unused referred element follows after the referring. In this case, we have active information just like in (5) and (13).

The relationship of inclusion or exclusion can be made more explicit by contrasting *this (one)* with *that (one)* in English, as it is done in French by adding the particles *-ci* and *-là* at the end of a variable. The example below shows this homogeneous contrast:

- (17) *Camarades, mes chers amis de Carcassonne, je me sens très bien au milieu de vous. (...) S'il est un lieu où les Pyrénées n'existent pas c'est bien celui-ci et vous comprendrez que je sois heureux de me sentir doublement en famille.* (Veland 1996:346)

[Comrades, my dear friends of Carcassonne, I feel very welcome in your midst. (...) If there is a place where the Pyrenees don't exist, it's really this (one) and you understand that I am happy to feel twice as much a member of the family.]

As Veland (ibid.) explains, the nouns classifying the above occurrence contain the semantic mark *whole* (a *cocon*, in his terminology), as in example (17); the mark of deictic situational function *this one* (*celui-ci*) or *that one* (*celui-là*) involves the notion of *entirety*. In (17), the addressor contrasts *a place where the Pyrenees don't exist (=this one)* with *the place where the Pyrenees exist (=that one)*. The pertinence of this contrastive criterion appears more clearly in (17), where the word *really* (*bien*) is significant. Its primary effect is to render the homogeneous contrast more explicit. In this case, as the referring correlates with the referred in direct anaphora, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we have active information.

We add an authentic English example, as follows:

- (18) She prefers her biscuits to **those** I make. (Lyons 1999:19)

As Lyons (ibid.) claims, the demonstrative *those* in (18) is distinguished by a 'matching constraint', which instructs the hearer to contrast the referent, *her biscuits*, with the identifiable object, *the biscuits I make (=my biscuits)*.

## 2.4. Generalization

In agreement with Corblin's (1985b:135) notion of *referential sliding* (*glissements référentiels*), we suggest that anaphora does not involve the material identity of references (*sloppy identity, divergent anaphora*). The example (19) below, however, moves from a specific reference to a generic one.

- (19) *Il trouva trois champignons et fut étonné car ce champignon était très rare dans la région.* (Reichler-Béguelin 1988b:17)  
 [He found three mushrooms and was astonished because **this/that mushroom** was very rare in this region.]

The referring *this/that mushroom* in (19) contains the meaning of *this/that kind of mushroom* or *all (those) kinds of mushrooms*. In French, the referring *ce champignon* signifies also *cette sorte de champignon*. Usually, English native speakers prefer to use *that (those)*. Consequently, the reference in (19) moves the passage from the particular to that of the general. In this case, as the referring correlates with the referred as a direct anaphora, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we have active information.

Let us now examine the French invariable demonstrative pronouns *ce* and *ça* referring to a particular object by generalizing it, as follows:

- (20) *Passe-moi ce paquet, mais attention c'est fragile.* (Burston and Monville-Burston 1981:247)  
 [Pass me this parcel, but look out, **?this/it** is fragile.]

In (20), the demonstrative *this* refers to the antecedent-trigger *this parcel*, which is designated definitely and conspicuously as being near the speaker. But because the antecedent-trigger is most likely the topic of the first part and acts as the current focus, the pronoun *it* is the best suited. As a result of this anaphoric reference, *it* has the characteristic of a generalization: the referring is anaphoric with the previous sentence,

hence the referred element is given and evoked. Furthermore, the degree of identity between the referring and the referred is maximal. Therefore, we are dealing with active information, just like in the case of (19).

### 3. *Semi-active information*

#### 3.1. Whole-part

There are discourse structures in which the NP in the first part of an utterance combines with a demonstrative determiner plus a subordinate word, while the first NP is a superordinate word. In this associative anaphora, the demonstrative determiner reclassifies the referred NP by reclassifying the superordinate concept as a subordinate one, based on a *whole-part* relation. We can see this below:

- (21) *Nous arrivâmes dans un village. **Cette église**, tout de même, quel horreur!* (Apothéoz & Reichler-Béguelin 1999:374)  
 [We arrived in a village. **That church!** Really! How dreadful!]

In (21), the referred *village* is a superordinate NP and the referring *that church* is a subordinate one. So we suggest that the demonstrative determiner has reclassification value: 'The church is in the village where we arrived'. In this case, the majority of native speakers of English prefer to use *that*, which expresses emotional distance. That is to say, the discourse reflects speaker's dread of the distant referred. As the referring 'church' is neither given or new, but can be inferred on the basis of 'village', the degree of reclassification is sufficient but not maximal. Therefore, this is a case of semi-active information.

An English example follows:

- (22) We went to hear the Minnesota Orchestra last night. **That conductor** was very good. (Ibid: 366)

In (22), the referring *that conductor* is the subordinate NP and the referred *the Minnesota Orchestra* is a superordinate one. In this case, we use *that* because the discourse is in the past tense.

Among French demonstrative pronouns, only the simple form of the variable pronoun has the characteristic 'whole-part' function, correlating the referring with the referred:

- (23) *A la Noël, les prisonniers reçoivent souvent un colis de victuailles. **Ceux** qui sont condamnés pour meurtre n'y ont pas droit.* (Pierrard 1991:81)  
 [At Christmas, the prisoners often receive a parcel of provisions.  
**Those** who serve a sentence for murder don't have this right.]

In (23), the referring *those (ceux)*, being part of a relative construction, includes the prisoners who are sentenced for murder and correlates with the referred *the prisoners* of the first part. Therefore, we could speak of a subset in this case. As the prisoners serving a murder sentence compose a subset of the prisoners, they are anaphoric with the referred, showing the 'whole-part' relation with the simple form *those*. The referring correlates with the referred through our inference and the degree of reclassification is sufficient but not maximal. Therefore, the information is semi-active.

### 3.2. Part-whole

There are also discourse structures in which the NP combines with a demonstrative determiner plus a superordinate word, while the first NP is a subordinate word. In this associative anaphora, the demonstrative determiner reclassifies the referred NP by reclassifying the subordinate concept as a superordinate one.

- (24) *L'Américain exprimait en effet l'opinion qu'il ne suffisait pas de raffermir la célèbre Tour penchée pour l'empêcher de crouler, mais qu'il fallait rendre*

*à ce chef-d'oeuvre de la Renaissance sa fière allure d'antan.*  
(Guénette 1995:206)

[The American expressed the idea that it would not be sufficient to strengthen the famous leaning tower in order to prevent it from collapsing, but that they should restore **this/that Renaissance masterpiece** to its former glory.]

In (24), the referred is the leaning tower and the referring NP is *this masterpiece*. As the Renaissance masterpiece is the leaning tower, the referred is a subordinate expression, and the referring NP a superordinate one. In this case, too, even though this example is in the past tense, most native speakers of English prefer to use *this(these)* rather than *that*. As the referring is neither given or new but can be inferred on the basis of the referred, the degree of reclassification is significant but not maximal. Therefore, we are dealing with semi-active information.

### 3.3. Particularity or quality

Many singular forms of demonstrative determiners show their endophoricity in relation to particularity or quality, as we can see in examples (25-26):

(25) *J'ai perdu mon briquet. **Ce cadeau** de l'oncle Ernest me manquera beaucoup.* (Corblin 1983:123)

[I lost my lighter. I will really miss **this/that gift** from my Uncle Ernest.]

(26) a. *Pierre écrit très vite. **Cette qualité** le sert.* (Corblin 1985:134)

b. *Pierre écrit très vite. **Ce défaut** le dessert.* (Ibid.)

[a. Pierre writes very fast. **This/That quality** is in his favor.]

[b. Pierre writes very fast. **?This/That shortcoming** works against him.]



In (25), the attribute of the referred NP *my lighter* becomes more explicit thanks to the referring element *this gift from my Uncle Ernest*. In this case, it is possible to analyze and infer the type of particularity or quality by examining this associative anaphora. Moreover, as (25) expresses a positive attitude (as seen in the emotional proximity of the speaker), native speakers of English prefer to use *this*. In contrast, if we assume that the listener doesn't have any relationship to Uncle Ernest and that the lighter is gone, *that* is better than *this*.

In (26), the attribute of the referred first sentence is more clearly designated by the referring element *this quality* (26a) and *that shortcoming* (26b), i.e., two kinds of particularity or quality. As (26a) shows a positive and approving attitude, as does (25), English speakers prefer to use *this*. If the speaker is negative, as in (26b), they use *that*, but *this* is also acceptable.<sup>9</sup> In (25-26), the referring correlates with the referred through our inference, hence the degree of reclassification is significant but not maximal. Therefore, we have semi-active information.

We suggest that there is very little difference between (26a) and (26b). To justify this claim, let us examine an example containing a plural form:

- (27) a. Pierre speaks very fast. And he also writes very fast. These/  
?Those qualities are in his favor.  
b. Pierre speaks very fast. And he writes very fast. **?These/  
Those shortcomings** work against him.

Changing the singular forms of the demonstratives in (26) into their plural forms, as in example (27), does not seem to trigger any further differences.

### 3.4. Fuzzy object

Only the French invariable demonstrative pronouns *cela* ou *ça* use an anaphoric expression with an implicitly determinate object, as seen in the following example:

(28) *Devant moi, quelque chose apparaissait (...); Ça semblait instable, perfide, engloutissant; ça remuait et ça démenait partout à la fois.*  
(Grevisse 1980:596)

[In front of me something appeared (...); **It/?this** seemed unstable, treacherous, engulfing; **it/?this** was moving and throwing itself everywhere at once.]

In (28), *it (ça)* is anaphoric with the undefined object, *something*, that seems unstable, treacherous, and engulfing. This example is in the past tense. Furthermore, it shows the addressor's emotional distance from the unclear reference. The pronoun *it* is the most suitable in the above example. As the referring correlates with the referred through our inference, the degree of their reclassification is sufficient but not maximal. Therefore, the information is semi-active.

## 4. Inactive information

### 4.1. Figuration

For the six endophoric uses of demonstrative determiners, identity is easily discovered in relation to the referred object and the referring subject, since an identical element exists between them. But with metaphorical expressions, there is very little, if any, literal identification; there exists, however, a common meaning between the comparing element and the compared one. Through a process of replacement of the compared with the comparing, a new meaning is ultimately

expressed. Let us examine endophoricity in relation to the figurations in the following examples (29-30):

(29) *La mer était constellée de voiles et ces papillons semblaient immobiles.*  
(Guénette 1995:75)

[The sea was covered with all kinds of sails. And **?these/those butterflies** seemed to be immobile.]

(30) *Un arbre dressait ses branches tordues non loin de là. Il décida de passer la nuit près de ce compagnon.* (Corblin 1983:123)

[A tree was spreading out its tortuous branches not far from there. He decided to spend the night beside **this/?that/companion.**]

In (29), the referring (=the comparing) *these butterflies* correlates with the referred (=the compared) *sails* by means of a metaphor constructed using associative anaphora. We can extract a common element of 'form' as a similarity between them. And in (30), even if the identity between the comparing *this companion* and the compared *tree* may seem far-fetched, we also have a metaphoric expression. In this case, the narrator considers the *tree* as a *companion* of our hero by extracting a 'familiarity' from *companion* and transferring it to the *tree*.

The inferential process replaces the referred with the referring by extracting the similarity between two elements; hence it is possible to identify a new concept for the referring NP. According to Zubin's hierarchy of egocentrism<sup>10</sup> (1979:478), the frequency of *that* is higher at the abstract level than at the inanimate, concrete level. The examples above, (29-30), clearly confirm Zubin's theory by their use of *that* or *those*; but in (29), the speaker can use *these* if he/she wants to give a more vivid description.

In (30), native speakers of English prefer *this*, even though the sentence is in the past tense. In such a case, the addressor's emotional proximity is more influential. As the referring correlates only with the referred through our inference, their degree of reclassification is

maximal, while their identity is minimal. Therefore, they represent inactive and new information.

Furthermore, the invariable demonstrative pronoun *ce* is preferred in synecdoche<sup>11</sup> as follows:

(31) *Tu peux venir manger ta soupe. C'est prêt.* (Burston and Monville-Burston 1981:248)

[You can come get your soup. \***This/It** is ready.]

In (31), *it* (*ce*) is anaphoric with the antecedent-trigger *your soup*. It is not just the soup that is prepared. Rather, it is the whole entity that can be associated with the soup; the quality of this soup being ready can be applied simultaneously, for example, to the table, the plates and dishes, the napkins, the rest of the meal, etc. This use of synecdoche denotes the whole entity by expanding. In such cases, the pronoun *it* is an acceptable anaphor.<sup>12</sup>

It should be noted, however, that because the antecedent-trigger is most likely the topic of the utterance's first part and acts as its current focus, the pronoun *it* is the most suitable.<sup>13</sup> As the relationship correlating the referring with the referred is easily inferable, the degree of their reclassification is weaker than in the case of the determiners in (29-30). Therefore, we are looking at inactive information.

#### 4.2. Vague idea

Only the French invariable demonstrative pronoun *ça* presents the endophoric characteristic in relation to a 'vague idea'. In the following example (32), the token *ça* serves cataphorically in relation to the target in order to express a vague idea that becomes more precise.

(32) **Ça** *n'est pas bien malin, quand on est un homme politique et que tous les regards sont braqués sur vous, de se mettre dans son tort de cette façon et de donner une prise pareille à ses adversaires!* (Maillard 1989:61)

[When one is a politician and all eyes are fixed on you, **it/?that** is quite stupid, to put oneself in the wrong like that and to give such an advantage to one's adversaries!]

In (32), *it* (*ça*) is cataphoric to the infinitive clause *to put oneself in the wrong like that and to give such an advantage to one's adversaries*. Good English doesn't use *that*; normal usage would be *it*. Situated in the infinitive clause, the NP *such an advantage* is a sort of vague demonstrative expression. According to a study by Fuller (2002), *such* (*a/an*) refers to opaque antecedents that carry more of a vague sense of the class of things being referred to and are not too clearly defined.<sup>14</sup> The fact that the antecedent-trigger is less defined and specific makes it certain that example (32) is endophoric in relation to a 'vague idea'. Since the referred is situated in the latter part of the sentence, we are faced with inactive information, just as was the case in examples (5) and (13).

##### *5. A tabulation of endophoric uses and informative values*

We have arranged the French demonstrative informative values for the demonstratives examined above, as shown in Table 3.

In Table 3, 'A' means active information, 'S' semi-active information, and 'I' inactive information.

Demonstratives Endophoricity	Determiners		Variables		Invariables			
	Simple	Complex	Simple	Complex	Ceci	cela	ça	ce
Part-whole	S							
Whole/part	S		S					
Particularity or quality	S							
Feeling	A			A		I	A	
Summary or definition	A			A		I	A	
Figuration	I	I						I
Homogeneous contrast	A			A				
Generalization	A							A
Fuzzy object							S	
Vague idea							I	

Table 3

We have also arranged the English demonstrative informative values for the two kinds of demonstratives 'this' and 'that' (see Table 4):

Demonstratives Endophoricity	Determiners		Pronouns	
	this	that	this	that
Part-whole	S			
Whole/part		S		S
Particularity or quality	S	S		
Feeling				
Summary or definition	A		A	A
Figuration	I	I		
Homogeneous contrast		A	A	A
Generalization	A	A		
Fuzzy object				
Vague idea				

Table 4

## 6. Conclusion

In this study, we have first presented the use of English endophoric demonstratives according to their uses of endophoricity. Then, we contrasted English and French usage with respect to the informative value of the demonstratives. Finally, we examined the validity of the hypothesis proposed in our Introduction. Our conclusions follow below.

First, English endophoric demonstratives were not used for feeling, fuzzy object and vague idea; here pronouns like *he*, *she* and *it* were preferred. In the categories of part-whole, summary and generalization, only determiners were used, while pronouns were not. The demonstrative *this* was limited to the seven sentential connections that showed an immediate/close spatio-temporal or emotional proximity; the demonstrative *that* was used in the opposite contexts.

Second, we examined the informative values of French and English as follows:

### (1) French

- 1) Active information: summary or definition, feeling, homogeneous contrast, generalization
- 2) Semi-active information: part-whole, whole-part, particularity or quality, fuzzy object
- 3) Inactive information: figuration, vague idea

### (2) English

- 1) Active information: summary or definition, homogeneous contrast, generalization
- 2) Semi-active information: part-whole, whole-part, particularity or quality
- 3) Inactive information: figuration

Third, we examined the validity of our initial hypothesis.

- 1) If the degree of identity was maximal in correlating the referring with the referred, the information was active and old.
- 2) If the degree of reclassification was maximal in correlating the referring with the referred, the information was inactive and new.

On the basis of our study, we concluded that Part 1 of our hypothesis was satisfied in the use of summary or definition, feeling, homogeneous contrast, and generalization, while Part 2 was satisfied in the use of part-whole, whole-part, particularity/quality, and fuzzy object. Therefore, we suggest that our hypothesis be revised as a principle for the use of endophoric demonstratives in the following manner:

Principle: If the degree of identity is maximal in correlating the referring with the referred, we are dealing with activated and old information. If the degree of reclassification is maximal, the information is inactive and new.

*French Department  
University of Ulsan  
29 Mugeo-dong  
Nam-gu  
Ulsan 680-749  
Korea*

\* This work was supported by University of Ulsan Research Fund of 2002.

### **Acknowledgments**

The author is grateful to his University of Ulsan for the financial aid and to his six colleagues, Wolfgang Pelzer (Professor of English at the University of Ulsan), Kimberly Jansma (Professor of French and Francophone Studies at UCLA), Eric



Gans (Professor of French and Francophone Studies Department at the UCLA), Patricia Clancy (Professor of Linguistics at the University of California, Santa Barbara), Christian Vandendorpe (Professor of French at the University of Ottawa) and Anne Zribi-Hertz (Professor of French at the University of Paris 8) for their helpful comments and discussions. The author appreciates also the two anonymous referees and Chief Editor, J.L. Mey, for their sincere comments.

## Notes

1. Apothéloz (1999:364) comments on this as follows: 'It refers to an object (the referent) which is new in discourse and has not, consequently, been explicitly mentioned in the prior context. And it can be fully interpreted referentially only by means of the data which have been introduced at an earlier stage into the universe of discourse'. Mitkov (2002:15) mentions that this is also known as bridging or indirect anaphora.
2. Mitkov (2002:4-5) explains the difference between the terms anaphor and anaphora by referring to Halliday and Hasan (1976), who describe anaphora as cohesion which points back to some previous item. The word or phrase 'pointing back' is called an anaphor, and the entity to which it refers or for which it stands is its antecedent. The process of determining the antecedent of anaphor is called anaphora resolution.
3. Apothéloz and Reichler-Béguelin (1999:365) comment that the 'trigger' concept has been extended to cover all types of anaphora. Cornish (1999:43) explains it as follows: Under the standard, traditional account of anaphora, the anaphoric expression, which by definition is semantically underspecified to some degree – a status often reflected by its also being lexically and morphologically attenuated in some way – needs to be put into relation with a suitable antecedent expression occurring in the co-text.
4. Veland (1996:289) explains as follows: 'Martinon (1927:108) constate en deux mots l'existence de l'emploi qui nous préoccupe et propose comme glose du SN féminin "pareille affaire", "cette parole", "cette action", chacune de ses réactions verbales senties comme généralement déplacée ou désagréable'.
5. Koo (2001:6-7) explains as follows: 'In dialog, there is some tendency for the speaker to use "this" to refer to express what he said with a positive feeling and "that" to refer to something said with a negative feeling'.

6. Zribi-Hertz (e-mail of 7/16/2004) comments as follows: '...je pense que dans cette classe d'emplois, la déixis non-proximale produit un effet de mise à distance, qui est solidaire de la connotation dépréciative. Il faut considérer la combinaison de tous les ingrédients de la phrase, pas seulement "celui-là". Dans l'exemple (11), le prédicat "un sacré numéro" est lui-même connoté péjorativement, il provient d'un lexique désinvolte, familier, non soutenu. La sélection de "celui-là" dans le sujet est en phase avec cette propriété: effet de mise à distance plus grand que 'ce', qui est non-spécifié ("c'est un sacré numéro")'.
7. Charaudeau (1992:233) explains the effect of *ça* instead of a personal pronoun, as follows:  
 'Alors, ça fait le malin'. [=tu ou vous]  
 'Tiens, salut, ça va?' [=tu]  
 'Oui. Tu vois. Ça passe des vacances'. [=je]
8. Guénette (1995:180) explains this as follows: 'ce que le locuteur cherche à exprimer, c'est plutôt "un courage" d'un type particulier. Ce qui particularise "ce courage", ce qui l'oppose aux autres types de courage, est explicité dans le texte par une relative dont le contenu est caractérisant à l'endroit de l'objet de pensée auquel renvoie "cette espèce de courage".'
9. In order to get the clearest and the most objective results regarding the subtle distinctions of some of our examples, we checked the examples using a test panel consisting of twenty English major students at UCLA (10/27/2003). They were asked to state their preferences of definiteness within a pre-defined set of expressions. The results are as follows (in percentages and number of respondents out of 20):

Example	Most acceptable (%)	Acceptable (/20)
(26a)	this (60), that (20), the (20)	that (11), this (3), the (4)
(26b)	this (56), the (33), that (11)	that (10), this (4), the (4)
(28)	it (90), this(5), that(5) / it (95), that (5)	this (6), that (2) / this (5), that(1)
(30)	this (80), the (20)	that (7), the (6), this (1)
(33)	it (95), this (5)	this (5), that (4), it (1)

10. According to Zubin (1979:478), the frequency of 'this' is ordered as follows: Speaker> hearer> other person> inanimate concrete> abstract.
11. Adam (1976:147-149) explains it as follows: 'Partie pour le tout et tout pour la partie, moins pour le plus et plus pour le moins, la synecdoque paraît être, comme métonymie, plus directement liée au référent que ne l'est la métaphore'. [Part for the whole and whole for the part, less for the most

and more for the least, synecdoche seems to be, just like metonymy, more directly bound to the referent than is the metaphor.]

12. Stirling (1996:69-85) explains the relationship between metonymy and anaphora using the example of the pronoun *it* as an instance of a general activity to product this type of metonymy.
13. Maes (1996:166-167) explains as follows: 'First, *that* can be used for referents which are clearly in focus. Second, *it* often occurs in a position in which Gundel et al. [1993] would expect *that*, i.e. when a newly introduced referent is established as the focus of attention in the discourse. Although [Gundel] confined herself to *it/that* occurrences with nominal antecedents, i.e. antecedents taking up argument positions within the sentence, and not independent clauses or clusters of clauses, the different proportions which these heuristics are based on remain strong when applied to my data: *it*, much more so than *that*, is associated with pronominal or full-NP antecedents and there are a lot more subject-*it* forms than subject-*that* forms occurring with an antecedent in subject position'.
14. Fuller (2002:44-47) claims the following: '*such (a/ an)* refers to the antecedent like the one that is mentioned and that exhibits similar but not necessarily identical types of practices'.

## References

- Adam, Jean-Michel & J.P. Goldenstein. 1976. *Linguistique et discours littéraire*. Paris: Larousse.
- Apothéloz, Denis. 1995. *Rôle et fonctionnement de l'anaphore dans la dynamique textuelle*. Genève: Droz.
- Apothéloz, Denis & Marie-José Reichler-Béguelin. 1999. Interpretations and functions of demonstrative NPs in indirect anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics* 31.363-397.
- Burston, Jack & Monique Monville-Burston. 1981. The use of demonstrative and personal pronoun as anaphoric subjects of the verb *être*. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 5(2).231-258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Charaudeau, Patrick. 1992. *Grammaire du sens et de l'expression*. Paris: Hachette.
- Combettes, Bernard. 1992. Hiérarchie des référants et connaissance partagée: les degrés dans l'opposition connu/nouveau. *L'Information Grammaticale* 54. 11-14.

- Corblin, Francis. 1983. Défini et démonstratif dans la reprise immédiate. *Français Moderne* 51(2).118-134.
- Corblin, Francis. 1985a. Remarques sur la notion d'anaphore. *Revue Québécoise de Linguistique* 15(1).173-195.
- Corblin, Francis. 1985b. Les chaînes de référence: Analyse linguistique et traitement automatique. *Intellectica* 1.123-143.
- Cornish, Francis. 1999. *Anaphora, Discourse, and Understanding Evidence from English and French*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fuller, Christiane. 2002. A contextual analysis of anaphoric reference: *This/these* versus *such (a/an)*. (Thesis for the degree of Master of Arts, UCLA).
- Galmiche, Michel. 1984. Référence indéfini, événements, propriété et pertinence. In: *Déterminants : Syntaxe et sémantique*. Paris: Klincksieck, 41-71.
- Galmiche, Michel. 1992. Au carrefour des malentendus: le thème. *L'Information Grammaticale* 54.3-10.
- Grevisse, Maurice. 1980. *Le bon usage*. Paris & Gembloux: Editions Duculot. (11<sup>e</sup> édition).
- Guénette, Louise. 1995. *Le démonstratif en français*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Gundel, Jeanette, Nancy Hedberg & Ron Zacharski. 1993. Cognitive status and the form of referring expressions in discourse. *Language* 69(2).274-307.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3.199-244.
- Halliday, Michael A. K & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Kim, Gong-Dae. 2005. Etude sur l'endophoricité du démonstratif en français. *Enseignement de Langue et Littérature Française* 20.109-138.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1984. Sur la sémantique des descriptions du démonstratif. *Linguisticae Investigationes VIII*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 63-85.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1986. Pour une explication du paradoxe de la reprise immédiate, un  $N_i \rightarrow \text{Le } N_i / \text{ un } N_i \rightarrow \text{Ce } N_i$ . *Langue Française* 72.54-79.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1988a. Reprise immédiate et théorie des contrastes. *Studia Romanica Posnaniensia* 13.67-83.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1988b. Nomination indépendante et démonstratifs. Actes du 3<sup>e</sup> Colloque de Linguistique (Strasbourg 28-29 avril 1988), Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, 211-228.
- Kleiber, Georges. 1988c. Sur l'anaphore démonstratif. In: *Nouvelles Recherches en Grammaire: Colloque d'Albi*. Université de Toulouse-le-Murail, 51-74.

- Koo, Ja-Eun. 2001. On endophoric definite and demonstrative determiners in English referring expressions. *Modern English-American Linguistic Society*, 1-28.
- Kuno, Susumo. 1972. Functional sentence perspective: A case study from Japanese and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3.269-320
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maes, Alfons A. 1996. The Markedness of Abstract-Object Anaphors in Discourse. In: *Coherence and Anaphora*. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 161-183.
- Maillard, Michel. 1989. *Comment ça fonctionne*. Thèse d'état de l'Université Paris 10.
- Mitkov, Ruslan. 2002. *Anaphora Resolution*. London: Pearson Education.
- Moeschler, Jacques. 1985. *Argumentation et conversation: Eléments pour une analyse pragmatique du discours*. Université de Genève.
- Pierrard, Michel. 1991. Observations sur le statut syntaxique et sémantique de 'celui+relative'. *Travaux de Linguistique* 22.69-91.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London and New York: Longman Group.
- Reichler-Béguelin, Marie-José. 1988a. Anaphore, connecteur et processus inférentiels. In: *Modèles du Discours*, Christian Rubattel (éd.), Actes des rencontres de linguistique française Crêt-Bérard, 303-336.
- Reichler-Béguelin, Marie-José. 1988b. Anaphore, cataphore et mémoire discursive. *Pratiques* 57.15-43.
- Renkema, Jan. 1992. *Discourse Studies*. Translated by Y.P. Lee. Seoul: Hankookmoonhwasa.
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1965. *Syntaxe du français contemporain I. Les Pronoms*. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1996. Metonymy and Anaphora. In: *Coherence and Anaphora*. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 10.69-88.
- Veland, Reidar. 1996. *Les marqueurs référentiels celui-ci et celui-là*. Genève: Droz.
- Zubin, David. 1979. Discourse Functions of Morphology: the Focus System in German. In: T. Givón, *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, 466-480.

