

## Discourse Deixis in the American Political Speeches

Huda Hadi Khalil

College of Education for Women - Department of English

### Abstract

The feature that prevails in spoken political discourse - especially with regards to the fact that it is otherwise used in the written one - is relatively high degree of formality. It is then just logical that formality is usually accompanied with more polite forms and higher degree of impersonality. Such discourse is characterized by the choice of specific vocabulary and syntactic structures as well. However, there are some tendencies to bring political speech nearer to the everyday discourse and that is why political speeches have been becoming more informal and personal. Like any other types of discourse, the American political speeches are loaded with deictic expressions that form an essential complementary part of any text.

The present paper aims at presenting a full presentation of the concept of deixis in general and the discourse deixis in particular. This presentation is the subject matter of the first and second sections of the paper. In the third section discrimination is drawn between two overlapping concepts: discourse deixis and anaphora.

The main aim of the present paper is to investigate the discourse deixis in the American political speeches, as a type of institutional talk, to find out the way this linguistic phenomenon used in the American political speeches and to see whether there is a special strategy for the use of the discourse deixis in this type of text. To achieve this aim, three American political speeches have been downloaded randomly from the internet from the website of <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq> and analyzed carefully. Each speech is delivered by a different politician; the first is for Barak Obama, the second is for Condoleezza Rice, and the third is for Paul Bremer. The analysis of the discourse deixis represents the practical part of the paper which is introduced in section four. The practical part also includes a number of conclusions which the analysis has come with.

### الأشارة النصية في الخطابات السياسية الأمريكية

هدى هادي خليل

كلية التربية للبنات - قسم اللغة الأنكليزية

#### الخلاصة

ان السمة الغالبة للنصوص السياسية الشفوية هي انها نوعا ما تتصف بدرجة عالية من الرسمية. لذا من المنطقي ان ترتبط الصفة الرسمية بأعلى درجات التأدب في الحديث وعدم الخصومية فيه بحيث تكون لهذا النوع من النصوص مفردات وتراكيب نحوية خاصة بها. غير انه في الوقت الحاضر هناك ميل نحو جعل الخطابات السياسية اقرب الى النصوص المستعملة في الحياة اليومية مما جعل هذه الخطابات اشبه بالاحاديث الخاصة والغير رسمية.

يهدف البحث الحالي الى تقديم عرض شامل لمبدأ الاشارة في اللغة بصورة عامة ومبدأ الاشارة النصية بصورة خاصة وقد تم تكريس الجزئين الاول والثاني من البحث لهذا الغرض. أما الجزء الثالث فقد كُرس لغرض بيان الفرق بين مبدئي الجنس والاشارة النصية لكونهما مبدئين متداخلين.

يهدف البحث بالدرجة الاساس الى تقصي الاشارة النصية في الخطابات السياسية الامريكية كنوع من الحديث المؤسساتي من اجل معرفة الطريقة التي يستخدم بها السياسيون الامريكان الاشارة النصية في خطاباتهم ومن اجل معرفة في ما اذا كان هناك طريقة خاصة لهذا الاستخدام في تلك الخطابات.

لتحقيق هذا الهدف الاساسي تم تحميل ثلاث خطابات سياسية امريكية بصورة عشوائية من شبكة الانترنت من الموقع <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq> وتم تحليل هذه الخطابات بدقة من الجدير بالذكر ان هذه الخطابات ملقات من قبل سياسيين امريكان من مختلف المراتب السياسية الاول لباراك اوباما والثاني لكوندليزا رايس والثالث لبول بريمر. ان تحليل هذه الخطابات يمثل الجزء العملي من البحث والذي قُدم في الجزء الرابع كما يتضمن الجزء العملي ايضا عدد من النتائج التي تمخض عنها تحليل الخطابات الثلاث.

## Section One

### Deixis

Deixis is believed to be a feature of English as well as of natural languages. In origin, the term *deixis* is Ancient Greek which means *display, demonstration or reference*. Deixis is one of the first linguistic phenomenon that considerations of language could not ignore. It is, in a way, the anchoring of language in the real world. This anchoring is achieved by pointing of variables along its dimensions. In other words, it is the phenomenon wherein understanding the meaning of certain expressions in an utterance requires contextual information. If the semantic meaning of words is fixed but their denotational meaning varies depending on time and/or place, they are deictic. Words or phrases that require contextual information to convey any meaning, such as pronouns, are said to be deictic ones; they are called *indexical expressions* or simply *indexicals* (Verschuieren, 1999: 18; Mey, 2001: 54 and <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deixis>).

The most common categories of deixis are those of person, place and time. These categories are the traditional and perhaps the most common ones. Personal deixis is reflected directly in the grammatical categories of person. The basic grammatical categories here are first, second and third person (Levinson, 2000: 68). According to Levinson (1983: 62), place or spatial deixis is the encoding of spatial locations relative to the location of the participants in the speech event. Time deixis is the encoding points relative to the time at which an utterance was spoken or written (Ibid).

There are, however, other types of deixis that are pervasive in language use. These types are discourse deixis, which is the main topic of the present paper, and social deixis. Social deixis is used to encode social distinctions that are relative to the participant role; aspects of social relationship between speaker and addressee or between speaker and some referent (ibid: 63).

Related to the phenomenon of deixis is the concept of deictic centre which is a set of theoretical points that a deictic expression is anchored to in a way that the evaluation of the meaning of the deictic expression leads one to the relevant point. Because the deictic expressions are frequently egocentric, the deictic center usually consists of the speaker at the time and place of the utterance in addition to the place in the discourse and relevant social factors (Cornish, 2005: 2).

However, the deictic expressions can be used in such a way that the deictic center is transferred to other participants in the exchange or to persons, places etc. being described in a narrative text (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deixis>). Consider the following example:

**(1) I am standing here now.**

The deictic center here is the person at the time and place of speaking.

## Section Two

### Discourse Deixis

In English, as is the case with many other languages, there are many words and phrases that indicate the relationship between one utterance and a portion of discourse. Examples of such words and phrases are *but, therefore, in conclusion, to the contrary, still, however, anyway, well, besides, actually, all in all, so, after all*, etc. such expressions have a component of meaning that

resists truth-conditional meaning. They merely indicate that the utterance that contains them is a response to or a continuation of a portion of discourse (Levinson, 1983: 87). The phenomenon of using such expressions is called *discourse deixis* (henceforth DD), or as sometimes referred to as *text deixis*. DD refers to the use of expressions within some utterances to refer to the discourse that contains the utterance, including the utterance itself (ibid: 85). Linguistically speaking, the DD refers to the preceding or subsequent segments of the discourse which usually consists of one or more clauses rather than referring to the specific entities in previous utterance (Yoshida, 2011:41). Examples are:

**(2) This is a great story.**

*This*, here, refers to an upcoming portion of discourse. Another example is:

**(3) That was a great story.**

*That* refers to a prior portion of discourse. Thus, the dimension of DD is involved whenever an expression points out at an earlier simultaneous or following discourse. Consider the following example which is taken from Verschueren (1999: 17):

**(4) A: Debby: Go anywhere today?**

**B: Dan: Yes we went down to *Como*, up by bus, and back by hydrofoil.**

**C: Debby: Anything to see *there*?**

**D: Dan: Perhaps not the most interesting Italian towns, but it's worth the trip.**

**E: Debby: I might do *that* next Sunday.**

**F: Jane: What do *you mean when you say* perhaps not the most interesting of Italian towns?**

**G: Jack: *He means* certainly not the most interesting....**

**H: Just *trying to be polite*.**

*There* in C refers back to *Como* in B; *that* in E refers to *going down to Como* in B; *you mean ...you say* in F, *he means* in G and *trying to be polite* in H all refer back to the utterance made in D.

DD is based on markers (deictic expressions) taken from other types of deixis; mainly special and temporal deixis. Thus, it is often possible to use temporal deictic expressions (such as *in the last paragraph* and *in the next chapter* which are analogous to *last week* and *next Thursday*) as discourse deictic expressions (henceforth DDE) because discourse itself unfolds in time. Special terms are also sometimes employed for the same purpose (such as *in this article* or *two paragraphs below*).

Demonstratives are the most prominent spatial deictics that are used as discourse deictics. For example:

**(5) *That* was the funniest story I've ever heard.**

It is worth mentioning here that when a demonstrative pronoun is used as a DDE, the referent can be a clause, a sequence of clauses or a verb phrase as shown in the following examples:

**(6) Jane took biology. *That* means she can take biology.**

**(7) I woke up. I ate breakfast. I watched TV. *That's* all I did today.**

**(8) John travels a lot. Jane does *that* too.**

(Levinson, 1983:85 and Levinson, 2004: 118)

Within the domain of DD, we can also include other ways in which an utterance signals its relation to surrounding texts. For example, when the expression *anyway* comes initially in an utterance, it indicates that the utterance containing it is not addressed to the immediately preceding discourse but to one, two or more steps back. Having the distinctive relativity of reference, such signals are considered to be deictic ones that are anchored to the discourse

location of the current utterance (Levinson, 1983: 85). Generally speaking, the DDEs are more exclusive in that they locate linguistic elements in the ongoing discourse (Diessel, 2012: 2417).

Although DD involves concepts within the linguistic context, it does not strictly replace a segment of text. Instead, it refers to an object, event, proposition or some other occurrence whose existence is implied by the text (Brassell, 2000: 14).

Speaking of the general types of DD, a DDE can be a switch reference. Switch reference is a type of DD and a grammatical feature found in some languages, but not in English (Thompson and Langacre, 1985: 188). In English, DD may be *token-reflexive deixis* in which the deictic expression refers to the expression or speech act in which it occurs (Levinson, 1983: 87, 63 and Verschueren, 1999: 21). It occurs, for example, when one says *this is what she sounded like* while imitating the voice of a person one is talking about. Other examples are:

**(9) This is what phoneticians call ‘creaky voice’** (the utterance itself is spoken in creaky voice).

**(11) This book will explain....** (as occurring in a book).

In English narratives, DD is essential in signaling a discourse boundary, as an ending marker of a piece of the utterance such as *that’s it* and *this is it*. In addition to narratives, the formulaic ending *that’s it*, as a coda, occurs in dialogue (Yoshida, 2011: 41).

### Section Three

#### Discourse Deixis and Anaphora

To avoid confusion, it is important to draw a distinction between DD and anaphora. Anaphora ‘concerns the use of (usually) a pronoun to refer to the same referent as some prior term’ (Levinson, 1983: 85). For example:

**(12) Harry’s a sweetheart; he is so considerate.**

Both *Harry* and *he* co-referential picking out the same referent. Anaphora can hold within sentences, across sentences and across turns of speaking in a dialogue (ibid: 90).

According to linguists and pragmatists, the difference between DD and anaphora is beyond dispute, but each one has drawn a distinction from his/her own view point. For example, Levinson (ibid) says that a pronoun is a DDE when it refers to a linguistic expression or a chunk of discourse. However, a pronoun is an anaphora when it refers to the same entity as a prior linguistic expression refers to.

Other linguists argue that DD is not a form of anaphora since its function is to relate to a prior or subsequent discourse. With DD, unlike anaphora, there is no independently existing entity waiting for its reference to be picked up by a DDE (Pewik et al, 2008: 697).

Levinson (2004: 119) says that DD refers to portions of text itself (such as *see the distinction above* or *the pewit sounds like this: pee-r-weet*), whereas anaphoric expressions refer to another entities outside discourse. The anaphoric expressions do this by connecting to a prior referring expression (anaphora) or a later one (cataphora) such as *in front of him*, *Pilate saw a beaten man*.

Cornish (2005: 2) summarizes the difference between DD and anaphora saying that DD involves the use of the speech situation to profile a new referent or a new conception of an existing referent within the discourse. Anaphora involves the retrieval from within a given ground of an already existing figure and its ground.

### Section Four

#### Discourse Deixis in the American Political Speeches (The Analysis)

The main aim of the present paper is to analyze the DD in the American political speeches (henceforth APSs), as a type of institutional talk, to find out the way this linguistic phenomenon

used in the APSs and to see whether there is a special strategy for the use of the DD in this type of text. To achieve this aim, three APSs have been downloaded randomly from the internet and analyzed carefully. Each speech is delivered by a different politician; the first is for Barak Obama, the second is for Condoleezza Rice and the third is for Paul Bremer. The analyses of these speeches can be put in the following points:

1. The APSs are loaded with DDEs. This shows how much the DD affects the clarity of the speeches and that makes their use inevitable especially when the politician intends to clarify or comment on a piece of his/her speech. This attempt of clarity is something vital in such a type of discourse which is directed to nations and the speaker needs to be careful and clear about what he/she says. Generally speaking, the politicians tend to organize their speeches into numbered or labeled points. They follow this strategy for two reasons: the first is that this strategy organizes the speech and makes it more comprehensive, and the second is that it makes it easy for them to refer to these organized points of speech whenever necessary. The three speeches analyzed follow this strategy which encourages the politicians to use DDE.

The frequency of occurrence of the DDE is 200 times in the three speeches analyzed. It has already been mentioned that DDEs can be of the type of the token-reflexive (in which the deictic expression refers to the expression or speech act in which it occurs). Of the 200 DDEs occurred, only three of them are token-reflexive ones. Two of them occurred in Obama's speech, within one sentence referring to the speech itself:

*I have carried this **message** from London to Ankara; from Port of Spain to Moscow; from Accra to Cairo; and **it** is what I will speak about today....*  
<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationspeech.htm/2009>

In the extract above, Obama has used the word *message* to refer to the speech itself which is described as a message from him to his audience. He has also used the pronoun *it* to refer to the message which, in its turn, refers to the speech itself. The third token-reflexive has occurred in Rice's speech in this way:

*In this **context**, I want to address in some detail **one of the briefing items** that we did receive, since **its content** has been frequently mischaracterized.*  
<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>

Rice has used the word *context* to refer to the speech itself. In addition to this token-reflexive, there are other two normal DDE: *one of the briefing items* and *its content*. They both refer to a forthcoming piece of the speech.

2. The majority of the DDEs are demonstratives; of the 200 DDEs found, 74 are demonstratives, i.e. 37% of the DDEs in the APSs are demonstratives. The following table shows a detailed statistics of each demonstrative expression:

Demonstrative Expression	Pronoun	Determine	Total
<i>This</i>	23	16	39
<i>That</i>	22	4	26
<i>These</i>		4	4
<i>Those</i>		5	5
<b>The Total Frequency of Occurrence</b>			<b>74</b>

Table (1): Demonstratives as DDEs in APSs

It is clear from the table above that *this* has the highest frequency of occurrence among the other demonstratives; 39 times. Then comes *that* which has the second rank of the frequency of occurrence in the demonstratives; 26 times.

The table also shows that these two demonstratives are used as pronoun substitutes more as pre-determiners preceding a noun that refer to a part of discourse. This tendency of the politicians has a significant effect on the speech and the politicians seem to be aware of that effect. The following four extracts are taken from the APSs analyzed. They contain *this* as a pronoun, *this* as a pre-determiner, *that* as a pronoun and *that* as a pre-determiner respectively:

*As we head into Copenhagen, let us resolve to focus on what each of us can do for the sake of our common future. And **this** leads me to the final pillar that must fortify our future: a global economy that advances opportunity for all people (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm>).*

*We also moved to develop a new and comprehensive strategy to try and eliminate the al-Qaida network.... **This new strategy** was developed over the spring and summer of 2001....(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>).*

*The bad news was there was no air conditioning. And when I arrived on May 12th, the temperature was already 115 degrees regularly during the day. And **that** meant that in the palace, if you were lucky, the temperature was only 100 (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).*

*As we pursue **this goal**, we will also pursue peace between Israel and Lebanon, Israel and Syria, and a broader peace between Israel and its many neighbors. In pursuit of **that goal**, we will develop regional initiatives.... (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm>).*

Comparing between the first and the second extracts, the reader immediately recognizes a sort of redundancy in the second one in which the word *strategy* has been mentioned twice. In the first time, it is mentioned as a word within a text with no problem. In the second time, it is mentioned as a head of a noun phrase pre-determined by *this*. It is that second mention which creates the redundancy. The text would have been more effective and stronger if the politician used *this* as a pronoun substitute saying: *And this leads me to the final pillar....* The same case of redundancy appears when we compare between the third and fourth extract in which the word *goal* has been mentioned twice over few lines.

The politicians have never used *these* and *those* as pronoun substitutes. Even the instances of their use as pre-determiners are few; four times for *these* and five for *those* in the three APSs analyzed. The following are examples of using *these* and *those* as pre-determiners:

*The terrorist threat to our nation did not emerge on September 11th, 2001. Long before that day, radical, freedom-hating terrorists declared war on America and on the civilized world: the attack on the Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983; the hijacking of the AchilleLauro in 1985; the rise of al-Qaida and the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993; the attacks on American installations in Saudi Arabia in 1995 and 1996; the East Africa [embassy] bombings of 1998; the attack*

on the USS Cole in 2000. **These and other atrocities** were part of a sustained, systematic campaign to spread devastation and chaos and to murder innocent Americans (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>).

*The cooperative effort of the whole world. Those words ring even more true today, when it is not simply peace, but our very health and prosperity that we hold in common*(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm>)

3. In addition to the demonstratives, politicians have used other expressions as DDEs. These expressions and their frequency of occurrence are as follows: *rather* (1); *rather than* (1); *after all* (2); *instead of* (2); *yet* (2); *first* (1); *first of all* (2); *second* (1); *third* (1); *in short* (1); *in fact* (1); *in a way* (1); *in fact* (2); *however* (1); *so* (2); *therefore* (1); *by the way* (4); and *of course* (4). They form 15% of the DDEs found in the APSs. In the APSs, these expressions have the syntactic function of conjuncts expressing the speaker's assessment of the relation between two linguistic units. Moreover, they have the pragmatic function of DD relating one piece of discourse to the other. Quirk et al (1985: 631) describes conjuncts as having "the function of conjoining independent units rather than one of contributing another facet of information to a single integrated unit." It is that function of conjoining separate linguistic units of discourse that gives them the pragmatic function of DDEs. The following three example extracts make this point clear. Each example contains an instance of conjuncts as DDEs:

*We needed to get action in three areas right away: We needed to take steps to get the economy going; we needed to begin the process of political reform; and, of course, we had to deal with the security problem* (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).

*We wanted to ensure that there was no respite in the fight against al-Qaida. On an operational level, therefore, we decided immediately to continue to pursue the Clinton Administration's covert action authorities and other efforts to fight the network* (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>).

*Third, we must recognize that in the 21st century, there will be no peace unless we take responsibility for the preservation of our planet* (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm>).

4. In the APSs, the pronouns have participated in the role of DD. Twelve instances of pronouns as DDEs have been found in the three APSs analyzed (6% of the total DDSs), but the pronouns used are only *it* (8 times) and *they* (4 times). Consider the following extracts:

*Now, let me bring it back to where I started and talk a bit about terrorism and the terrorists in Iraq*(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).

In her speech, Rice quotes three of the intelligence reports and then refers to them as follows:

- "Unbelievable news coming in weeks," said one.

- "Big event -- there will be a very, very, very, very big uproar."

- "There will be attacks in the near future."

*Troubling, yes. But **they** don't tell us when; they don't tell us where; they don't tell us who; and they don't tell us how* (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>).

In the first extract, Bremer uses the pronoun *it* to refer to the initial part of his speech which tackles the issue of terrorism. In the second extract, Rice quotes three intelligence reports then she refers to them five times using the pronoun *they*. These are the only times in which *they* is used as a DDE.

5. Other linguistic units used as DDEs are the coordinating conjunctions *and* and *but* with frequency of occurrence of 16 (5 for *and* and 11 for *but*). They form 8% of the DDEs found. Most often, they occur at the beginning of the sentence. Of the 5 instances of *and*, 3 instances have occurred initially in the sentence; of the 11 instances of *but*, 7 instances have occurred in the same previous position.

It is sometimes correct to begin a sentence with *and*, *but* or other connectors. There is no reason not to do that. This strategy helps emphasize an important point or reestablish a main idea after a long series of statements. Most often, these words make a sentence more forceful and graceful. Starting a sentence with a coordinator is neither wrong nor less formal (Carner, 2003: 42). Accordingly, APSs cannot be considered to be informal just for having few instances of *and* and *but* at the beginning of the sentences. Rather, in the APSs, *and* and *but* have strong emphasis as DDEs in their initial position in the sentence.

The following extract is taken from Bremer's speech. It contains two usages of *and*; the first is at the beginning of the sentence and the second is at the middle. Reading the extract, the difference between the emphases applied by the two instances of *and* becomes clear.

*Torture is no longer allowed. **And** the Constitution provides for a balance of power among the three branches of government, similar to ours but different, **and**, of course, confirms the independent judiciary, which I had established a year ago* (<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).

Here are two more extracts taken from Obama's speech; in the first, there is *but* at the beginning of the sentence and the second one has *but* in the middle:

*Rather, they are rooted, I believe, in a discontent with a status quo that has allowed us to be increasingly defined by our differences, and outpaced by our problems. **But** they are also rooted in hope -- the hope that real change is possible, and the hope that America will be a leader in bringing about such change* ([http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech .htm](http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm)).

*In this hall, we come from many places, **but** we share a common future* (Ibid).

6. Many other DDEs have been found, but they cannot be categorized within any of the categories discussed above. They do not belong to a particular linguistic unit. Thus, they are put under the category of miscellaneous DDEs. They have the highest frequency of occurrence among the other categories of DDEs; they have occurred 68 times (34% of the total DDEs).

The three extracts below (taken from the three APSs analyzed) contain clear examples of the miscellaneous DDEs:



Let me read you **some of the actual chatter** that was picked up in that spring and summer:

- "Unbelievable news coming in weeks," said one.
- "Big event -- there will be a very, very, very, very big uproar."
- "There will be attacks in the near future."

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/condolezzarice911statement.htm>).

In the extract above, Rice used the phrase *some of the actual chatter* to refer to three reports that she quoted from the intelligence.

*I want to try to cover both subjects. But first let me tell a story on myself.*

*I was, as Gene mentioned, Ambassador-at-large for counterterrorism -- in charge of our country's counterterrorism programs in the late 1980's....*

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).

In the extract above, Bremer used the phrase *a story on myself* to refer to a forthcoming discourse (his speech) in which he tells a story about himself.

*Today, let me put forward **four pillars** that I believe are fundamental to the future that we want for our children: non-proliferation and disarmament; the promotion of peace and security; the preservation of our planet; and a global economy that advances opportunity for all people.*

*First, we must stop the spread of nuclear weapons....*

*That brings me to the second pillar for our future....*

*Third, we must recognize that in the 21st century, there will be no....*

*And this leads me to the final pillar that must fortify our future....*

(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/barackobama/barackobamafirstunitednationsspeech.htm>).

Here, Obama has used the expression *four pillars* to refer to long discussion which takes about four pages of his speech.

7. It has already been mentioned that DD is the use of expressions to refer to parts of the discourse that contains the expression. That reference can be directed backwards or forwards, i.e. a DDE can refer to a previously mentioned or a forthcoming part of the discourse that contains the DDE.

Concerning the APSs analyzed, the majority of the DDEs (150; 75%) refer to a forthcoming part of the speech. The other DDEs (50; 25%) refer backwards to a previously mentioned part of the speech. Reading the APSs analyzed one can clearly figure out that the politicians have used the backwards references as reminders of previously mentioned parts of discourse or to give an additional brief explanation to complete the discussion. The following extract contains examples of both:

*Now, let me turn, if I can, to Iraq and answer **two questions I often get:***

*What was it like? And, how are we doing? What was it like? Well, you will have read that we worked and lived in a palace .... But it was certainly not easy living.*

*We had, when I arrived, no electricity, no running water, no telephones. On the plus side of having no electricity, we had no communications from Washington for some time -- **which is the good news.** The bad news was there was no air conditioning.*

*And when I arrived on May 12th, the temperature was already 115 degrees...(<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/paulbremertdwaterhouse.htm>).*

The two expressions *two questions I often get* and *the bad news* refer to forthcoming parts of the speech within the same extract. The expression *which is the good news* refers backwards to a previously mentioned part of the speech within the same extract also.

### Conclusions

After careful analysis, the following conclusions have been arrived to:

1. It has appeared that the APSs are loaded with DDEs. This cannot be accidental; there is a purpose behind this which can only be achieved through the use of DDEs. The obvious reason is that the political speeches are directed towards nations and their delivery is somehow a historical incident. Therefore, the politicians are careful about their speeches. In many occasions in their speeches, the politicians try to refer or attract the attention of their audience to what they intend to speak about or what they have already said. They do that by referring to certain pieces of the preceding or following parts of their speeches in order to remind the audience of these parts or to clarify them.
2. Concerning the token-reflexive type of DD, the politicians have used it to refer their speeches without mentioning the word *speech* itself. Instead, they used other vocabulary; namely *message, it* (referring to *message*) and *context*. This strategy is related to the concept of euphemism as an attempt of indirectness which is a communicative strategy by means of which the politicians avoid being outspoken and attempt to hold a correspondence between their talk and face considerations.
3. We all know that *this* is used to close singular and uncountable objects and *that* is used to refer to faraway singular and uncountable objects. Reading the APSs carefully, it has been found that the politicians are, somehow, unconscious of the matter of closeness and farness issues of *this* and *that* respectively. These two demonstratives have been used in the same way without clear difference. However, the politicians are committed to use these two demonstratives to refer to singular parts of their speech.  
The politicians, like any other orators, seek to avoid redundancy by its entire means to get full attention of their audience. It is this goal which makes them prefer to use the DDEs as demonstratives in the form of pronoun substitutes more than as pre-determiners for words which have already been mentioned before.  
The politicians have used the plural demonstratives *these* and *those* as pre-determiners only and for very few times. Using *these* and *those* as pronoun substitute in a political speech with so many issues is a risky process since it may very easily confuse the audience of the correct referents. It seems that the politicians seem to talk about one thing at a time and they rarely refer to more than one part of their speech at a time.
4. In the APSs analyzed, there have been 30 instances of conjuncts which play a vital role as DDEs. They contribute to the organization and clarity of the text in such a way that they help the speaker a lot in arranging and relating the issues he/she wants to communicate to the audience.
5. The only pronouns which are used as DDEs are *it* and *they*. This is quite logical; the pronoun which is used as a DDE is supposed to refer to part (or parts) of discourse. In this case, *it* and *they* are the only suitable pronouns. The use of any other pronoun (like: *he, him, she, her, you, etc.*) would have seemed rather awkward except in the case of personification which is usually not conceivable in such political texts since it might confuse the audience.
6. The category of the miscellaneous DDEs has the highest frequency of occurrence among the other categories. The APSs analyzed are rather long parts of discourse performed by their speakers at one go. When the politician makes a reference to any part of the speech, that part

is usually remote or is formed from many sentences. Accordingly, the politicians tend to give that part a particular title that perfectly suits its content. To make that title (reference) clear and suitable, the politician frees himself/herself from the typical linguistic units used for this purpose and tries to use miscellaneous expressions to make himself/herself clear. That is the logical explanation why we find many miscellaneous DDEs in APSs.

7. In the APSs analyzed. The majority of the DDEs refer to a forthcoming part of the speech. The other DDEs refer backwards to a previously mentioned part of the speech. This leads us to the fact that the politicians tend to prepare their audience to what they intend to discuss in their speech. They name the parts of their speech before they start discussing them. This way they give their audience a clear introduction about the issues they tend to present. Psychologically speaking, this has a better effect on the ability of the comprehension of the audience.

### Bibliography

- Brassell, E. (2000) *Demonstrative Anaphora: Forms and Functions in Full-Text Scientific Articles*. California: University of North Carolina.
- Cornish, F. (2005) *Prosody, Discourse Deixis and Anaphora*. The International Conference "IDP05. Discourse-Prosody Interface" at l'Universite de Provence.
- Diessel, H. (2012) "Deixis and Demonstratives" In Maienborn, C.; Leusinger, K. and Portner, P. (eds.) *Semantics*, vol. III, Berlin: Huberts Co. Gmbh and Co.KG, Göttingen, pp.2413-2425.
- Garner, B. A. (2003) 'On beginning a Sentence with But' In *Michigan Bar Journal*, October, pp. 43-44.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ~~(2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicatures*. Cambridge: MIT Press.~~
- ~~(2004) 'Deixis and Pragmatics' In Horn, L. and Ward, G. (eds.) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.97-121.~~
- Mey, J. L. (2001) *pragmatics: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Piwek, P.; Beun, R. J. and Cremer, A. (2008) 'Proximal and Distal in Language and Cognition: Evidence from Deictic Demonstratives in Dutch' *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40, pp. 694-718.
- Quirk, R. ;Greenbaum, S. ; Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.
- Thompson, S. A. and Longrace, R. E. (1985) 'Adverbial Clauses' In Shopen, T. (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Complex Constructions*. Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 171-234.
- Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Yoshida, E. (2011) *Referring Expressions in English and Japanese*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deixis/2012>

<http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/wariniraq/2012>

<http://www.indiana.edu/hallaba/GardRes/Element-of-Style-in-Science-pdf/2012>

<http://www.urop.uci.edu/journal.htm/2012>