

On Stylistic Relevance of the Choice of Anaphoric Expressions

František Daněš

The author examines certain aspects of anaphoric chains, called by him "coreferential naming chains" (CNCs); they are constituted by an initial naming unit (INU), introducing a given discourse subject (DS), and a number of coreferential naming units (CNU) of different grammatical forms, structures, syntactic functions and intensional meanings. The discussion concentrates first on the different ways and manners in which particular naming units (NUs) characterizing the DS in different ways, are conditional on co-text and context and, the other way round, how they contribute to the building up (development) of the text. The second aspect of the inquiry is the stylistic (rhetorical) relevance of the options of different NUs. In his approach the author endeavours to keep apart three accesses to the text: from the viewpoints of the producer, of the receptor, and of the linguistic analyst. — The discussion is based on the texts of modern English and German literary prose, and presents concrete analyses and interpretations of several samples of such writings. The last section examines, in detail, one special variety of CNCs with a personal DS, called by the present author "austere chains", with several subvarieties, and offers analyses of some works by E. Hemingway, F. Kafka and W.G. Hardy, as well as of some fragments from several other writers.

1. Introduction. Coreferential naming chains.

Our point of departure may well be the following statement by Murphy (1988: 317):

"Many objects have an indefinitely large number of possible labels that people may use in referring to them. One object might be called *a thing, an artifact, a piece of furniture, a chair, or a rocking chair*. [...] Exactly the same issues arise in referring to people. One man might be referred to as *Fred Jones, Mr. Jones, Fred, Uncle Fred, the man wearing the green sweater, the bastard, the insurance agent*, and so on."

The said possibility will, of course, be employed in text construction: the diverse "labels" — I would say rather "names"¹ or "naming units (NU)" —

¹ Cf., e.g., Padučeva (1970) or Viehweger (1972 - *Nomination, nominative Kötter*). In this usage, however, the term *name* covers also expressions of pronominal character (cf. Padučeva: 226).

mutually substituted, namely in the cases of coreference. Harweg (1988: 31f.) speaks of "syntagmatic substitution", which "normally consists in the coreferential 'resumption' [of a given discourse referent - F.D.] or syntagmatic replacement of a certain expression by one or more than one other expression" in a text. This substitution procedure proceeds in two directions, the anaphoric and the cataphoric ones. Consequently, very often the phenomenon of coreferential resumption (germ. *Wiederaufnahme*) by means of the syntagmatic replacement of names will be called *anaphora* (and *cataphora*).²

In texts, a given discourse referent or discourse subject (DS)³ may be coreferentially resumed once or several (many) times, so that pairs or chains (strings) of coreferential naming units occur; I shall call them *coreferential naming chains* (CNC). (Cf. Viehweger's (1977, 1978) *nominative Ketten* and Agricola's (1979) *Isotopieketten*.)

A special position occupies that NU by which a DS will be introduced into the discourse. In respect to subsequent coreferential NUs (renominations) this initial or introductory unit (INU) appears as "substituendum". Particular NUs differ in their grammatical character as well in their semantic category and content. In terms of such properties the pairs of NUs in substitution relation can be classified. (Cf., e.g., Harweg 1968, 1988; Daneš 1983. Both authors take into account also pairs based on the relation of semantic contiguity, but such non-coreferential relations I would rather call "semantic affinity nets" in a text.)

Nevertheless, very often the interest of the analysts is restricted to substitution pairs only, or if they consider the whole naming chains (cf., e.g., Palek 1968), they take them out of the text and context, without due regard to the concrete ways and manners in which the particular coreferential expressions are conditional on co-text and context, and, the other way round, in which they contribute to the building up (development) of the text.

My article will be devoted just to the discussion of this co- and contextual aspect of CNCs, along with the stylistic (rhetorical) relevance of the choice of different NUs. If we conceive of style, in Praguian tradition, as concerning ways and manners in which linguistic means of expression are being selected and organized (arranged) into singular structural wholes, then the trivial fact that the same thing can be said in more than one way, or, more specifically, that one and the same DS can be named and referred to by means of an immense number of different NUs, necessarily bears upon the stylistic aspect of the make-up of texts. - For practical reasons the present discussion will concen-

² Padučeva (1970, 226): "The relation between the names of a given text that have identical denotata may be called *anaphoric relation*". This label was transferred from poetics and adapted. Its deficiency consists in the fact that it often covers the phenomenon of cataphora (a relatively new coinage) as well. The usage is not quite unified and consequent; e.g. de Beaugrande (1980: 133) speaks about "anaphora" in cases of pronominal resumption only.

³ DS is treated by me very broadly, as that entity of any kind, not only "objects", but other "facts" as well) which the producer has just in mind when using this or that NU and which he wants to bring to the receptor's mind.

trate mainly on a specific class of DS's - persons, and on one type of texts - modern literary prose.

2. Naming, communicating, referring. Types of CNS.

2.1. In order to comprehend well the functioning of NUs in text, it is necessary to recall that utterances (as minimal communicative units, messages, and as basic text components) contain two functional layers, corresponding to two utterance-making procedures, that of naming and that of conveying a message, of communicating. The text producer names (mentions) particular DS's in order to tell something concerning their qualities, states, changes, relations, something about their behaviour, actions, activities, or about the processes or events in which they are involved.⁴

What is the position of referring in this scheme? It appears necessary to treat referring as a human action, performed with linguistic expressions (bilateral signs) by the producer and the receptor as well (cf. de Beaugrande 1980: 61, and Conte 1986: 1)⁵ and it can only be accomplished via propositions (i.e., cognitive content configurations underlying particular utterances/messages); cf. Searle (1971: 14), Conte (1988: 25). Moreover, looking at reference from the text-comprehender's angle, it is hardly to disagree with de Beaugrande (1980: 66) that "referring is in fact accomplished via the entire text-world model".

A persuasive example offers the text of a detective novel in which two different personages are acting, but at last (in the final chapter, paragraph, or sentence) it would appear that the two characters (say, an apparently good-hearted olderly gentleman and the evident murderer) are, in fact, one and the same person.

The crucial point with naming and referring is that the objects of the world (as well as their fictitious images) do not exist without properties (except for the hero of a Musil's novel) and the other way round (it may be that this distinction represents "transference to the world-structure of the structure of sentences" - cf. Russell, 1946: 225 - reflecting the naive world view). The human differentiation, categorization, classification of experience into resem-

⁴ I am speaking here about functional "layers", not about sentence "parts", since the predicative part of a sentence may contain (and often contains) nominal referential positions. - If, in the present discussion, I concentrate on noun phrases as referential expressions only, it does not mean that I deny the possibility of other syntactic categories to be used for reference as well.

⁵ Conte's definition of reference reads as follows: "ein Akt, den ein Sprecher vollzieht, um mit einem sprachlichen Ausdruck auf einen Gegenstand zu verweisen und um den Hörer zu instruieren, diesen Gegenstand zu identifizieren (bzw. re-identifizieren)". I find very important that even the comprehender's act of identification has to be subsumed under "reference" in linguistic sense. Nevertheless, the act of referential identification of DS's may sometimes be connected with problems and uncertainties: even if language users will altogether agree on the (intensional) meanings of a particular language sign (but they need not), the application of this notional content to pieces of reality, i.e., the referential identification via meaning, need not be unambiguous or undisputed in all cases, even in cases of the definite and explicit texts of legal documents (cf. Daneš, in print).

blance classes find their reflection in the systems of naming units of the vocabularies of natural languages, so that the intensional meaning of any common noun (noun phrase) represents a structure of features reflecting the properties of objects or facts (this fact is revealed in an especially distinct way in the "motivated" or "descriptive" words, i.e. derived or compounded; but it holds good, to be sure, even with "words-labels"). Consequently, any NU used in an act of reference will inevitably be connected with mentioning the given set of properties of the DS. In this way the DS will be characterized (or specified). Padučeva (1970:226) truly maintains that "naming of objects usually is not separated from stating their properties".⁶

The hierarchical notional structuring of vocabularies along with the immense possibilities of modifying simple (head) nouns by means of attributives of different grammatical forms and structures (adjectives, prepositional noun phrases, dependent relative clauses or blocks of clauses, etc.) and of different semantic categories, all this offers a rather broad diapason of choices to connect the mere reference to a DS with the mentioning of differently rich sets of its various properties. The major types of syntactic attributives may be found in the following fragment of H. Miller's text (5):

"Everything Kerouac writes about – those weird, hauntingly ubiquitous characters whose names may be read backwards or upside down, those lovely, nostalgic, intimate-grandiose stereopticon *views* of America, those nightmarish, ventilated *joy-riders* in gondolas and hot-rods (...)"

The fragment contains – besides the cataphoric introductory pronoun *everything* – three coordinated appositive NUs (referring to three different DS's). The head nouns of the NUs are underlined here; they can be considered names of direct (first rank) reference and correspond to the syntactic objects of the predicate *writes about*. The attributives (modifiers) to those head nouns contain, recursively, also nouns (or noun phrases) in referring positions (cf. *names, America, gondolas, hot-rods*); this time we have to do with indirect references of different ranks. The reference ranks correspond to the hierarchies of the syntactic structure; the direct (basic) reference goes with nouns occupying the syntactic positions of the arguments (participants) to the predicate.

One of the most common types of reference hierarchy are the possessive attributives. Thus the phrase "The house of his brother's wife" may be differentially resumed as a whole in a subsequent text sentence by means of

⁶ Padučeva maintains that even proper names serve not only to refer to an object, but also to point to some constant property of that object; e.g. *John* means 'a person who responds to a call *John!*'. In fact, however, a proper name often reveals more characteristics of its potential referent; thus *John* points to the fact that its referent will be a male person, very probably belonging to an English speaking community; or the name *Réké* very probably would refer to a he-dog of a Czech master. Further, Padučeva's claim that as the only kind of name that can be regarded as a true "deep name" of an object, including no properties of it, may be considered pronouns, appears to me not fully justified; it may, perhaps, hold for such cases as "Was is your wife?" – "No! It was my sister", but certainly not, e.g., for the English pronouns *he, she*, bearing information about the sex of a person.

the pronoun *it*, in which the three indirect references (cf. *his, brother's, wife*) are not expressed; the reference is only implicit (cf. Conte 1988: 26f.). On the other hand, it is possible (with certain restrictions) to pick up a singular DS referred to indirectly and resume it separately; cf. "Einstein's theory of relativity was designed to explain the motion of light in space. [...] He found that [...]".

As a very special, though not rare, kind of attributives may be regarded appositions (of noun phrases); appositive constructions are groups of two or more different denominations (NUs) of one DS, i.e., they are intrasentential coreferential naming chains within the limits of one (doubled or multiplied) nominal sentence constituent (subject, object, etc.). The semantic relation of the apposed NU to the first (basic) one ranges from a simple specification or evaluation to summation, particularization (illustration), and explication. E.g.: "He had met *Olga, a bright girl of fifteen, the daughter of a man of property*". "His death, an evident political murder, disquieted the whole public" (the apposed NU gives the reason for the predicated reaction of the public). The following fragment from F. Kafka's "Urteil" (p. 10) shows a rather expanded and complicated characterizing NU of a DS, with an apposition containing two coordinated relative attributive clauses:

"Ich habe mich mit einem Fräulein Frieda Brandenfeld verlobt, einem Mädchen aus einer wohlhabenden Familie, die sich hier erst lang nach Deiner Abreise angesiedelt hat, die Du also kaum können dürftest." There are also detached, disconnect attributives and appositions; e.g.: "High above the town stood a castle. Old, unrepaired, nearly in ruins". – "Zehntausende rotten sich zusammen. Alle die bedrohten Eigentümer. Der Mob der Strasse. Das immer plünderungsfrohe Gesindel." (S. Zweig, 44-reformulated.)

The detached (separated) and/or successive, appositive characterization of a DS makes the particular characteristics more distinct. They become foregrounded and the appositive construction reveals a semi-predicative character (see further below).

2.2. Naming is, to be sure, not the only – and in certain respect not the primary – way how to introduce the characteristics of DS's into the utterance. The other way is the introduction via predication. The basic relation between these two modes can be revealed by the following sequence of sentences (adopted from Mathesius):

- (1) He presented her with two roses.
- (2) One of the roses was red, the other white.
- (3) The red rose was fully unfolded, the white one a bud only.

In sentence (2), the two characteristics of the two DS's 'roses', introduced in (1), are stated via predication and in the subsequent sentence (3) they are incorporated into the NUs resuming the DS's. This shifting (transferring) the expression of a characteristic from the predication to a subsequent nomination represents one of the basic procedures in text construction. On the level of the

sentence-constituents structure it may be described as the attributivization of a preceding predication; grammatical (syntactic) means employed are nominalizing transformations of different kinds, an attributive can be viewed as a "degraded" predication (H. Paul) or a "latent" one.

A special kind of attributivization is represented by attributive relative clauses; the procedure of attributivization is realized by means of sentence relativization: the actual utterance function of a sentence will be suspended and the sentence degraded to a mere predicative structure used as a clause name of the underlying proposition in the position of an attributive to a noun (phrase).

There are also "semi-predicative" constructions, standing somewhere inbetween the two poles. Such constructions are located in different distances from the poles; nearer to the attributive pole are appositions (in grammars of English often treated as "verbless clauses"), positions nearer to the predication pole occupy some "non-finite" clauses, e.g. the participial ones in English (cf. "*Soundly defeated for re-election in 1854, and grieved by the death of his beloved wife, Bento was not yet ready to submit.*" - Kennedy, 87).

From the stylistic viewpoint it appears important that the different types of characterizing a DS have evidently bearing upon certain stylistic properties (values) of texts. I have in mind properties such as would often be associated with polar (though necessarily somewhat impressionistic) distinctions of "foregrounded - backgrounded"; "high - low (in a hierarchy)"; "condensed (compressed, concise) - diffuse (prolix)"; "close - loose"; "static - dynamic"; etc. They may be related to different aspects of text structure. - Other phenomena, e.g., types of attributives and appositions, are relevant to different text types, to different ways of subject-matter presentation, etc.

The above example with two roses is, of course, a rather elementary one, in which the immediately preceding predication is of the simple quantification type, with simple characteristics, expressed in both positions by means of identical simple adjectives. A somewhat complicated example: In Carroll's "Alice" we read about "a footman in a livery", whom "she would call *fish*"; and about "another footman in a livery [...] like a *frog*" (78). And on the next occasion they are called "Fish-Footman" and "Frog-Footman" (79f.). A less transparent example is found in the following (abridged) text fragment from P. de Kruif: "[...] one of their dogs inoculated with the surely fatal stuff from a rabid rabbit's brain came down." The complex characteristics "inoculated ..." represents a kind of summarization of or derivation from informations contained (may be in a scattered way, mostly in predication components) in the preceding context. (Cf. a detailed discussion of such phenomena in section 3 below.)

2.3. In conclusion I would try to formulate strategies concerning the characterization of DS's, as they follow from our above considerations: In building up a text, its producer has to decide, *inter alia*, (1) which of the immense set of thinkable properties of a DS (be they inherent, relational, or evaluative) he will adduce at all (and which, in turn, he will leave to readers'

inference procedures), (2) in what sequential order and at what places in the text he will mention this or that property - with other words, how he will construct CNCs of particular DS's: especially important is the decision concerning INUs; (3) what forms of expression of NUs he will choose; (4) last but not least, he has to decide which of the characteristics will be assessed via predication, and which, in turn, mentioned via naming (without having been predicated first).

3. The involvement of CNUs in co-text and its stylistic values.

3.1. To begin with, let us analyse a CNC extracted from a passage/episode in U. Sinclair's novel "The Spy" (191-194). In the episode (taking place in New York during the First War) the young hero Peter makes an occasional acquaintance with a girl, but when she discovers, during a promenade, that he has a "red" friend, disgusted and with indignation she hurries from him away. Now, the CNS of DS 'girl' is the following one:

a neat little girl going into a picture show (INU) - her - (they) - she - she
- his manicurist - Miss Frisbie - Miss Frisbie - his lady - (they, their)
- his lady-love - the girl - the girl - the little manicurist - Miss Frisbie - Miss Frisbie - she - she - her

Generally speaking, authors may use different options in choosing particular NUs, ranging from a 3rd person pronoun (e.g. *she* discloses the following characterizing features only, 'one female person') or a proper name to very richly characterizing NUs - cf. the following one:

"Man vergegenwärtige sich einen Brünetten am Anfang der Dreissiger und von stattlichen Statur, dessen Haar an den Schläfen schon merklich zu ergrauen beginnt, dessen rundes, weisses, ein wenig gedunsenes Gesicht aber nicht die Spur irgendeines Bartwuchses zeigt" (Th. Mann, quoted from Harweg 1988: 47).

In the choices at least the following several factors might be operative: (1) The relevance of particular characteristics to the contents of the subsequent and preceding co-text; (2) The distribution of relevant characteristics according to the author's text plan and stylistic pattern; (3) The artistic literary bias of the author's personality and/or the stylistic dominant of the given text whole (literary work), conditioned also by the text type, by the style of the literary period, etc.

In the above sample by Sinclair, the INU mentions several inherent characteristics and a situational one, and is relatively moderate, not an abundant one. The evaluative adjective *neat* (from the set of several other neatly-synonyms, as *beautiful, handsome, nice, pretty*) implying cleanness, orderliness, simplicity, purity, appears in accord with the girl's future behaviour and her ultimate reaction; the same holds with the characteristic *little* (young, unexperienced).

The first occurrence of NU *manicurist* does not, in fact, bring a new information about the DS to the reader - as it could appear when examining

the extracted CNC out of context; this had been prepared in the preceding co-text by the preceding explicit predication "she worked in a manicure parlor".⁷ As a co-text-given characteristic also appears NU *his friend* (she became his friend in the course of the episode). NU *Miss Frisbie* (proper name + "title"!); in turn, brings into the text a new, unknown characteristic; its introduction is clearly prompted by the co-text, in which the young pair had proudly been making their promenade in Park Avenue on Eastern Sunday, studying, in their best clothes, "the customs and make-up of the ladies": The third occurrence of *Miss Frisbie* accentuates, again, the "miss-like", detached, and high behaviour of the girl after the accident. As for NU *his lady*, its motivation is the same as with the first occurrence of *Miss Frisbie*. But NU *his lady-love*, appearing in the description of the accident in the context "... without introducing his lady-love, [he] took her by the arm and hurried away", has an ironical connotation prompted by contrast. A similar connotation has NU *the little manicurist* (when she "stamped her foot with impatient anger" and "her eyes flashed with indignation"). – Among all NUs of the given CNC, *the girl* appears as "least text dependent and characterizing", most "neutral" – with the exception of the pronoun *she/her*.

3.2. The above discussion prompts us to a schematic survey of different CNUs in respect to their position in text structure (cf. also Viehweger 1977). In general, they may primarily be conditioned by co-text, or co-operate in text development.

3.2.1. The basic distinction is that between (1) text/situation-independent and (2) text/situation-contingent CNUs.

(1) The independent CNUs can be treated in relation to the INU; or to another preceding CNU; they belong to two essentially different classes: (a) The coreferentiality of these CNUs is based on the semantic system of vocabulary or/and on other systems of knowledge (there is no objectively stable, generally valid, dividing line between the two or between particular knowledge "modules", however). If a succession INU - CNU (or CNUⁿ - CNUⁿ⁺¹) in a text is based on the general relation "genus pro specie" (or, "genus pro individuo"), then CNU does not bring forth new characteristics of the

⁷ When formulating our findings about text structure/processing, we may approach it from three different points of view: 1. from the producer's angle (here the notions of the author's motivations, intentions, etc. find their place); from the receptor's angle (if we state possible effects of text phenomena on receptor's comprehension and interpretation); from the linguistic analyst's angle, i.e., from the viewpoint of a specially erudite receptor, comprehender, and interpreter, who primarily takes into account the relatively objective data of the text structure and the broad and differentiated knowledge resources and skills of the set of possible receptors (a rather vague assumption, though – cf. Daneš in print) and who tries then to ascertain a wide range of different possible partial and global comprehenders' interpretations and to ascribe to them, as far as possible, different degrees of likelihood.

For evident reasons one has to prefer the third approach (after all, in a certain measure present in the other two, to be sure). Nevertheless, at certain occasions, formulations of the other two kinds will not be avoided, in our discussion, too. (Cf. also note 10.)

given DS; if, in turn, the relation is that of "species pro genere" (or "individuum pro genere"), then CNU, with an obligatory identifier, is highly informative and text developing.⁸

A special class is represented by figurative (mostly metaphorical) NUs. Both with figurative and non-figurative NUs, the members of a coreferential pair show a common semantic (notional) core. With figurative NUs this core appears as a *tertium comparationis*, that is posed as a "riddle" to the interpreter. Nevertheless, in view of the fact of a virtual "referential pansynonymy", stated by Karcevskij (1929) under the label of the "asymetric dualism" of the linguistic sign,⁹ the task of finding out the *tertium comparationis* is, in fact, restricted not to the figurative use only (or the "figurative use" should be conceived of much more broadly and indeterminately than it currently will be).

(b) The coreferentiality of CNU is not based on the vocabulary and/or on some conceptual system, neither it is derivable/predictable/recoverable from preceding co-text. Such CNUs naturally bring forth new characteristics of the respective DS and contribute to text development (cf., e.g., a CNU revealing the proper name of the DS).

(2) Text/situation-contingent CNUs are of two major kinds:

(a) By means of a CNU the informative content (a part of it) of the preceding co-text (or of its section) either will be summed up or/and appreciated, or it will be specified, explained or particularized (itemized). With such CNUs certain increase of information is often associated. – As for anaphoric pronominalization or for the repetition of the same NU and for its lexical synonym proper, we could say that they retain the development of the naming line in suspension.

(b) The characteristics expressed by a CNU are prompted by the informative content of the preceding co-text (and/or by the situation) and are inferred from it. The degree of the "newness" of such characteristics vary owing to the subjective differences in world knowledge and inference processes.

Thus if a historical person – say Napoleon Bonaparte – is introduced as DS by means of his proper name, then, from an "abstract" viewpoint of the overall

⁸ These cases are relatively rare and their existence is doubted by some linguistics. Nevertheless, they do normally exist and may be based on the psychological phenomenon that mentioning of a generic term activates, in the receptor's memory, corresponding set of species and their instances. Of course, such a semantic link is evidently relatively weak and vague and is restricted to cases where the relationship between the hyper-item and the hypo-item/s belongs to the currently activated part of knowledge; the hyper-item mostly implies, in such cases, a few co-hypo-items only. From the textual point of view, between the occurrences of a hyper-NU and of a hypo-NU there exists a "naming jump", a missing predicative link. E.g. in: "Last spring I got a bodily injury. This fracture of my left arm viewed me for a long time", there is a semantic gap between "bodily injury" and "the fracture of my left arm", the missing predicative link being "I broke my left arm".

⁹ Karcevskij claims that any linguistic sign represents, in principle, a point of intersection of two series: the synonymic and the homonymic ones. Items of the first series represent values of a similar (analogical) character, expressed by means of different signs. The items are meant as different variants of an identical fact. (The second series, the "panhomonymic" one, is based on associative transpositions).

historical knowledge, any known characteristic of this DS might be "theoretically" inferrable, not "new". But such an abstract general way of reasoning does not do justice to the concrete conditions of text processing. Since the characteristics of a (historical) person are, in fact, indefinitely numerous, the selection of one or several of them by the text producer appears, to a high degree at least, incalculable and, consequently, associated with a relatively high degree of "newness" (unexpectedness) to the readers. The relatively great differences concerning the knowledge of historical facts between individuals do not allow for generally valid conclusions concerning text comprehension.

3.2.2. Along with the semantic (cognitive) aspect of the content of NUs, another aspect (or a bundle of affined aspects) is operative, namely pragmatic values of evaluation, emotion, attitudes. In W. Styron's "Sophie's choice" (215) the narrator quotes from his diary:

"Leslie re-creates for me the dark odyssey of her psychoanalysis. And of course of her family. Her *horrible* family. Her family *which is a vast work gallery of monsters*. The *ruthless and ambitious father whose religion is molded plastics and who* [...]. The *creepy* younger sister and the *stupid* older brother. Above all, the *ogreish* mother *who has dominated* Leslie's life with bitchery and [...]. All this Leslie pours out to me in a terrible rusk."

Pragmatically imbued characteristics will be of a more or less subjective character and have an originator/experienter/attitude bearer. They represent a "point of view" from which a DS, an action, event and other "facts" are looked at, experienced. (Cf. Conte 1988; she makes use of the happy label "empathy", initially borrowed by Kuno 1975 from Uspensky 1973.) Even though the producer's view-point appears as typical and basic for the text, there are texts (text types) with relatively rich and complicated "empathic structure", with a number of "empathic shifts". This is especially the case of narratives (spoken as well as written), with their intricate structuring.

In section 4 several examples will be adduced showing how the choice of a certain CNU may be just contingent on an empathic shift. (Cf. also the fragment from Sinclair's "The Spy" above.) But now I shall try to show, how even the option of an apparently most "unemotional, sober" CNU may be conditioned by an emotional attitude. The following text fragment is from I. Murdoch's novel "The Sea, the Sea", written in the 1st person sg. ("Ich-Form"). The attitude bearer is here the narrator (fictitiously identical with the author of the novel).

"I became obsessed with the idea of carrying a chair and table out of the tower and [1] I set off across the rocks with the little folding table which I had moved from the middle room to the drawing room. [2] This object soon began to seem absurdly heavy, and I found to my annoyance that the smooth steep faces of the rocks were too difficult to climb [3] while I was holding the table in one hand. [4] Eventually I let the thing fall into a crevasse."

Outside the text, the individual NUs can be neatly ordered according to the degree of their semantic (conceptual) generality: *the little folding table which*

... - *the table - this object - the thing*. Interestingly enough, such an order roughly corresponds with a pragmatic, empathic ordering of entities on the dimension of "proximity (intimacy)" - "distance".

Now, how to explain the actual sequencing of this set of NUs in the given text fragment? Their sequence corresponds neither to Lakoff's (1968) assumption of a sequel (1) proper name, (2) specific description, (3) a general class name, (4) pronoun, nor to a reverse one (creating a "knowledge deficit") mentioned by de Beaugrande (1980: 146). In fact, the most informative NU, with a number of inherent characteristics and a situational one, occurs in sentence 1/ as INU (what is often the case; but I would never claim, as some scholars do, that an INU can represent a "full, complete" characterization of a given DS: there is no such thing). NU *this object* in (2), of a very "distant" character, goes with the narrator's assertion that the table is very heavy, and with his annoyance at the impossibility to manipulate it.¹⁰ The use of the basic (neutral) term of the given lexical hierarchy, *the table*, in (3) is in accord with the factual, objective character of the message in the subordinate clause. In (4), representing the culmination and catastrophe of the episode, the most distant and somewhat contemptuous, in the given content, NU *the thing* occurs (in colloquial usage it is used to denote "something mentioned but unnamed, as in contempt" - Webster's Dictionary).

4. One specific variety of CNCs: the "austere" chains of modern literary prose.

4.1. This section of the present contribution will deal with one kind of CNCs with a personal DS typical of modern literary prose. This variety can be characterized, somewhat metaphorically, as "austere" or "bare". The austerity of these chains concerns two aspects. First, the set of different NUs (taken as types) constituting such a chain (be it long as it may) is extremely small and slightly differentiated; in some cases it may consist of one item only, continually repeated (with the possibility of pronominalization, of course).

Second, NUs of austere chains are of a very general, highly categorial meaning (they mention very restricted sets of categorial characteristics) and their contribution to the characterization (specification) of the DS is very poor.

4.2. There are several subvarieties of austere chains: I shall adduce and illustrate here several of them.

¹⁰ I have just tried to formulate my findings by employing the relatively objective, "neutral" approach. Of course, we could also say that the text producer chose this NU in order to underline the (fictitious) narrator's annoyance, his attitude to the table - only who really knows producer's intentions or motives (often the producer himself is ignorant of them)? Or we could say that the receptor learns about the narrator's negative attitude to the table from the given NU - but in fact anything linguists can know with certainty is that the text itself prompts a general possibility of such a comprehension (perhaps beside other possibilities) to potential readers, nothing more.

4.2.1. Subvariety (I) may be illustrated by Hemingway's famous story "The Old Man and the Sea". Apart from the more or less regular pronominalization (*he, him, his*), occurring also as the initial, opening word of the whole narrative (a relatively frequent phenomenon of narrative techniques), the hero of the story is referred to by means of the only NU *the old man* (without initial capital letters, that is in the function of a common noun phrase, not of a proper name), even occurring in the title. The only exception is his proper name *Santiago el Campeón*. Once it is mentioned in the reminiscences about the bygone days when the old man "was not an old man then but was Santiago El Campeón", i.e. not an anonymous veteran; for the second time the name *Santiago* occurs in the boy's direct speech to the proprietor. Thus both occurrences of the proper name are co-textually motivated. – As for the second personage, *the boy*, his proper name never occurs. And let us say that even the third main "personage", *the (great) fish*, is referred to with its generic name only, without attributives, with the exception of the quite simple and matter-of-fact adjective *great* (also the old man addresses it with this NU).

Generally we might characterize subvariety (I) of austere CNCs by stating that NUs used in them represent such denominations the meaning of which corresponds to the relatively most general degree in the given conceptual hierarchy. The qualification "relatively" is necessary here and concerns the fact that such a NU contains in its meaning those semantic features only, but all of them, that in the given text appear to be necessary and sufficient characteristics of the DS for all different contexts in which the NU occurs there. Consequently, we often find in such CNCs bare nouns only, without attributives or with attributives of a basic semantic character (such matter-of-fact adjectives as *old, young, great*...). (Let us add that on the surface the situation may look differently in different languages; cf. "The old man and the sea", but Russ. "Старик и море"). To be sure, there are scarcely strict objective criteria of the necessity and sufficiency of characteristics. But let us remember that the subjective component in belletristic literature is inevitable and essential.

4.2.2. Subvariety (II) I shall illustrate by two of F. Kafka's *Erzählungen*. In the first story, a relatively longer one, "In der Strafkolonie", the following main personal DS's (personages) are referred to: *der Offizier, der (Forschungs)reisende, der Verurteilte, der Soldat, der (frühere) Kommandant, der (neue) Kommandant*. With several exceptions, which I shall comment on below, the DS's are referred to only by means of these NUs throughout the whole text. We could characterize the labels of this kind as "status/role names", by means of which DS's are presented as "individualized types/roles". This concurs with the fact that these NUs occur with definite article even in opening, initial position of the whole story (the second effect of the use of the definite article here is the in-medias-res commencing).

Interestingly enough, in the second Kafka's narrative, "Vor dem Gesetz", the INU with which its two personages are introduced, occur with indefinite

article: *ein Türhüter, ein Mann (vom Lande)*. This fact bears on the style of the narrative, more or less resembling that of folk tales and, at the same time, the personages are conceived of as individuals solely characterized (identified) by their roles. *Der Türhüter* is a social role in full sense and the actual performance of this function by the personage throughout the whole narrative represents one of the two conflicting actions on which the plot of the tale is based – the other, complementary action being the patient waiting of *der Mann (vom Lande)* till he is admitted to *das Gesetz* (a third, somewhat mythical, DS). The variation of NUs is here minimal: the full NU *ein/der Mann vom Lande* occurs only twice: as INU and then in the following context: "Solche Schwierigkeiten hat der Mann vom Lande nicht erwartet; das Gesetz soll doch jedem und immer zugänglich sein, denkt er [...]", where the typically naive assumptions of a countryman are showed (let us remember that even in the first story, the behavior, actions, and activities of the personages follow from their statuses/roles and do not go beyond their standard framework).

Let us now return to the above mentioned exceptional variant of NUs in the first Kafka's story. They are really not many and for the most part not striking, though interesting. The full denomination *der Forschungsreisende* occurs as INU only (INUs are often more informative, as mentioned above); its CNU *der grosse Forscher* occurs twice, in "Offizier's" direct speech, exaggerating in this way the significance of this personage; the variant *der fremde Reisende* appears also twice, in the context of the speculations of the pardoned convict, fully uninformed of the situation (a case of empathy).

CNUs *der/dieser/unser Mann* with which "der Offizier" refers to the DS "der Verurteilte" again reflect the unpersonal approach an officer may have to a (convicted) soldier. In all these examples, the attributives (simple adjectives to the point) and/or very highly generic nouns reflect the specific personal attitudes of the given DS's.

There is only one place in the entire text where DS is characterized with a rather expanded noun phrase (in an appositive position) specifying several striking qualities in the appearance of the DS, that might evoke certain evaluative and emotional attitudes in the reader. At any case it is certainly not insignificant to the sense of the whole text that this exceptionally treated DS is *der Verurteilte*: "[...] der Verurteilte, ein stumpfsinniger breitmäuliger Mensch mit verwahrlostem Haar und Gesicht". We can only speculate about the author's intentions and motives (conscious or unconscious) that lead him to employ this descriptive NU. And, similarly, we can only theorize about the effects on the reader, about possible comprehensions and interpretations of this NU by different potential readers when construing the sense of the whole text.

4.2.3. Subvariety (III) may be regarded as an extreme case: the personages are not named (in proper sense) but referred to by the 3rd person pronouns *bei ihm, bis* and *sbe/ber*. In these circumstances, however, the pronouns are used neither anaphorically, nor cataphorically in the strict sense, since they do not

point back or forward to a previous or subsequent mention and thus replace an earlier or later noun phrase,¹¹ but they function "absolutely", more or less like nouns with a very general, categorical meaning of 'male/female person'.

It is well known that the anaphoric/cataphoric use of *he/she* and *his/her* ("possessive" pronouns evidently belong to the category of personal pronouns as its subcategory – cf. Daneš 1985) in the position of INU at the beginning of narratives is a common phenomenon (e.g. in Joyce's "Dubliners" a third of the short stories begins with a cataphoric *he/she*). And it is not a rare case when a substitution noun-phrase, to which the many times and without interruption occurring pronoun points forward, comes in relatively late in the text (sometimes it appears even in a very far distant paragraph; cf. the story "Eveline" in *Dubliners*).

A very interesting specimen of such a use of pronouns is found in W. Styron's "Sophie's Choice" (91f.). A new tenant of a boarding house is discussing with an old one the somewhat unusual behavior of a pair of younger people living in the room just above that of the newcomer. They are quite unknown to him, he does not know even their names; the only information about them he derived from specific noises they produced and which he could not fail to hear and interpret. Now, in the dialogue of the new and old tenant, the couple above will consistently be referred to as *he, she, they*, without problems. Only after a while the old tenant mentions, in passing, the proper name of 'him' (and the newcomer is happy to learn it). – It seems to me necessary to treat the use of *he/she* in such cases as deictic rather than cataphoric: the pronouns do not substitute, in fact, a subsequent noun phrase, but they directly refer to and indicate the two persons, sufficiently identified by the dialogue partners (for the dialogue's sake), and by the reader as well.

¹¹ Cf., e.g., Leech & Svartvik (1975:56). In Heidolph et al. (1981) the 3rd person pronouns are classed as "personale Stellvertreter-Pronomen" (personal substitute-pronouns), in distinction to the 1st and 2nd person pronouns, functioning as deictic forms. Let us add that in languages with nonobligatorily expressed subjects (such as Latin or Czech), the distinction between substitutive and deictic pronouns appears in a somewhat different light and has to be treated in view of the deictic function of the personal endings of finite verb-forms as well (cf. Daneš 1985). – Even in languages such as, e.g., German, Latin, Russian, where the option of a gender form of the 3rd person pronoun is in principle regulated by the rules of concord with the formal (grammatical, morphological) gender of the noun (phrase) which the pronoun anaphorically/cataphorically substitutes (independently of any semantic association bearing on some "natural" property of persons/objects denoted by the noun), some conspicuous traces of the "natural basis for gender" (Lyons) evidently appear. Not only that *he/she* may be used in a story in the above mentioned "absolutely" naming manner similarly as, e.g., in English, but there are some more consequential phenomena. Thus in German the name for 'death' is *der Tod* (masc.), whereas the Czech equivalent *smrt* is a feminine. Consequently, in German speaking countries 'death' will be symbolized (personified) as a male figure ("Schrittler mit der Sense"), while in Czech, 'death' appears as an old woman with the scythe. The sex of the English "skeleton in a black robe, holding a scythe" seems to be indeterminate. Nevertheless, the title of Sherwood Anderson's short story "Brother Death" discloses the possible masculine character of 'death' in English. In Czech, e.g., such a story could never be written and an equivalent translation of Anderson's text would be a very hard nut, not less hard, of course, than the translation of a Czech fairy tale "Smrt knoflíčka", in word for word translation "Godmother Death".

Moreover, we should not neglect the fact that naming is not the only way of characterizing a DS in text: on the one hand, DS's will be further characterized in detail directly in the predication component, and on the other hand, many characteristics are entailed by (inferred from) the whole story, by situations in which DS's are involved, etc.

A good illustration of subvariety (III) is offered by W.G. Hardy's short story "The Czech Dog". In it the use of *she* is absolutely consequent, it is really the only NU referring to the given DS. As regards *he*, alternating GNU *the/this man* appears several times. (After all, the meaning content of this noun differs from the "absolute" *he* only in that it contains an additional feature 'adult' – but this property of the respective DS follows from the described situation from the beginning of the story). And again, the use of the alternant is context contingent: the given DS is named as *the man* twice from the viewpoint of a dog (cf.: "The collie, perceiving that the man's attention was [...] "It was continuing to watch the man"), and NU *this man* appears in the author's presentation of 'hers' flow of thought and imagination (cf.: "Sitting here in this secure, comfortable room, she tried to visualize the ditch and the darkness and this man". "It was not this man's fault that in his fight for his country he had to sacrifice everything [...]"). In both cases a kind of "narrative accent" is present (pointing at, contrasting – cf. the demonstrative *this*), probably a component of the "empathy" phenomenon, mentioned above. – The other two occurrences of *the man* are in the author's pure narrative descriptions and are not easy to explain in terms of context contingency. But it is possible to propose a syntactic interpretation: in texts such as Hardy's the difference between the two uses of 3rd person personal pronouns, the "absolute" one and the "normal" one, i.e., according to the syntactic rules of pronominalization, is neutralized. Now, in both cases NU *the man* occurs in such a syntactic (co-textual) position where the use of *he* according to the rules of pronominalization would be excluded.

4.2.4. A distinct, though in any case affined variety of "bare" CNCs are chains containing sheer proper names. Thus in Hemingway's short story "The Undeclared", the two main heroes, *Manuel Garcia* and *Miguel Retana*, are referred to nearly in all cases by their proper names (though in a few common modifications: *Manuel; Manolo* (when addressed));¹² *Retana*). In the short opening part of the text only, describing Manuel's coming into Retana's office, Retana is referred to as *someone – the voice – a little man*, in their turn: the author views the situation from Manuel's position, the sequence corresponds, to Manuel's local progression.

¹² Certainly, it is not by chance that the personage in a relatively low social position is here often referred to by the author with the first name (and addressed by Retana with a familiar, hypocoristic form), whereas the personage having a relatively high social prestige is called by the author with the family name. This is a further example of the empathic approach, even in passages with the author's "objective" narration or description.

Relatively often we meet with combinations of proper names and pronouns. Thus in Sheila Kaye-Smith's short story "A Day in a Woman's life", the proper name *Joyce Armstrong* appears as INU, but subsequently the heroin will be mostly referred to with the pronoun *she/her*. The other way round, in H.G. Wells's short story "The Man who Could Work Miracles" the INU introducing the hero is the pronoun form *him*, followed by CNUs *he - he - he - bis - his* (name was George McWhirter Forthingay) - *he - he - he - bis - Mr. Forthingay*; in the subsequent part of the text the proper name occurs then very often (thus the first occurrence of the proper name is in a predicative position - not a rare case).¹³ Even though a proper name bring forth a very meagre characterization of its DS, the initial pronominal reference (esp. if the proper name comes in relatively late) creates in the comprehender a feeling of the above mentioned "knowledge deficit", connected with expectation. But this deficit has rather a pragmatic than a semantic base: the proper name will be experienced by people as an unalienable possession, as an indispensable attribute of any human being.

An ingenious pattern of the combination of "status/role" chains and the chains with proper names may be found in Faulkner's "dual" story "The wild palms". Since the analysis of its rather refined and complicated structure would require much more place than I have at my disposal here, I have to abstain from it.

4.3. In conclusion let us consider the possible overall stylistic value (sense) of the austere (non-depictive, non-descriptive) CNCs. We have pointed above to the fact that there are other sources of information about a DS, in fact, than NUs only. Consequently, in a text with austere chains the informative, characterizing role of NUs is drastically reduced and the reader/comprehender of the text has to find out and often to construe by inference particular characteristics of DS's from the predication component and from the entire story. Such a text "reckons" with the independent constructive endeavour of the comprehender. On the one hand it forces him to be self-reliant in comprehension and evaluation, and on the other hand it does not set limits to his comprehension and does not force him into certain solutions and evaluations, it does not try to "guide his hand", to instruct him. (Thus whether a certain personage is "wretched" or not, whether an event was "lucky" or not, is not to be settled by the respective NUs, but has to be inferred from the story by the comprehender, or more precisely, the reader has to make evaluations of his own.) - This assumption is sustained by the fact that even the non-naming text component (and, consequently the whole text) very often reveals austerity features, too. But these problems would lead us beyond the realm of text linguistics.

¹³ For simplicity's sake I have not taken into account the titles of the stories. The interpretation of respective NUs (*a woman's*; *the man who* ...) in respect to the subsequent CNCs would bring further interesting findings.

In my opinion, it is preferable to treat 'austerity' rather as an abstract stylistic principle, that would be applied in individual texts with different degrees of consistency, in a singularly patterned interaction with other principles of the stylistic make-up of the text.

Address of the Author:

František Daněš
CS - 160 00 Praha 6
Velvarská 19

- Agricola, E. (1979), *Textstruktur. Textanalyse. Informationskern*, Leipzig, VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- de Beaugrand, R. (1980), *Text, Discourse, and Process*, Norwood, N.J., Ablex.
- Conte, M.-E. (1986), "Textreferenzen und Typen anaphorischer Wiederaufnahme", in W. Heydrich and J.S. Petöfi (eds.), *Aspekte der Kohäsität und Kohärenz von Texten*. Hamburg, H. Buske: 1-15.
- Conte, M.-E. (1988), *Condizioni di coerenza*, Firenze, La Nuova Italia.
- Daneš, F. (1983), "On Text Constituting Semantic Relations", in S. Rot (ed.), *Languages in Function*, Budapest.
- Daneš, F. (1985), "Zwei Anmerkungen zu den Personalpronomen", *Zeitschrift für Slavistik*, 30: 53-60.
- Daneš, F. (in print), "Some Considerations Concerning Text and Textprocessing", in J.S. Petöfi et al. (eds.), *Aspects of Textological Research*, Hamburg, H. Buske.
- Harweg, R. (1968), *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*, München, Fink.
- Harweg, R. (1988), "Sentence Sequences and Cotextual Connexity", in J.S. Petöfi (ed.), *Text and Discourse Constitution*, Berlin/New York, W. de Gruyter: 26-53.
- Heidolph, K.E. et al. (1981), *Grundzüge einer deutschen Grammatik*, Berlin, Akademie-Verlag.
- Karcevskij, S. (1929), "Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique", in TCLP 1: 88-92.
- Kuno, S. and Kaburaki, E. (1975), "Empathy and Syntax", in S. Kuno (ed.), *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, Cambridge, Mass.: 1-74.
- Lakoff, G. (1968), *Pronouns and Reference*, Bloomington, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1975), *A Communicative Grammar of English*, London, Longman.
- Murphy, G.L. (1988), "Personal Reference in English", *Language in Society*, 17: 317-349.
- Pađučeva, E.V. (1970), "Anaphoric Relations and Their Representation in the Deep Structure of a Text", in M. Bierwisch and K.E. Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in Linguistics*, The Hague/Paris, Mouton: 224-232.
- Palek, B. (1968), *Cross-Reference. A Study from Hypersyntax*, Praha, Universitas Carolina.
- Palek, B. (1977), "Reference and Text", in T.A. van Dijk and J.S. Petöfi (eds.), *Grammars and Descriptions*, Berlin/New York, W. de Gruyter: 355-394.
- Paul, H. (1909), *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, Halle.
- Russell, B. (1946), *History of Western Philosophy*, London, G. Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Searle, J. (1971), "The Problem of Proper Names", in D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits (eds.), *Semantics*, London, Cambridge UP: 134-141.
- Uspensky, B. (1973), *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*, Berkeley, University of California Press.

- Viehweger, D. (1977), "Zur semantischen Struktur des Textes", in F. Daneš und D. Viehweger (eds.), *Probleme der Textgrammatik II* (= Studia grammatica XVIII), Berlin, Akademie-Verlag: 103-118.
- Viehweger, D. (1978), "Struktur und Funktion nominativer Ketten im Text", in W. Motsch (ed.), *Kontexte der Grammatiktheorie* (= Studia grammatica XVII), Berlin, Akademie-Verlag: 149-168.

Literary sources

- Anderson, S., *Brother Death*, in *The Albatros Book of American Short Stories*, Hamburg/Paris/Bologna, The Albatros, 1935: 30-48.
- Carroll, L., *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, London, Macmillan 1928.
- Faulkner, W., *The Wild Palms*, London, Chatto and Windus, 1939.
- Hardy, W.G., *The Czech Dog*, in M. Foley (ed.), *The Best American Short Stories*, Cleveland/New York, The World Publishing Co, 1945: 109-114.
- Hemingway, E., *The Undeclared*, in *The Albatros Book of American Short Stories*, Hamburg/Paris/Bologna, The Albatros, 1935: 203-233.
- Hemingway, E., *The Old Man and the Sea*, New York, Scribner's Sons, 1952.
- Joyce, J., *Dubliners*, Hamburg/Paris/Bologna, The Albatros, 1932.
- Kafka, F., *Das Urteil und andere Erzählungen*, Frankfurt a.M./Hamburg, Fischer Bücherei, 1952.
- Kaye-Smith, S., *A Day in a Woman's Life*, in *My Best Story. An Anthology*, London, Faber and Faber, 1934: 186-208.
- Kennedy, J.F., *Profiles in Courage*, New York, Harper and Row, 1964.
- de Kruif, P., *Microbe Hunters*, New York, Pocket Book Inc., 1940.
- Miller, H., *Preface to J. Keruac's The Subterraneans*, New York, Avon, 1959.
- Murdoch, I., *The Sea, the Sea*, Harmondsworth, Penguin Books, 1980.
- Sinclair, U., *The Spy [= 100%: The Story of a Patriot]*, London, T. Werner Laurie Ltd.
- Styron, W., *Sophie's Choice*, Toronto/New York/London/Sydney, Bantam Books, 1980.
- Wells, H.G., *The Man who Could Work Miracles*, in *My Best Story. An Anthology*, London, Faber and Faber, 1934: 404-424.
- Zweig, S., *Sternstunden der Menschheit*, Leipzig, Insel-Verlag.