



UDC 811.113.4

Dina Nikulicheva

*Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
Moscow State Linguistic University*

THE THREE-TERM MODEL OF COMMUNICATION AND THE SYSTEM OF DANISH DEICTIC PRONOUNS

For citation: Nikulicheva D. The three-term model of communication and the system of Danish deictic pronouns. *Scandinavian Philology*, 2023, vol. 21, issue 1, pp. 39–57. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2023.103>

The article focuses on the system of deictic pronouns in Danish. It is argued that in addition to binary oppositions expressing the objective (nearest vs distant) location of objects in the physical space relative to the speaker, like *this* vs *that* — *denne* vs *den*, a three-term opposition develops in modern Danish. This allows to specify the subjective interaction between the three participants in the communicative act: the speaker (1st person), the listener (2nd person) and the objects of the surrounding world (3rd person). The system of secondary demonstrative pronouns — *deictic binomials* — is investigated. “Deictic binomial” is used as a term for an analytical combination of a simple deictic pronoun and a spatial adverb. Four possible combinations of such binomials are considered. The Danish Corpus (KorpusDK) analysis made it possible to assert that combinations of proximal deixis indicators — such as *denne her* ‘this here’ — are subjective markers of 1st person signaling that the deictic object enters into the speaker’s personal space. Combinations of indicators of distal and proximal deixis (such as *den her* ‘that here’) are “cohortatives” — subjective markers of the 2nd person, signaling the common perception of shared attitude to the deictic object by the speaker and its addressee. Combinations of analytical indicators of distal deixis (such as *den der* ‘that there’) — shift the negatively evaluated object outside the personal space of the speaker and the space of communication, which corresponds to the communicative function of the 3rd person. The search in the Danish Corpus for the fourth type of combinations, that is, combinations of proximal and distal deixis (such as *denne der* ‘this there’) gives practically no results. This confirms the conclusion that the paradigm for expressing the speakers subjective attitude to the object of deixis in modern Danish is represented by three categories that correspond to three “spatial areas” — the speaker’s personal space (1st person), the common communication space shared with the addressee

(2nd person), an external space into which the speaker subjectively removes the disapproved or alienated objects of deixis (3rd person).

Keywords: Danish language, three-term model of communication, deictic pronouns, pronominal binomials, personal space of the speaker, common communication space, subjectively alienated space.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since Karl Bühler's *Organonmodell* [Bühler, 1934] the three-term model of a communicative situation, presupposing three obligatory participants in any communicative situation — the referred state of affairs (3rd person), the speaker (1st person), and the hearer (2nd person), — has been the basis of any theory of language and communication. That three-term model corresponds to the three main language functions (the representative, the expressive, and the appeal functions) and to their three semiotic correlates, as in Piers's triad: icon, symbol, index, or in Durst-Andersen's triad: model, symptom, signal. According to Per Durst-Andersen, the three-term model of communication presupposes three possible supertypes of languages, where “grammar is either a model of a situation, a symptom of a speaker's experience of a situation or a signal to a hearer to look for the situation behind the information given” [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. X]. Danish, as well as English, belongs to the hearer-oriented languages. “In hearer-oriented languages the sentence is designed to be a means for transmitting the information to the hearer by the speaker. This means that there must be the important distinction between old and new information. The determinant category is tense or more specifically the difference between the imperfect / simple past (e. g. Dan. *sagde* / Eng. *said*) and the perfect / present perfect (e. g. Dan. *har sagt* / Eng. *has said*). The article system is anchored in the notion of familiarity (e. g. Dan. *bogen* / Eng. *the book*) vs unfamiliarity (e. g. Dan. *en bog* / Eng. *a book*) and thus functions as the nominal equivalent to tense” [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 207]. The researcher calls such focus “the basic voice of language”. Along with the “notion of basic voice which is linked to the automatic output structure of a grammar” he introduces the notion of the secondary voice “which depends on the speaker and his speech intentions” [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 236]. While the first one is the *objective* (public) voice, the second is the *subjective* (private) voice of a language [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 260]. The general idea is that “the Danish speaker has to show the hearer whether

or not his old or new pieces of information presented to him are *objectively or subjectively founded*” [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 252].

P. Durst-Andersen illustrated this distinction with various Danish examples.

1. Choice between verbal forms:

Jeg tror at der vil være mange i køen ‘I think there will be many in the line’ / *Jeg tror at der ville være mange i køen* ‘I think there would be many in the line’ [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 253].

2. Choice between two different types of relative pronouns:

Der er ingen der / som kan forstå hvad du siger ‘There is no one who can understand what you are saying / what you say.’ If the speaker uses *der* he talks about concrete situations in which the hearers talk was unintelligible. If he uses *som*, he assigns the hearer the quality of being unintelligible [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 254].

3. Choice between different modal particles and between different modal verbs:

1a. *Han er nok taget til London.*

1b. *Han må være taget til London (Jeg så hans billet).*
‘He has (must be) gone to London (I saw his ticket).’

2a. *Han er vel taget til London.*

2b. *Han kan være taget til London (Han plejer at gøre det).*
‘He has (can be) gone to London (he often does that).’

3a. *Han er vist taget til London.*

3b. *Han skal være taget til London.*
‘He has (should be) gone to London (hear-say)’ [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 255].

The last three groups of examples are especially important for our research because they show that the Danish language uses special system of functional words to distinguish between epistemic responsibility for the utterance between the 1st person, 2nd person and 3rd person. Durst-Andersen calls them for “three *subvoices* within the subjective voice” [Durst-Andersen, 2011, p. 256].

The hierarchical organization of the subjective modality system in Danish was described by E. Krylova. She analyzes in detail the Danish particles expressing “the attitude of the speaker to the reliability of the statement (1st person)”, the particles expressing “the speaker’s offer of his assessment of this or that object, counting on its acceptance by the listener (2nd person)” and the particles, “referring the listener to a spe-

cific but unexpected situation for the speaker (3rd person)” [Krylova, 2021, p. 380–381].

The novelty of our research lies in applying the three-term model of the communicative situation to the functional-semantic description of Danish deictic pronouns. Such an approach has never been previously applied to this category of words, and its application, as we will show in the article, has a wide explanatory and systematizing potential.

2. TWO-TERM AND THREE-TERM PRONOMINAL DEIXIS

A typical function of the pronominal deixis in various languages is to position the object within the space of the communicative situation: closer to the speaker (Eng. *this*, Rus. *этом*) or in the more distant space (Eng. *that*, Rus. *том*). Quite often languages employ a three-term gradation. Consider, for example, Spanish, where exist the demonstrative adjectives *este* (this — next to the speaker), *ese* (this — next to the listener), *aquel* (that — far from everyone) [Matveev, 2011, p. 42], or Turkish, where three deictic pronouns make up the opposition: *bu* (the location of an object within the “space of the speaker” and in his field of vision), *şu* (the location of the object outside the “space of the speaker” but in relative proximity) and *o* (the location of the object outside the “space of the speaker”, relatively far from the speaker or in the “space of the interlocutor”) [Napolnova, 2022, p. 14].

3. SIMPLE AND COMPOUND DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS IN DANISH

Typically, in Danish demonstrative pronouns are described as binary oppositions of proximal and distal deixis, for example, E. Hansen and L. Heltoft write that “using demonstrative pronouns, the speaker signals that the objects he is talking about are in the physical space around the interlocutors. *Denne* marks a relatively small distance between the speaker and the object, *den* marks a relatively large distance according to the subjective assessment of the speaker: *vil du låne mig denne bog?* ‘will you lend me this book?’, *vil du låne mig den bog?* ‘will you lend me that book?’” [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 562].

Using the terminology of P. Durst-Andersen [Durst-Andersen, 2011], we can say that the Danish deictic pronouns *denne* vs *den* point to the location of objects in the “real world” and not in the “imagined

world”. Note that the subjectivity of the speaker’s assessment of distance (“talerens subjektive skøn”) is not absolute, but depends on the location of the object. In this regard, the example cited by E. Hansen and L. Heltoft is indicative: *vil du række mig den bog*, if a contrasting example is impossible **vil du række mig denne bog* ‘hold out (pass on) that book to me’ [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 562]. The sentence **vil du række mig denne bog* is inadmissible because the Danish pronoun *denne* implies objective reach (physical location within the outstretched arm), and the verb *række* ‘to pass’, ‘hold’ implies that the object is out of reach, which creates the effect of cognitive dissonance.

Along with simple single-word pronouns in modern Danish, there are also compound deictic pronouns formed by a combination of two components. These are analytical combinations of proximal deixis pronouns (*denne, dette, disse*) or distal deixis pronouns (*den, det, de*) with adverbs of proximal (*her*) or distal (*der*) spatial localization, for example, *denne her, de der*, etc. We will call them *deictic binomials*.

The authors of “Grammatik over det danske sprog” consider compound demonstrative pronouns to be colloquial synonyms for single-word pronouns: “I talesproget har *den* synonymerne *dender* og *denneder*, og *denne* synonymerne *denher* og *denneher*” ‘In colloquial speech, *den* is synonymous with *dender* and *denneder*, and *denne* is synonymous with *denher* and *denneher*’ [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 564].

4. OPEN OR CLOSED SPELLING?

It should be noted that by proposing a “closed” (merged to form a single word) spelling of the normatively separate combinations *den her, denne her*, etc., the authors of “Grammatik over det danske sprog” violate the normative Danish spelling. They write that “*Denher, denneher*, etc. are merged in spelling here (contrary to the instructions of the Danish spelling dictionary) to show that this is one word, and not a pronoun + adverb” [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 564]. Such a spelling innovation seems to be not entirely justified since it violates the general tendency of the Danish grammatical system to express the “subjective voice of the language” by forming analytical combinations of functional words — which was the subject of the introductory part of our article.

According to the Corpus of Modern Danish [KorpusDK], the spelling of closed and open deictic binomials statistically confirms our point

of view, demonstrating that their closed spelling is a rarity. So, for example, regarding the open vs closed spelling of the *den her / denher* binomial, the Corpus provides the following numbers: common gender: *den her* — 1,806 occurrences, *denher* — 5 occurrences; neuter gender: *det her* — 7,004 occurrences, *dether* — 19 occurrences; plural: *de her* — 1,510 occurrences, *deher* — 0 occurrences. Therefore, it is the analytic deictic binomials that should be considered the normative members of the deictic oppositions under study.

In this article, we propose to consider two-word deictic pronouns not as synonyms for the corresponding one-word demonstrative pronouns of proximal and distal deixis, but as *separate elements of a subjective deictic paradigm*. Later it will be shown that these two-component combinations differ from their one-word counterparts in pragmatic semantics, that is, they provide additional information for the addressee about speaker's attitude to the indicated object.

The **research methodology** included the following four steps:

1) analyzing the four possible combinatorial variants of Danish deictic binomials;

2) verifying the frequency and semantics of contexts for each of the combinatorial models according to the Corpus of the modern Danish language;

3) clarifying invariant meanings for each of the four combinatorial models;

4) combining these invariant meanings within a single paradigm.

The four potential combinations of proximal and distal indicators in deictic binomials are represented by the following models.

1. **PROXpron_PROXloc** — binomials combining two indicators of proximal deixis, formed according to the “*this here*” type — *denne her, dette her, disse her*.
2. **DISTpron_PROXloc** — binomials combining indicators of distal and proximal deixis, formed according to the “*that here*” type — *den her, det her, de her*.
3. **PROXpron_DISTloc** — binomials combining indicators of distal and proximal deixis, formed according to the “*this there*” type — *denne der/ dette der/ disse der*.
4. **DISTpron_DISTloc** — binomials combining two indicators of distal deixis, formed according to the “*that there*” type — *den der, det der, de der*.

Let us now look at the functioning of each of the four above mentioned models in the Danish Corpus.

PROXpron_PROXloc

Statistics: *denne her* — 1,291 occurrences, *dette her* — 664 occurrences, *disse her* — 60 occurrences; *denneher* — 56 occurrences, *detteher* — 20 occurrences, *disseher* — 2 occurrences.

Statistical frequency is given with unresolved homonymy. A detailed verification shows that sample groups may include some random examples. For *PROXpron_PROXloc* model, this may be the proper adverbial meaning of the adverb *her*:

Nærmer man sig en storby, bliver de spredte bebyggelser stadig tættere, gårde, parcelhuse, rækkehuse, forstæder — indtil massive bygningsmasser rejser sig i vejret... Intet af dette her. Efter de indledende spredte bebyggelser så man så godt som intet opretstående. Her var krigens spor mærkbare. 'As you get closer to a big city, the scattered settlements become ever closer, farms, detached houses, terraced houses, suburbs — until massive building masses rise into the air... None of **this** here. After the initial scattered settlements, you could see almost nothing standing. **Here** the traces of the war were noticeable.'

Proper proximal deictic binomials are used in several **types of contexts**.

1. Negative assessment of the deictic object by the speaker:

Jeg skal ikke gøre mange bemærkninger til denne udvalgsbetænkning, den er enstemmig, og det er et godt område at komme i gang i... Jeg har siddet og studeret denne her enstemmige udvalgsbetænkning, og jo mere jeg har studeret den, jo mere er jeg kommet i tvivl om, hvad vi overhovedet skal med den. 'I will not make many comments on this committee report, it is unanimous, and it is a good area to start... I have sat and studied **this (here)** unanimous committee report, and the more I have studied it, the more I doubted what we should do with it at all.'

The example is interesting because in one context the speaker first simply points to the object of discussion (*denne udvalgsbetænkning* 'this committee report'), and then evaluates it (*denne her enstemmige udvalgsbetænkning* 'this (here) unanimous committee report').

2. Negative assessment of the anaphoric situation where the speaker seems hurt:

"Og så kan man jo tvivle på, hvilke chancer jeg har i den forsamling. HK har intet gjort for mig i denne her sag. Det skulle lige være den konservative folke-

tingsgruppe, der havde fyret mig på den måde. Så havde HK kørt alle kanonerne i stilling”, siger Yrsa Jørgensen. “And then you can doubt what chances I have in this assembly. The Confederation of Trade and Office Employees has done nothing for me in **this (here)** case. If the conservative parliamentary group had fired me in that way, then the union would have all the guns blazing”, says Yrsa Jørgensen.

High frequency of the proximal deistic binominals *dette her, denne her, disse her* is typical for the speeches of politicians expressing their emotional involvement to topical problems and situations.

The expressive evaluative lexemes are typical for the contexts where proximal deictic binomials occur. Consider, for example, *horrible synspunkter* ‘horrible views’, *alvorlig afvisning* ‘serious refutations’, *flabet svar* ‘brazen reply’, *rystende* ‘shocking’, *for galt* ‘too much’, *frækhed* ‘impudence’ in the following examples:

Vi hørte her en klar støtte til Le Pen, en klar støtte til de højrekræfter, der er, en støtte til, at det, der fremover skal styre, hvis han får noget at skulle have sagt, hvis Dansk Folkeparti, som vi må gå ud fra står bag disse her horrible synspunkter, får noget at skulle have sagt, skal være race og religion. Det skal afgøre, om man kan få dansk statsborgerskab. Det, som er rystende, er, at vi ikke får en alvorlig afvisning fra regeringen af den slags synspunkter. ‘We heard here a clear support for Le Pen, a clear support for the right-wing forces, a support for race and religion that determine who can get Danish citizenship, if he has something to say, if the Danish People’s Party, which, we must admit, stands behind **these (here) horrible views**, has something to say. What is **appalling** is that we do not get a **serious rejection** from the government of such views.’

3. Positive approximation.

Deictic binominals of this model are also used for perceptually moving closer and making bigger a positively evaluated anaphoric situation or a positively evaluated object:

Jes Lunde kalder det glædeligt, at Venstre støtter hans forslag. “Det er en nyorientering fra deres side. For dette her forslag om en tilmeldingskupon har jo været til afstemning tidligere i folketingsssalen — i 1990 — vor de stemte imod det”, siger han. ‘Jes Lunde calls it gratifying that Venstre supports his proposal. “It is a reorientation on their part. Because **this (here) proposal** for a registration coupon has been put to a vote earlier in the parliament — in 1990 — where they voted against it”, he says.’

“Jeg synes det er mere spændende med de biler, der har været et almindeligt syn på landevejene. Tag nu den her”, siger Peter Nielsen og peger på en bronzemetal

Citroën GS stationcar. “Den var meget udbredt i Danmark for 20 år siden. I dag er der næsten ingen tilbage. De rustede simpelthen op. Men **dette her** eksemplar fandt vi i Rouen i Normandiet”. “I think it’s more exciting with the cars that have been a common sight on the roads. Now take **this one**”, says Peter Nielsen, pointing to a bronze metal Citroën GS station wagon. “It was very common in Denmark 20 years ago. Today there are almost none left. They simply rusted to dust. But we found **this here** copy in Rouen in Normandy”.

First, the speaker draws attention of the interlocutor to the car closest to them, using the deictic binominal *den her*. Then the reference to the object changes to the binominal *denne her*, which testifies to the subjective attitude of the speaker to the object. The speaker is clearly admiring this rare and well-preserved bronze-colored vintage car brought from Normandy.

5. EVALUATIVE AMBIVALENCE OF CLOSED BINOMIALS OF PROXIMAL DEIXIS

The analysis of Corpus-based examples shows that closed (one-word) spelling is more common for binomials of proximal deixis than for other types of deictic binomials. This may indicate their tendency to lexicalization as a kind of evaluative adjectives:

*Jeg sidder med en mandlig bekendt på Operacafeen i Stockholm... vi får jo fiske-suppe... og jeg kommer til at bide i **denneher** halve hummer. Og knæk så ryger det halve af min ene fortand!.. det var så forfærdeligt.* ‘I’m sitting with a male acquaintance at the Opera cafe in Stockholm... we’re having fish soup... and I’m going to bite into **this (here)** half lobster. Crack and half of my front tooth breaks!.. It was so horrible.’

The combination of historical presence, nominal sentences, exclamations, evaluative lexemes and sensory predicates is a typical context for using binomials of proximal deixis.

Det er *dog* for *galt*! Har man nogensinde kendt *mage til frækhed*. Her arbejder jeg i 20 år morgen, middag og aften på **denneher** computer og fodrer den med input og så kommer den med **detteher**. **Detteher** flabede svar. ‘It’s *too wrong*! Have you ever known *such audacity*. Here I work for 20 years morning, noon and night on **this (here)** computer and feed it with input and then it comes up with **this (here)**. **This (here)** flabby answer.’

Of special interest is the use of the affirmative particle *dog* in the last example. According to the research of E. Krylova, this particle is

“a 1st person affirmative”, because it “helps the speaker to present as a reliable the situation, not assumed by him being reliable earlier” [Krylova, 2021, p. 376].

Like analytical binomials, merged binomials can express both speaker’s negative and positive assessment. Thus, the positive assessment of the deictic object is typical for advertising texts:

Jeg har aldrig brudt mig om stegt sild, men disseher små nyfangede basser er noget andet. Havsmag, nærmest sødlige og slet ingen sildefims. Feriemad. ‘I’ve never cared for fried herring, but these (here) little freshly caught bass are something else. Tastes of the sea, almost sweet and no herring flavor at all. Holiday food.’

Here we see the same semantic variant of positive approximation as in the previous example about a retro car (*dette her* eksemplar = *this here* copy).

DISTpron_PROXloc

Statistics: *den her* — 1,806 occurrences, *det her* — 7,004 occurrences, *de her* — 1,510 occurrences; *denher* — 5 occurrences, *dether* — 19 occurrences, *deher* — 0 occurrences.

This type of deictic binomials is the most polysemantic due to the combination of opposite spatial meanings. The main functional types, as used in colloquial speech and in narrative, will be illustrated below. It will be shown that, despite their apparent heterogeneity, it is possible to derive a common pragmasemantic invariant of their meaning: the speaker and other participants in communication having a common focus on the deictic object. We propose to call this type of meaning a *cohortative deixis*.

The cases of the joint use of *den her* and *den der* must be excluded from our analysis since they present a contrast between *objective distance* from the speaker to the two compared objects.

A typical context of such contrast is a communicative situation where the speaker chooses one of two objects at different distances. A test offered to four Danish native speakers showed that, regardless of which of the two objects the speaker chooses (that means regardless the subjective focus), the spatially closer object is always designated as *den her*, and the more distant object as *den der*: *Jeg tager den her (kjole), men ikke den der* ‘I’ll take this dress, but not that one’ or *Jeg tager den der*

(kjole), *men ikke den her* ‘I’ll take that dress, but not this one’. Whereas it is impossible to use one-word deictic “synonyms” in such examples: **Jeg tager denne (kjole), men ikke den*; **Jeg tager den (kjole), men ikke denne*.

It is an altogether different matter when there is only one object in a communicative situation. Below we will focus on such examples.

6. REFERENCE TO A SINGLE OBJECT OR A SITUATION IN DIRECT SPEECH

It is noteworthy that the binomials *den her*, *det her*, *de her* are especially widely used in the speeches of politicians:

Når der kommer flere børn og ældre, så skal pengene følge med. Og det gør de nu. Det gør de under den her regering. ‘When there are more children and old people, more money should be allocated. And this is what happens. This is what happens under *this (den her)* government’.

This is a quote from the New Year’s speech by the Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen, who heads the current social democratic government of Denmark. Instead of various possible ways to convey the message: *den socialdemokratiske regering* ‘social democratic government’, *vores regering* ‘our government’, *den nuværende regering*, ‘current government’ — the prime minister chooses the deictic pronoun *den her*.

On the one hand, such complex pronominal deixis represents the object in a detached way (*den*), which creates the effect of impartiality (in contrast to the definitions, like *vores* or *den socialdemokratiske regering*), and, on the other hand, brings the object of speech closer to the audience (*her*), which creates a cohortative effect of common perception of the situation by the speaker and his audience.

Politicians like to talk about *det her land* ‘this country’, *det her samfund* ‘this society’, *det her handleksforløb* ‘this development’, *de her penge* ‘this money’, etc., implying that the audience shares with the speaker not only the background knowledge about the referent, but also its assessment. Therefore, such contexts also frequently include evaluative predicates:

I en opsplitningssituation og årlige besparelser i form af synergieffekter på 75 mio. kr. skal kursen ligge på 150. “Men det ligger og *balancerer på en knivsæg*. Falder *det her opkøbsscirkus* til jorden eller fortsætter det. Det er afgørende”, siger Mogens Kristensen, analysechef i Sydbank. ‘In a split-up situation and annual savings in the form of synergy effects of DKK 75 million, the

exchange rate must be DKK 150. “But it is balancing on a knife’s edge. Will this acquisition circus collapse to the ground or will it continue. That is essential”, says Mogens Kristensen, head of analysis section at Sydbank.

In order to compare the pragmatic semantics of *det her* binomials with the deictic binomials of *dette her* type considered above, let us turn to the contexts where they both occur.

- ***det/den her* vs *dette/denne her***

The semantic difference is obvious in cases of co-occurrence of *det her* and *dette her* in one utterance:

“Som ansvarlig politiker *kan jeg ikke sidde dette her overhørig*. Jeg vil tage kontakt til industriministeren og stille ministeren en række spørgsmål for at finde ud af, hvad vi kan gøre ved *det her*”, siger den konservative Flemming Hansen til B. T. Flemming Hansen *finder det uacceptabelt*, at der stadig hersker usikkerhed omkring Dankortets sikkerhedssystemer, efter at politiet nu har opgivet efterforskningen af 20 uforklarlige Dankort-sager. “As a responsible politician, I *can’t sit by and listen to this (here)*. I will contact the Minister of Industry and ask the Minister a number of questions to find out what we can do about *that (here)*”, says the conservative Flemming Hansen in an interview to B. T. Flemming Hansen finds it unacceptable that there is still uncertainty surrounding Dankort’s security systems, after the police have now abandoned the investigation into 20 inexplicable Dankort cases’.

The politician Flemming Hansen considers the current state of affairs with the security of bank cards unacceptable (*finder det uacceptabelt*). He marks his emotional involvement in the situation using an approximating deixis: *jeg kan ikke sidde dette her overhørig*. When it comes to discussing the current situation with the minister of industry, the politician points to it using a more objectifying cohortative deixis, making it clear that both the minister and the audience are familiar with the situation.

- ***den her, det her, de her* in narrative**

In contrast to direct speech, the use of the analytical binomial *det her* in the author’s narrative has a slightly different communicative function. It creates an impression of visual approximation to the addressee of the described situation. The addressee in the narrative is the reader. The speaker is the author of the narrative. By using *det her* in relation to a temporally distant situation (*det*) brings it closer to the reader, offers a “close-up” view of the described situation, as if it were “here” (*her*).

“Hvad vil der ske på Børsen i morgen?” spurgte en ung, kvindelig free-lancer og holdt en anden mikrofon frem. Omkring hende lød forarget hvisken og grynten fra de mere erfarne kolleger, hvoraf flere allerede havde undret sig over hendes tilstedeværelse. *Dether* var en højtidelig, historisk stund. Man snakker *vel* ikke travløb under en begravelse, hvis man er professionel. “What will happen on the Stock Exchange tomorrow?” asked a young, female freelancer, holding out another microphone. Around her there were indignant whispers and grunts from the more experienced colleagues, several of whom had already wondered about her presence. *This* (*dether*) was a solemn, historic moment. You probably don’t talk on the go during a funeral if you’re a professional.

By using *det her*, the narrator brings the past situation closer to the reader. Unlike the examples with *dette her*, where the speaker expresses his own emotional assessment, here the text conveys indignation of the attending characters, as if the author and the reader overhear their inner speech: *Man snakker vel ikke travløb under en begravelse, hvis man er professionel*. It is significant that the modal particle *vel* is used here. According to E. Krylova, this particle is an operator of evaluation, which the addressee is supposed to share with the author of the statement.

The use of *det her* or *dether* in a narrative about past events can also serve as a signal that the addressee should vividly imagine the described situation, based on knowledge shared with the addressee:

Som sædvanlig greb den roligt fremadskridende rytme ham og lagde sit mønster hen over hans tanker. Sådan skulle man kunne skrive. Begyndelsen måtte være enkel nok. Anråbelsen først, oh, gudinde. Og spørgsmålet om årsagen. Hvorfor forlade det skønne Attika og de fagre piger, samtalen i søjlegangen omkring Agora, druerne og filosoferne? Nåh, *jo*, der var *dether* med arveretten til kongedømmet og onkels luskede lokkemad med det gyldne skind. ‘As usual, the steadily progressing rhythm seized him and laid its pattern across his thoughts. That’s how you should be able to write. The beginning had to be simple enough. The invocation first, oh, goddess. And the question about the reason. Why leave beautiful Attica and the beautiful girls, the conversation in the colonnade around the Agora, the grapes and the philosophers? Well, yes, there was *this* (*dether*) birth right to the kingdom and uncle’s sneaky bait with the golden skin.’

It is significant that this statement includes the modal particle *jo*, which, according to the study of E. Krylova, is an “epistemic affirmative of the 2nd person”, used “when the speaker tries to confirm the authenticity of his statement by the presence of knowledge common to both communicants” [Krylova, 2021, p. 376].

As we can see, narratives about the past events preserve the general invariant meaning: the speaker and the addressee share common view of an object (or situation), which indicates that these deictic binomials are oriented to the 2nd person.

Thus, the invariant meaning of contextual variants with deictic binomials of the *den her* type is cohortativity — the common perception of the deictic object shared by the speaker and the addressee or the audience, which allows us to consider them as deictic binomials focused on the 2nd person.

PROXpron_DISTloc

Statistics (with unresolved homonymy): *denne der* — 74 occurrences, *dette der* — 106 occurrences, *disse der* — 44 occurrences; *denmeder* — 0 occurrences, *detteder* — 0 occurrences, *disse der* — 0 occurrences.

The complete absence of one-word deictic binomials in the Corpus is noteworthy. although “Grammatik over det danske sprog” provides two examples with no comments from the authors: **Denmeder** *telefon er defekt* ‘This telephone is broken’ and **Detteder** *skal du bare lade ligge til senere* ‘Save it for later’ [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 564].

As for open compound spelling, all Corpus examples are the cases of unresolved homonymy. In such examples, *der* is a relative pronoun introducing dependent clauses. Usual examples are cleft sentences that typically put a particular constituent into focus.

Since the Danish punctuation norm is unstable, the comma before *der* in complex sentences may be omitted. Compare:

Den mest vigtige af de negative sider, er spørgsmålet om, hvornår en person er hjernedød. Det er dette, der optager mange af kritikerne. ‘The most important of the negative aspects is the question of when a person is brain dead. **This** is **what** concerns many of the critics’

and:

Han var som en vulkan der sprudede både ild og røg. Det var dette der gav hans overordentlige intelligens dens slagkraft. ‘He was like a volcano erupting with both fire and smoke. It was **this that** gave his extraordinary intelligence its striking power.’

In the entire Corpus, we managed to find only one example of an undoubtedly deictic binomial of the *PROXpron_DISTloc* model:

— *Sig mig engang, piger, betjenten lænede sig ind over det tunge gammeldags skrivebord, da Mulle havde talt færdig, — hvordan fik I penge til at købe mad på denne der Burger-restaurant. Og så vidt jeg ved er neglelak og øh... hygiejnebind også ret kostbart. Og I har lige fortalt, at I brugte jeres sidste penge på pladsbilletter til Esbjerg?* — Tell me, girls, — the officer leaned over the heavy old-fashioned desk when Mulle had finished speaking, — how did you get money to buy food at **this** (*denne der*) Burger restaurant. And as far as I know, nail polish and uh... sanitary napkins are pretty expensive too. And you just told me that you spent your last money on tickets to Esbjerg?

Judging by the context, this is a case of subjective approximation (actualization) by the speaker of an object that is not physically present in the communicative situation. The introduction into the space of actual communication of an object remote in space and/or time can be compared with the semantics of the Danish evidential perfect. Compare the reconstruction of the past situation from indirect evidence in the example provided by P. Durst-Andersen: *Tyven er gået ind ad kældervinduet og har brudt døren op til stueetagen* ‘The thief entered through the basement window and broke open the door to the ground floor’ [Durst-Andersen, 2000, s. 141]. However, the fact that *denne der* is registered in the Corpus only once hardly characterizes the deictic model *PROXpron_DISTloc* as productive.

DISTpron_DISTloc

Statistics (with unresolved homonymy): *den der* — 18,152 occurrences, *det der* — 12,702 occurrences, *de der* — 12,018 occurrences; *dender* — 1 occurrence, *detder* — 2 occurrences, *deder* — 3 occurrences.

The homonymy of *der* as a spatial adverb and *der* as a relative pronoun complicates the count. Typical examples of unresolved homonymy are cleft sentences and relative clauses:

Det er det, der ofte sker i nyhedsoplæsningen. ‘This is what often happens in the news programs.’

For den, der som Jens Jørgensen tolker citatet på den rigtige måde, er indrømmelsen ikke til at tage fejl af. ‘For those who, like Jens Jørgensen, interpret quotes accurately, the admission is misleading.’

However, the Corpus abounds in true deictic binomials of the *DISTpron_DISTloc* model:

Pepsi kikkede hen imod en busk, “jeg syntes jeg hørte et eller andet”. Jazz tog en lommelygte og gik derhen, “her er ikke...”. De kunne høre et bump. “bare rolig jeg faldt bare over en gren eller sådan no” Daniel gik derhen, “sådan no- hvad? Åh gud”. De andre så derhen, “hvad er det?” Jazz vendte sig for at brække sig og Daniel gik hen til de andre, “øh Poul, hvordan skal jeg sige *det her... det der* var Ulrik”. “hvad mener du med Ulrik?” Julie brød ind, “hvad mener du med *var*”? Poul så ned i jorden, “så fik skoven én til”. ‘Pepsi looked towards a bush, “I thought I heard something”. Jazz took a flashlight and went over there, “this isn’t...” they could hear a bump. “don’t worry, I just fell over a branch or something —”. Daniel went there, “so no- what? Oh God”. The others looked over there, “what is that?” Jazz turned to throw up and Daniel went to the others, “uh Poul, how should I say *this... that* was Ulrik”. “what do you mean by Ulrik?” Julie broke in, “what do you mean by *was*”? Poul looked down at the ground, “then the forest got another one”.

Two friends, Jazz and Daniel, wandering away from their companions in the forest, discover the corpse of the missing Ulrik. Daniel returns to the others and says, as if he and Jazz are still looking at the corpse: *det her*, and then corrects himself and says: “*det der var Ulrik*”. The character subjectively pushes the frightening object away in space and time. Therefore, instead of the present tense, the form of the past *var* appears, and instead of *det her*, the distal deixis is used: *det der*.

The combination of two lexemes of distal deixis creates an effect of subjective distancing from the disapproved or alienated object:

*...ren var hun ikke <...>. Har du ikke andet tøj end **det der**, spurgte han da hun var færdig med at spise og pegede på hende.* ‘...she wasn’t clean<...>. Don’t you have any other clothes apart from **that (det der)**, he asked when she finished eating and pointed at her.’

A man looks at a woman in dirty clothes (*ren var hun ikke*) and asks if she has any other clothes to change into. Using the double distal deixis *det der*, the speaker not only points to an object relatively distant from him (*det*), but also emotionally removes himself from it (*der*).

In Danish the speaker can typically use deixis to distance objects that cause negative emotions for him. The examples of emotive utterances provided in the Danish Academic Grammar prove this beyond doubt [Hansen, Heltoft, 2011, s. 562]: *lad være med at sidde og vippe på **den** stol* ‘stop swinging on (that) chair’; *hvornår reparerer du **det** fjernsyn?* ‘When will you fix (that) TV?’; *tag **de** hænder op af lommen!* ‘take (those) hands out of your pockets’. Compare the above with neutral statements where

the definite article is used instead of the pronoun of distal deixis: *være med at sidde og vippe på stolen* ‘stop rocking in your chair’; *hvornår reparerer du fjernsynet?* ‘When will you fix the TV?’; *tag hænderne op af lommen* ‘take your hands out of your pockets’. Therefore, it is natural that the distal deixis is chosen to describe conflict situations:

Hov du dér! Du kan sgu ikke parkere din bil dér. <...> Flyt så dén bil, og det skal være hurtigt. ‘Hej **you there!** You can’t park your car there. <...> Then move **that** car, and do it fast!’

7. CONCLUSIONS

Since the Corpus search for combinations of morphemes of proximal and distal deixis *dette der / denne der / disse der / detteder / dennesder / disseder* gave practically zero results, we may conclude that the paradigm of expressing subjective attitude of the speaker to the object of deixis in modern Danish is represented by three categories: subjective approach to the object, cohortative focusing on the object, subjective distancing from the object.

Thus, the paradigm of the deictic binomials in the Danish language consists not the binary opposition but three “spatial areas” — the speaker’s personal space (1st person), the common communication space shared with the addressee (2nd person), an external space into which the speaker subjectively removes disapproved or alienated objects of deixis (3rd person).

The semantics of subjective evaluation present in deictic binomials contributes to their lexicalization, which is reflected in the so far rarely practiced closed spelling (*denneher, denher, dender*, etc.). In future, this may bring them closer to evaluative adjectives.

REFERENCES

- Bühler K. *Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag, 1934. 434 S.
- Durst-Andersen P. En kognitiv analyse af perfectum og imperfectum i dansk. *NyS: Nydanske studier og almen kommunikationsteori*. Vol. 27–28. København: Dansk lærerforening, 2000. S. 131–164.
- Durst-Andersen P. *Linguistic supertypes. A cognitive semiotic theory of human communication*. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011. 314 p.

- Hansen E., Heltoft L. *Grammatik over det danske sprog*. Bd. 2. Syntaktiske og semantiske helheder. Århus: Det danske Sprog- og Litteraturselskab, 2011. S. 421–1167.
- Krylova E. B. *Communicative functions of modal particles in Danish*. Moscow: MAKS Press, 2021. 440 p. (In Russian)
- Matveev S. A. *The whole Spanish grammar in 4 weeks*. Moscow: Astrel Publ., 2011. 251 p. (In Russian)
- Napolnova E. M. *Spatial and temporal relations in the lexical semantics of the modern Turkish language*. Dr. Sci. thesis abstract. Moscow, 2022. 39 p. (In Russian)

DICTIONARIES AND INTERNET-RESOURCES

- KorpusDK — *Dansk korpus*. Available at: <http://ordnet.dk/korpusdk> (accessed: July — August 2019).

Дина Никуличева

Институт языкознания РАН,

Московский государственный лингвистический университет

СИСТЕМА ДЕЙКТИЧЕСКИХ МЕСТОИМЕНИЙ ДАТСКОГО ЯЗЫКА КАК ОТРАЖЕНИЕ ТРЕХЧЛЕННОЙ МОДЕЛИ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ СИТУАЦИИ

Для цитирования: *Nikulicheva D. The three-term model of communication and the system of Danish deictic pronouns // Скандинавская филология. 2023. Т. 21. Вып. 1. С. 39–57. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu21.2023.103>*

В статье рассматривается система дейктических местоимений датского языка. Доказывается, что помимо *бинарных оппозиций*, выражающих объективное (ближайшее vs удаленное) расположение в физическом пространстве указываемых предметов относительно говорящего, по типу *этом vs том — denne vs den*, в современном датском языке развивается *трехчленная оппозиция*, нюансирующая субъективное взаимодействие между тремя участниками коммуникативного акта: говорящим (1-е лицо), слушающим (2-е лицо) и объектами и ситуациями внешнего мира (3-е лицо). Исследуется система вторичных указательных местоимений — *дейктические биномы* — аналитические сочетания дейктических местоимений и наречий пространственной локализации. Рассматриваются четыре возможных комбинаторных варианта таких биномов. Анализ Корпуса датского языка позволил утверждать, что сочетания показателей ближнего дейксиса — типа *этом здесь* — являются субъективными маркерами 1-го лица, сигнализирующими о проникновении объекта дейксиса в личное пространство говорящего. Сочетания показателей дальнего и ближнего дейксиса (типа *том здесь*) являются когортативами — субъективными маркерами 2-го лица, сигнализирующими о совместности восприятия объекта дейксиса, общности представлений о нем, совпадении его оценки говорящим и его адресатом. Сочетания аналитических показателей дальнего дейксиса (типа *том там*) — выводят негативно оцениваемый объект за рамки личного пространства говорящего

и пространства коммуникации, что соответствует коммуникативной функции 3-го лица. Поиск по корпусу четвертого типа комбинаций, то есть сочетаний морфем ближнего и дальнего дейксиса (типа *этот там*), дает нулевой результат. Это подтверждает вывод о том, что парадигма выражения субъективного отношения говорящего к объекту дейксиса в современном датском языке представлена тремя рядами, категоризирующими три «пространственных пояса» — личное пространство говорящего (1-е лицо), совместное пространство коммуникации, разделяемое с адресатом (2-е лицо), внешнее «чужое» пространство, в которое говорящий субъективно отстраняет порицаемые или отчуждаемые объекты дейксиса (3-е лицо).

Ключевые слова: трехчленность модели коммуникативной ситуации, датский язык, местоименный дейксис, объективная локализация, субъективная характеристика, дейктические биномы, трехчленная оппозиция.

Dina Nikulicheva

Dr. Sci. in Philology, Professor,
Institute of Linguistics of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
1, Bolshoy Kislovsky per., Moscow, 125009, Russian Federation
Moscow State Linguistic University,
38, ul. Ostozhenka, Moscow, 119034, Russian Federation
E-mail: nikoulitcheva@yandex.ru

Никуличева Дина Борисовна

доктор филологических наук, профессор,
Институт языкознания РАН,
Российская Федерация, 125009, Москва, Большой Кисловский пер., 1
Московский государственный лингвистический университет,
Российская Федерация, 119034, Москва, ул. Остоженка, 38
E-mail: nikoulitcheva@yandex.ru

Received: August 18, 2022

Accepted: October 1, 2022