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ABSTRACT

This article proposes a revision of stage- or theater-based models of speech event conception in order to account for Japanese, Korean, and English demonstratives that refer to topical entities in conversational settings located in or related to a theater, cinema, or similar place. We argue that the three languages conventionally adopt different ways of partitioning and deictic categorization in structuring a speech event conception. We further demonstrate that the ways of partitioning and categorization in a stage/theater-based model of speech event can account for some other differences between the three languages in temporal or textual uses of deictic expressions.

1. Introduction

This study presents a revision of idealized stage- or theater-based models of speech event conception drawing on Japanese, Korean, and English demonstratives referring to topical entities in conversational settings related to an actual stage or theater. Japanese and Korean are known to exhibit much similarity in terms of discourse-pragmatic as well as morpho-

* Part of the present paper was orally presented at the 12th High Desert Linguistics Society Conference, held in Albuquerque, New Mexico on November 13, 2016. We are very thankful to Yongtaek Kim and Walter Klinger for their enlightening answers to, and useful comments on, the Korean and English data we consulted each of them for. This research is partially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C), JP15K02487, 2015-2017.
syntactic characteristics, one of which is the deictic (more specifically, demonstrative) system that postulates a proximal/medial/distal distinction: ko/so/a- in Japanese and i/geu/jeo in Korean (Shibatani 1990; Sohn 1999). The medial form is also described as addressee-proximal in the demonstrative reference, while in textual reference it can be treated as a functional counterpart of the definite article in European languages (Kinsui and Takubo 1992).

The two languages, however, differ in the deictic forms used or avoided in some types of speech event situations. For instance, two people seeing a movie together refer to the main figure on the screen with the proximal form ko- ‘this’ rather than the medial so- ‘that’ or distal a- ‘that’ in Japanese, but with the distal form jeo ‘that,’ neither proximal i ‘this’ nor medial geu ‘that,’ in Korean, as illustrated in (1):

(1) a. Kono[Sono/^[Ans]hito this[that medial/that distal] -person
    hurinsi-teru-no sit-teru?
    have.an.affair-PRG-NMLZ know-PRF

b. Jeo[I/^[Geo]saram that distal [that medial ] -person
    bullyunha-neun geo ara?
    have.an.affair-ADN NMLZ know
    ‘Do you know s/he is having an (extra-marital) affair?’

Comparable differences can be found when one student sitting in the back of a classroom whispers to her friend about the teacher now giving a lecture, or when two spectators of a musical show gossip about a singer now warbling a solo on the stage. In these situations, one can use kono sensei ‘this teacher’ and kono kasyu ‘this singer’ in Japanese. In Korean, however, one cannot use either i seonsennim ‘this teacher’ or i gasu ‘this singer’ but has to use jeo seonsennim ‘that distal teacher’ or jeo gasu ‘that distal singer.’

In the present study, we argue that Japanese, Korean, and English conventionally adopt different ways of partitioning in structuring a speech event conception, which accounts for their distinct choices of deictic expressions for topic entities in situations such as those mentioned above. The relationship between the speaker/addressee and the content they talk about has been characterized in terms of a stage- or theater-based model of speech events (Langacker 1991: 283–284; Ide 2005: 51–52, inter alia), where the content and the speaker/addressee are compared to a play on the stage and its audience.

Since a stage is normally demarcated from the audience’s seating area in some way, the performer on the stage can be viewed as a distant entity from the audience’s perspective. Such a view explains why Korean requires a distal form to refer to the on-stage topic entity. Simultaneously, it is also the case that a stage and the audience’s seats ordinarily constitute a theater as a whole and can thus be seen as one and the same location. In this conception, the on-stage performer can be seen as an entity located in the audience’s vicinity, and this is responsible for the Japanese choice of a proximal form to refer to the topic entity.

Our discussion further demonstrates that the different modes of partitioning in the stage...
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model of speech events can account for some other differences observed in the temporal and textual uses of deictic expressions. We finally argue that theorizing stage-modeled conceptions of speech events may, in fact, be valid and effective for many different languages, but there can be certain degrees of diversity in the structure and other characteristics of the presupposed stage-audience complex.

2. Deixis and stage-based models of speech event conception

2.1 Demonstratives in deixis

As has been assumed in earlier studies on what currently goes under the name of deixis, demonstratives comprise one major component of deixis; their reference can ideally be described with reference to the deictic system of each language. Fillmore (1971, 1997) and Lyons (1977: Ch. 15), now the classics of this field of research, deal with demonstratives and definite articles in such a broader perspective: spatial, temporal, discourse, and social.

Fillmore deals with what amounts to spatial deixis in the chapter COMING AND GOING (1997: 77–102) rather than SPACE (1997: 27–44). He argues, “the terms of discourse deixis are taken from systems of deictic and non-deictic time semantics, for the very good reason that any point in a discourse can be thought of as a point in time—the time at which that portion of the discourse is encoded or decoded—with preceding portions of the discourse conceived as occurring earlier in time, later portions thought of as occurring later in time” (1997: 103). Lyons (1977: 668–669) contends, “the use of the demonstratives in both temporal and textual deixis, and also in anaphora, is connected with their use in spatial deixis.”

Demonstratives can suggest themselves as nominal, adjectival, and adverbial (Lyons 1977: 650) in Japanese, Korean, and English as well as in other languages. Our discussion below largely restricts itself to adjectival uses of demonstratives.

The English demonstratives, this/these and that/those, can be understood as instructing or inviting the addressee to direct his or her attention to “a particular region of the environment” in order to find the (group of) item(s) that is being referred to (Lyons 1977: 655). As is generally assumed, the instruction or invitation is, in the most primitive manner, indicated by the pointing gesture, which instantiates a typical manifestation of spatial reference. The neutral sense of the demonstrative that is “derived by abstraction from the gesture of pointing” (Lyons 1977: 656) and it leads to the so-called textual reference. The definite article is interpreted as, diachronically and synchronically, a variant of the demonstrative further abstracted in terms of both instructive (gestural) function and phonological form (Lyons 1977: 646–647, 650).

The Japanese and Korean demonstratives can also be characterized as basically serving a similar gestural function and have, in one way or another, developed a use of textual reference that approximates to the neutral sense of the English that. Such a function is observable, especially, in the medial demonstratives, the Japanese sono- and the Korean geu. In these two languages, however, there have not so far been any phonological variations that correspond

2 This is because adjectival uses are available for the reference to human as well as non-human entities in all the three languages. Adverbial uses are not employed for human references. Unlike English and Korean, nominal uses of demonstratives can hardly be used to refer to human entities in Japanese.
to the English definite article. Rather, bare (demonstrative-less) nominals can be adopted more often than not for the discourse entities referred to by English nominals with a definite article.

As Lyons (1977: 670) points out, “deictic distinctions can be used to identify the antecedents of anaphoric expressions”; the English demonstratives this and that can be put to anaphoric uses. Although anaphora involves “the transference of what are basically spatial notions to the temporal dimension of the context-of-utterance and the reinterpretation of deictic location in terms of what may be called location in the universe-of-discourse” (Lyons 1977: 670), those demonstratives “do no more than simply encode the distinction of temporal proximity in relation to the moment of utterance” (ibid.). For instance, one cannot say (2b) to mean ‘John and Mary came into the room: John was laughing, but Mary was crying’; one needs to say (2a) (Lyons 1977: 671).3

(2) a. John and Mary came into the room: he was laughing, but she was crying.
   b. John and Mary came into the room: that person was laughing, but this person was crying.

However, if we are to translate the pronouns in (2a) into Latin or Turkish, he might be translated with ille “that-male-one” and she with haec “this-female-one” in the Latin version, while in Turkish they might be translated with o “that-one” and bu “this-one,” respectively (Lyons 1977: 669).1

In Japanese and Korean, unlike Latin and Turkish but like English, it is hard to translate he and she in (2a) with a demonstrative. As Lyons (1977: 671) acknowledges, “In so far as recency of mention is itself a deictically based notion and is encoded, in one way or another, in the anaphoric pronouns used in particular languages, anaphora rests ultimately upon deixis,” but “the potential referents in the universe-of-discourse cannot be indexed solely, or even primarily, in terms of recency or relative order of previous mention.” As is the case with English, the Japanese and Korean demonstratives cannot be understood to “encode the distinction of temporal proximity in relation to the moment of utterance” (Lyons 1977: 670). We will seek for another account for such textual reference of the demonstratives in terms of demonstrative mapping and demarcation in the stage-based model of speech event conception.

2.2 Demonstrative mapping in Japanese, Korean, and English

Unlike English, both Japanese and Korean exhibit a tripartite distinction in deixis (Shibatani 1990; Sohn 1999). The Japanese demonstrative morphemes ko/so/a- largely mean proximal ‘this,’ medial ‘that,’ and distal ‘that’ or ‘over there,’ respectively. The medial form so- is also described as addressee-proximal in spatial deixis, while it can be treated as a functional counterpart of the definite article in European languages (Kinsui and Takubo 1992). In Korean as well, the demonstrative morphemes i/geu/jeo serve similar functions, in which the medial geu’s

3 Lyons (1977: 669) adds that he and she in (2a) “can frequently be translated (into somewhat stilted English)” as the former and the latter, respectively.

4 Lyons (1977: 669) notes that the same is true of the German jener and dieser, Spanish ése (aquel) and ésete, French celui-la and celui-ci.
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Reference is largely limited to ‘near the addressee’ and ‘aforementioned’ (Ogoshi 2009: 136).

Table 1: Demonstrative morphemes in Japanese, Korean, and English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proximal ‘this’</td>
<td>ko^-</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medial ‘that medial’</td>
<td>so^-</td>
<td>geu</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distal ‘that distal’</td>
<td>a^-</td>
<td>jeo</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two languages stand in stark contrast with respect to the medial sense: ‘farther than the speaker’s proximity but nearer than the distal.’ In Korean, the medial sense is largely limited to the addressee’s proximal, as diagramed in Figure 1. The aforementioned sense constitutes part of the medial sense in that the mentioned entity, visible or not, is evoked in the addressee’s mind (proximity). Other invisible entities are referred to in the extended medial sense because they are also intended as evoked in the addressee’s mind (see Section 4).

In Japanese, the addressee–proximal sense is not isolated from, but constitutes merely a portion of the medial–distance sense, as in Figure 2. The medial–distance sense is distinguished from the distal sense without regard to the presence of an addressee. The immediately aforementioned invisible entity is referred to as medial as well as proximal because its conception is now located in the addressee’s (medial) as well as the speaker’s (proximal) mind. Other invisible entities, aforementioned or not, are construed as extended distal in that they are farther than visible distal entities (see Section 4).

Unlike Korean and Japanese, English embodies the proximal and distal senses alone. The deictic conception of demonstratives does not distinguish the medial from the proximal and the distal sense. English exhibits partial similarity to both Korean and Japanese: the addressee proximal sense is not isolated from the other (medial or distal) sense, as in Japanese, while only the proximal and distal senses obtain, as is the case with Korean when the addressee is absent.
2.3 Stage-based models of speech event conception

The term *deixis* comes from Greek *deiktikos* meaning “pointing” or “indicating,” which was employed by Greek grammarians in the sense of ‘demonstrative,’ and translated by Roman grammarians into Latin as *demonstrativus* (Lyons 1977: 636). As can be understood from the etymology, the meaning and function of demonstratives in European languages are grounded on the pointing gesture or similar communicative devices like eye gaze or nodding. Similar points can be made for Japanese and Korean as well as English. As far as deixis, including demonstratives, is centered around the speaker(s), who will make the pertinent gesture physically or in some linguistically or communicatively valid manners, any attempt to provide a sufficient account for the meaning and function of demonstratives will have to be based on an appropriate description of the speech event conception in which the speaker(s) will participate.⁵

Some previous studies have proposed modeling such a speech event conception on a theater setting, in which the people or things being talked about in the relevant sentence are equated with the actors, actresses, or other entities on the stage and the speaker and addressee with the audiences in the seating area. Langacker (1991: 283–284) and Ide (2005: 51–52) are representative of such modeling, but no particular attempts are found in those two studies to locate demonstrative references in their proposed stage-based models of speech event conception. Langacker nevertheless correctly points out that deictic expressions, “grounding predications” in his terms, are based on “the psychologically defined notion of mental contact” (1991: 91–92; emphasis original) and that each of the predications “does not profile the grounding relationship, but rather the entity that is grounded by this relationship” (1991: 94). Demonstrative distinctions like proximal/distal, visible/invisible, etc. underlie the unprofiled relationship.

Langacker (2008: 281–284) further attempts to map out the meaning of English demonstratives in his stage-based model of CDS (current discourse space). Taking demonstratives with pointing as “a natural place to begin examination of individual grounding elements” (281), he argues that they presuppose “a range of possible targets visually accessible from the ground” (283), and “their meaning resides primarily in the very act of singling out a nominal referent” (282) in reference to the speaker’s proximity or distance. In his account, the distance in the proximal/distal distinction need not be spatial: “If someone says *I really like this pen*, the proximity coded by *this* might be spatial (the speaker is holding the pen), temporal (the speaker is holding it now), functional (the speaker is using it), attitudinal (the speaker likes it), or any combination of these” (Langacker 2008: 283).

The CDS-based account of demonstratives is to some extent successful in accommodating the meaning of demonstrative reference. Still, it cannot adequately explain the non-central as well as central uses of demonstratives in English, let alone Japanese and Korean, because the demonstrative mapping it presupposes remains only roughly sketched. On the same ground, it does not necessarily give a satisfactory

---

⁵ Here the “speaker(s)” are intended to mean “anchoring speakers” (corresponding largely to a speaker, addressee, and/or their complex) in Koguma and Izutsu’s (2017) sense.
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Explanation for how demonstratives are used, if more realistic theatrical settings are taken into account. The topical entities in such settings can either be visible or invisible, and languages may differ in how the first- and second-mentioned entities are assessed in terms of proximal/distal distinction (e.g., one in the speaker’s vicinity, one at a distance from the speaker, and so on) and how they categorize such invisible entities (e.g., an extension of the visible distal entity, a variant of the visible medial entity, and so forth). We will therefore draw on different uses of Japanese, Korean, and English demonstratives in theatrical settings and demonstrate how the demonstrative mapping of each language demarcates and categorizes (portions of) the stage-based conception of speech events.

3. Deictic reference to a visible topic entity in a theater setting

3.1 First mention

Here we look at examples of deixis in theater settings, in which the topic entity on the screen or on stage is being mentioned for the first time. First, consider a situation in which speakers (spectators) refer to the topic entity (an actor, not a character) on the screen in a movie theater, as depicted in Figure 4. In this situation, Japanese speakers will use the proximal kono- rather than the medial sono- or distal ano-, but Korean speakers, in contrast, will use the distal jeo, neither the proximal i nor medial geu, as illustrated respectively in (3a) and (3b) below. In further contrast, English speakers are most likely to adopt a personal pronoun (he) as in (3c), since the actor on the screen has already achieved a topic status in this context and allows them to pronominalize the referent.

(3) a. Kono[#Sono/#Ano]-hito this[that medial/that distal]-person hurinsi-teru-no sit-teru? have.an.affair-PROG NMLZ know-PRF
   b. Jeo[#I/#Geu] saram that distal[this/that medial] person bullyunha-neun geo ara? have.an.affair-ADN NMLZ know 'Do you know that [this] man is having an affair?'
   c. Do you know he is having an affair?

Figure 4: Motion picture with one topic entity on the screen

6 Demonstratives can also be employed here but their imports may amount to Langacker’s (2008: 283) “attitudinal” rather than “spatial” distance. For example, that guy may imply a ‘derogatory’ attitude or opinion and this guy a complimentary one, particularly in the second mention (Walter Klinger, personal communication). Such uses of demonstratives are, therefore, not necessarily relevant to our present discussion.

7 Walter Klinger informed us that the English speaker is more likely to start the utterance with by the way, did you know, or guess what, and that hurinsuru and bullyunhada should be put in an expression like have an extra-marital affair rather than just have an affair because affair does not imply extramarital, i.e., scandalous, and an affair between unmarried people is perfectly reasonable for most people.
Next, we turn to another situation in which speakers refer to a topic entity on the stage in a musical show, as depicted in Figure 5. In this situation, Japanese speakers will primarily use the proximal kono- rather than the medial sono- or distal ano-. They could use the distal ano- only secondarily, as exemplified in (4a). However, Korean speakers will use the distal jeo only, neither the proximal i nor medial geu, as instantiated in (4b). Here as well, English speakers will most likely adopt a personal pronoun (he) to refer to the singer as in (4c) because the referent has already achieved a topic status.

Figure 5: Musical show with one topic entity on stage

(4) a. Kono[Ano/ Sonata]-kasyu
   this[that distal/that medial]-singer
   hurinsi-teru-no    sit-teru? 
   have.an.affair-prog-nmlz know

b. Jeo[Geu]    gasu
   that distal[his/that medial] singer
   bullyunha-neun geo ara?
   have.an.affair-adn nmlz know

‘Do you know that [this] singer is having an affair?’

c. Do you know he is having an affair.

The distribution of the deictic forms to refer to first-mentioned topic entities can be summed up as in Table 2. Japanese employs the proximal ‘this’ to refer to a first-mentioned topic entity (one on the screen/stage) in motion pictures and uses either proximal ‘this’ or distal ‘that distal’ in musical shows and plays.

In contrast, Korean adopts the distal ‘that distal’ to refer to a first-mentioned topic entity in motion pictures, musicals, and plays. These differences imply that Japanese primarily sees the stage/screen as proximal and secondarily sees the stage as distal in musical shows or plays, while Korean consistently views the stage/screen as distal. As far as demonstrative mapping is concerned, English does not assess the stage/screen with respect to the proximal/distal distinction.

3. 2 Second mention

We go on to situations where a topic entity on the screen or on stage is mentioned for the second time. In example (5), Japanese and Korean speakers mention a car next to the previously mentioned man on the screen, as in (5a-b), respectively: ‘You can see a car to the side, right?’

(5) a. Tonari-ni kuruma-ga mieru-desyo?
   side-at car-nom be.visible-innit

b. Yeop-e cha-ga boi-ji?
   side-at car-nom be.visible-innit

Table 2: Deictic forms for reference to first-mentioned topic entities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>Musical/Play</td>
<td>Movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-mentioned</td>
<td>kono ‘this’</td>
<td>kono ano ‘this/that distal’</td>
<td>jeo ‘that distal’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5:

Musical show with one topic entity on stage
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c. You can see a car to the side, right?

Then, in example (6), the speakers mention the car for the second time: ‘Is that a foreign car?’ In this situation, Japanese speakers will use the distal *ano-* rather than the medial *sono-* or proximal *kono-*, as in (6a). Korean speakers, as well, will use the distal *jeo* alone, neither the medial *geu* nor proximal *i*, as in (6b). English speakers, here again, will ordinarily employ a personal pronoun *it*, and not a demonstrative, as shown in the English translation (6c).

(6) a. *Ano[\*Sono/#Kono]*-kuruma gaisya?
    that\_distant[that\_medial/this]-car foreign:car
b. *Jeo[\*Geu/#I]* cha
    that\_distant[that\_medial/this] car
wejecha-ya?
foreign\_car\_cop\_fp

c. Is it a foreign car?

Figure 6 depicts another scene of the musical show, in which a topic entity on stage is mentioned for the second time. In example (7), the speakers mention a woman on stage behind the previously mentioned male singer: ‘There’s a woman behind the man, right?’ After that, in example (8), they mention the woman for the second time: ‘Do you know she is having an affair?’ In this situation, too, Japanese and Korean speakers will both use the distal forms: *ano-* in Japanese and *jeo* in Korean. They will not use the medial *sono-* and *geu* or the proximal *kono-* and *i*. English speakers, in contrast, will not ordinarily employ any demonstratives but will use personal pronouns, as shown in the English counterpart (8c).

(7) a. *Usiro-ni onnanohito-ga iru-desyo?*
    back\_at woman\_nom be\_innit
b. *Dwi-e yeoja-ga iss-ji?*
    back\_at woman\_nom be\_innit

c. There’s a woman behind the man, right?

(8) a. *Ano[\*Sono/#Kono]-hito*
    that\_distant[that\_medial/this]-person
*hurinsi-teru-no* sit-teru?
    have\_an\_affair\_prog\_nmlz know\_prf
b. *Jeo[\*Geu/#I]* yeoja
    that\_distant[that\_medial/this] woman
bullyunha-neun geo ara?
    have\_an\_affair\_adn nmlz know

c. Do you know she is having an affair?

The observation so far can be summarized as in Table 3. In Japanese, first-mentioned topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Deictic forms for reference to first- and second-mentioned visible topic entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-mentioned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Second-mentioned | *ano-* ‘that\_distant’ | }
entities in motion pictures are treated as proximal but those in musical shows or plays are treated as either proximal or distal. On the other hand, second-mentioned entities are treated as distal in all the three theatrical settings. In Korean, all the topic entities in the theater settings, either first- or second-mentioned, are treated as distal, neither proximal nor medial. In English, neither the first- nor second-mentioned entities are handled from the viewpoint of proximal/distal distinction; they are differentiated with respect to gender as well as number.

Now we can see some clear differences between Japanese and Korean in the conception of speech event located in a theater. The stage/screen and the seats ordinarily constitute a theater as one whole and can thus be seen as one and the same location. In this conception, the topic entity can be seen as an entity located in the audience’s vicinity, which is responsible for the Japanese choice of a proximal form to refer to a first-mentioned topic entity. A second-mentioned entity is, in contrast, referred to with a distal form, which is ascribable to the entire distance from the speakers through the first-mentioned entity to that second-mentioned entity, as indicated by the broken arrows in Figures 7(a) and (b). Notice that the visual paths involved shape a two-step access to the target referent: the ‘car’ and ‘woman.’

Meanwhile, since the stage/screen in a theater is normally demarcated from the audience’s seating area in some way, the topic entity on the stage/screen can be viewed as a distant entity from the audience’s point of view. In this understanding, Korean requires a distal form to refer to the topic entity regardless of whether it is first-mentioned or second-mentioned. In sharp contrast, English presupposes neither a demarcation of theatrical settings nor proximal/distal distinction for first/second mention.

4. Deictic reference to an invisible topic entity in a theater setting

Next we move on to the conception of speech events, not located in but related to a theater setting. This time, the relevant referent is no longer visible to speakers. Suppose that the speaker and addressee go out of the theater and then talk about a particular scene of the movie such as the one depicted in Figure 4 above. In example (9), the speakers confirm that the addressees remember that there was a car beside the man on the screen.
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(9) a. Sakki otoko-no tonari-ni
while before man-GEN side-at
atta-kuruma oboe-teru?
car remember-PRF
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Ano[Sono/#Kono]-kuruma gaisya?
that_distal[that_medial/this]-car foreign:car

b. Agga geu namja yeop-e
a.while.before that_medial man side-at
isseoss-deon cha gieognna?
was-pst.ADN car remember

Geu[Jeo/#I] cha
that_medial[that_distal/this] car

wejche-ya?
foreign:car-copy.fp

And then, the speakers ask if that car is a foreign car. In this second mention, the topic entity that was seen on the screen but is now invisible is referred to with the distal form ano- in Japanese, as in (9a), but with the medial form geu in Korean, as in (9b). In this case, ano kuruma and geucha ‘that car’ are uttered as the second mention to the relevant car. In English, the car is referred to by the pronoun it, not a demonstrative, in this case too, as in (9c).

Meanwhile, the second utterance in (9a–c) (‘Was it a foreign car?’) can be made out of the blue, leaving out the first utterance (‘Do you remember the car the man was standing next to?’), in which case the deictic forms can serve as the first mention. Interestingly, English prefers the distal demonstrative or the definite article in such a case: that car or the car. In a nutshell, the now invisible topic entity is referred to with the distal form in Japanese and with the medial form in Korean in both the first and the second mention. In English, however, the invisible topic entity is referred to using the distal demonstrative or the definite article in the first mention but using a pronoun in the second mention.

We look at one more case of an invisible topic entity. Suppose this time that the speaker and addressee go out of a musical show in a theater and then talk about a particular scene of the show as depicted in Figure 6. In example 10, the speakers further confirm that the addressees remember that there was a woman singing behind the man on stage. Subsequently, the speakers let the addressees know that that woman is now having an affair. The topic entity that was seen on stage but is now invisible is referred to, again, with the distal form ano- in Japanese, as in (10a), but with the medial form geu in Korean, as in (10b). In this case, ano hito ‘that person’ in Japanese and geu yeoja ‘that woman’ in Korean are uttered as the second mention of the relevant woman. In English, the woman is referred to using the pronoun she, not a demonstrative, here as well, as in (10c).

(10) a. Otokonohito-no usiro-de
man-GEN back-at
onnanohito-ga utat-teta-no
woman-NOM sing-PST-PST-NMLZ
oboet-teru?
remember-PRF

Ano[Sono/#Kono]-hito
that_distal[that_medial/this]-person
hurinsi-teru-n-datte.

have.an.affair-PST-PST-NMLZ-EVD_hearsay

b. Namja dwi-esoe yeoja-ga
man back-at woman-NOM
norachaeess-deon-geo saenggagna-ji?
sing-PST-PST.ADN-NMLZ remember-innit

Geu[Jeo/#I] yeoja
that_medial[that_distal/this] woman
bullyunha-goiss-dae.
have an affair prog evd hearsay

c. Do you remember that there was a woman singing behind the man? I hear she is having an affair.

However, these deictic forms can also serve as the first mention if the second utterances in (10a–b) (‘I hear she is having an affair’) are made without being preceded by the first utterances (‘Do you remember that there was a woman singing behind the man?’). Here again, the now invisible topic entity is referred to with the distal form in Japanese, and with the medial form in Korean, in both the first and second mention. In English, in contrast, it is encoded using the distal demonstrative or definite article (that woman or the woman) in the first mention but using the pronoun (she) in the second mention.

Table 4 sums up the distribution of the deictic forms to refer to the topic entities that were seen on the screen or stage but are now invisible.

5. Revision to stage-based models of speech event conception

5. 1 Partitioning and categorization in the Japanese, Korean, and English speech event conceptions

As we have demonstrated so far, Japanese employs a distal form to refer to invisible, or mental, topic entities in theater settings in both the first and second mention. On the other hand, Korean employs a medial form to refer to invisible or mental topic entities in theater settings in both the first and second mention. The Japanese use of a distal form to refer to invisible topic entities can be analyzed as an “extended” distal reference in spatial deixis, because those entities are located somewhere farther than visible distal entities, as can be seen in Figure 2, given in Section 2.2 above.

On the other hand, the Korean use of a medial form to refer to invisible topic entities can be viewed as an “aforementioned” medial reference in temporal deixis, as depicted in Figure 1, given in Section 2.2 above. Those entities are viewed as located in the addressee’s vicinity because they were once mentioned and their conceptions are now retrieved in the addressee’s mind. This aforementioned reference use of a medial form is reminiscent of the English definite article or the demonstrative that. The definite article is employed when the speaker assumes that the relevant nominal referent was previously mentioned or evoked (Lyons 1977: 671–672). Likewise, that is adopted for the referent that has been previously mentioned rather than the one that will be mentioned: One can introduce one’s explanation by saying This is my explanation, while one can “post-announce” one’s explanation by saying That is my explanation (Fillmore 1997: 104).

We are now in a position to generalize over the deictic forms used to refer to visible and invisible topic entities in a speech event located in a theater and a speech event related to it. The distribution of deictic forms in each type of

| Table 4: Deictic forms for reference to first- and second-mentioned invisible topic entities |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                 | Japanese                        | Korean                          | English                        |
|                                 | Movie | Musical/Play | Movie | Musical/Play | Movie | Musical/Play |
| First-mentioned                | invisible (mental) | ano ‘that distal’ | geu ‘that medial’ | he/she/it/that/the |
| Second-mentioned               | invisible (mental) | ano ‘that distal’ | geu ‘that medial’ | he/she/it/that/the |
Visible topic entities on the stage or screen in theater settings are conceptualized in terms of spatial deixis in both Japanese and Korean. In Japanese they are referred to primarily as proximal and secondarily as distal, but in Korean they are consistently referred to as distal. Meanwhile, invisible (mental) topic entities are conceptualized in terms of spatial deixis in Japanese, i.e. distal in the sense of ‘farther from speakers than visible distal.’ However, in Korean they are conceptualized in terms of both spatial and temporal deixis, i.e., medial in the sense of ‘now at the addressee’s hand’ and ‘mentioned before.’ In clear contrast, English presupposes no spatial deixis responsible for a proximal/distal distinction in theatrical settings; visible and invisible topic entities are all categorized in terms of gender and number (he/she/it/they) rather than distance and number (this/that/these/those).

As we have discussed so far, even when referring to the same topic entities in an identical theater setting, Japanese, Korean and English speakers are liable to use systematically different subcategories of spatial and temporal deixis. This implies that the three languages conventionally adopt different ways of partitioning and categorization in structuring the speech event settings located in and related to an actual theater. Likewise, even when referring to one and the same speech event, Japanese, Korean, and English speakers may assume different modes of partitioning and categorization in structuring a stage- or theater-based conception of speech event in general terms.

If any stage/theater-based conception is proposed as a generalized model of a speech event, applicable to a great many languages including Japanese, Korean, and English, it would be neither an extremely simple figure (e.g., Langacker 1991: 283-284) nor a cartoon-like drawing (e.g., Ide 2005: 51-52), found in earlier studies. We have to recognize some diversity in language-specific varieties of stage-based speech event conceptions, as will be demonstrated below. The next section outlines a possible modification required for a more satisfactory stage-based model of speech event conception.

### 5.2 Diverse possibilities of stage-based speech event conception

Arguing for the demonstrative mapping of Japanese, Korean, and English presented in Section 2.2, we discussed their diversity in partitioning and categorizing portions of theatrical settings in Sections 3 and 4, which is summarized in Section 5.1. Based on these, the stage-based model of speech event conception in Japanese, Korean, and English can be diagramed as in Figures 8 to 10 below, respectively. In
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8 The representation of these diagrams is partially
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---
those diagrams, the left and right person figures at the bottom represent the speaker and addressee, respectively, while the rectangle and the circle labeled visible stand for the stage and an entity thereon. On the other hand, the top right circle indicates an invisible entity, which was on stage but is now off stage. In the Korean conception, the proximal, medial, and distal are distinguished, as represented by three different colors: white, light grey, and dark grey, respectively. The visible, on-stage entity is construed as distal, while the invisible entity is construed as extended medial. This latter construal is attributable to the understanding that the invisible entity is part of the medial in that its concept is now available at hand to the addressee, i.e., in the addressee’s vicinity.

In the Japanese conception, a different type of proximal/medial/distal distinction is made, as represented by the above-mentioned color contrast. Here, the visible, on-stage entity is again construed as distal. Likewise, the invisible entity is construed as distal in that it is farther away than visible distal entities. In a real theater setting such as involving a motion picture or play, furthermore, the stage and the seating area for the audience can be interpreted as one whole that is now the speaker/addressee’s vicinity. Those particular cases illustrate an extended proximal, whereby part of the intrinsic deictic partitioning among proximal, medial, and distal are left out.

On the other hand, the English conception only distinguishes between proximal and distal and categorizes topic entities in the real theater settings (whether visible or invisible, and whether on-stage or off-stage) as extended distal. Nevertheless, those cases do not encourage the use of a distal demonstrative but a pronominal of the same effect of reference to the topic entities. Since the English distal includes the

adapted from the diagrams adopted in Koguma and Izutsu (forthcoming).
addressee’s proximity, such distal reference to those topic entities may possibly be due to the availability of their concepts to the addressee, as is the case with Korean.

Another dimension in which the speech event conceptions of the three languages differ is the plausible orientation of the speaker and addressee, who are aligned face-to-face in Korean but side-by-side in Japanese and English, as seen in the above figures. The fact that Korean isolates the addressee’s proximity on a par with the speaker’s proximity, i.e., medial, can be ascribed to the interpretation that the speaker and addressee face each other with their bodies oriented toward the stage in the speech event conception. Conversely, Japanese and English do not demarcate the addressee’s proximity from the speaker’s non-proximity (medial in Japanese and distal in English) and make a simply distance-based, three-way or two-way, distinction because in their speech event conceptions, the speaker and addressee are both put in the same alignment with their faces and bodies identically oriented toward the stage. In English, furthermore, the speaker/addressee distinction can be blurred, which may account for why Langacker’s (1991, 2008) representations of stage-based speech event conceptions often do not make such a distinction but depict the speaker and addressee as one whole G (ground) or C (conceptualizer).

We argue that such revisions of stage-based models of speech event conception as we are proposing are possible and even necessary to deal with many more observations on demonstrative uses and deictic phenomena in general: the English usage of a distal demonstrative for deictic reference to an obviously proximal entity in the speaker’s hand (Sawada 2013: 9–12); or the Korean use of a distal demonstrative in an apparently proximal reference to a man outside an apartment room with the speaker barely separated from him by the front door (Miyabayashi 2017: 26–30). In one of our ongoing pilot studies, we have further recognized that an entity coming up to and another going away from the speaker can be referred to differently in languages like Japanese and Korean: the former is more liable to be mentioned with a proximal form of demonstrative, while the latter with a distal form.9 For example, suppose that one actor is coming on to the stage (‘enters’), while another is going out (‘exits’). At the moment when the two actors are located at the same distance from the speaker and addressee, the entering actor seems more likely to be referred to with kono hito ‘this one’ and the exiting one with ano hito ‘that distant one’ in Japanese.

In a preliminary analysis, these phenomena turned out to concern the directionality of the pertinent topic entities in addition to the speaker and addressee’s orientation and motion. The directionality can be set in accordance with not only the motion of topic entities (including speech event participants) but also the pointing gesture and eye gaze of those participants. The relevant phenomena also involve what is now

9 The Central Alaskan Yup’ik Eskimo language is well known for the abundance of demonstrative forms (Jacobson: 1995; Tamura 2014), which could be interpreted in an easier and more straightforward way by extending our present analysis to their characteristic categorization. Some or most of the conceptual distinctions attested in those many distinctive demonstrative forms can turn out to be made in Japanese, Korean, and English as well. These three languages may only differ from Yup’ik in that such distinctions are encoded in a two-way or three-way system of demonstratives rather than an ‘intricate’ and ‘exotic’ multiple-way system.
well-known as fictive motion or change (Talmy 2000); we currently refer to the overall phenomena under the umbrella term of “dynamic deixis.” Our proposed revision of a stage-based speech event conception will hopefully help us to seek a more satisfactory explanation of what is collectively named demonstrative and its related spatial, temporal, and textual deixis.

6. Conclusion

As may be the case with many other languages, Japanese, Korean, and English adopt different conventional ways of partitioning and categorization in structuring a speech event conception located in a theater or a speech event conception related to it. Japanese does not but Korean does demarcate the stage or screen of a theater from the audience and categorize it as not proximal to either the speaker or addressee but as distal from both. This accounts for the two languages’ distinct choices of deictic expressions for topic entities on the stage/screen: proximal in Japanese and distal in Korean. In sharp contrast, English ordinarily does not make any comparable deictic distinction about such topic entities; it relies much more on their aforementioned or evoked status in the addressee’s knowledge and encourages the speaker to use a pronominal rather than a demonstrative. The conception of a theater as one self-contained unit encourages an intra-event perspective, as in Japanese, while the demarcation of the stage/screen from the audience promotes an extra-event perspective, as in Korean.

The relationship between the speaker/addressee and the content they talk about has been characterized in terms of a stage- or theater-based model of speech event (Langacker 1991; Ide 2005, inter alia), where the content and the speaker/addressee are compared to a play on the stage and its audience. Such a characterization has been shown to be responsible for various grammatical and pragmatic phenomena in many different languages. However, there can be some diversity in the structure and other characteristics of the presupposed stage-audience complex in each language. It is not surprising that stage-based models of speech event conception in different languages differ from one another to the extent that speech event conceptions in actual theater settings can differ from one language to another.

In either an actual setting of a stage/theater or an idealized speech event model based on it, topic entities can be assumed to be visible or invisible and mentioned for the first time, the second time, or more times in a stretch of discourse. Visible entities can be categorized based on a two-way, three-way, or multiple-way distinction (or with no distinction of distance from the speaker and/or the addressee): proximal, medial, distal, etc. The visibility or mention status of topic entities can also influence a particular (portion of) demonstrative mapping in some occasional settings and account partly for the relevant deictic distinction, as manifested in the difference between Korean and Japanese demonstrative reference to invisible topic entities. The speaker and addressee can be aligned differently in terms of their eye gaze and body (e.g., face-to-face, side-by-side, or as one unitary whole), on which the basic demonstrative mapping of each language can be grounded.

Theorizing a stage/theater-modeled conception of a speech event is sure to be considerably valid and effective for describing and analyzing many different languages, but it must be remembered that there can be a certain (or possibly even a considerable) degree of
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diversity in the structure and other characteristics of the presupposed conception with the relevant (sub)categorization of deictic elements even within a language. The speech event conception presupposed in the conversation setting (Izutsu and Izutsu 2017) and the narrative setting (Izutsu and Izutsu 2016) must be described quite differently. We have to recognize that a “writing event conception” is conceptualized as a considerably different kind of language production (Izutsu and Izutsu 2017). We hope to have shown that our proposed revision of a stage-based speech event conception is helpful for seeking viable accounts for these old and new issues in the foundation of human language.
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