

UDC 81.25

<https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/71/46>

PECULIARITIES OF DEIXIS AND ANAPHORA IN SPEECH DISCOURSE

©*Rakhmatova O.*, ORCID: 0000-0002-6664-7638, Fergana Polytechnic Institute,
Fergana, Uzbekistan, ferpi_info@edu.uz

ОСОБЕННОСТИ ДЕЙКСИСА И АНАФОРЫ В РЕЧЕВОМ ДИСКУРСЕ

Рахматова О. К., ORCID: 0000-0002-6664-7638, Ферганский политехнический институт,
г. Фергана, Узбекистан, ferpi_info@edu.uz

Abstract. This article considers peculiarities of deixis and anaphora in speech discourse. The author of the article believes that the separation of deictic and anaphora relations as independent objects of research in linguistics is associated with the consideration of the problems of deixis as a category of general activity theory, communicative-functional, pragmatic and cognitive linguistics, and anaphora as a category of text/discourse linguistics, which provides its structural-syntactic and semantic coherence. This explains the transition from the study of the characteristics of syntactic anaphora, mainly pronouns, within the sentence/utterance to the consideration of text / discourse anaphora.

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются особенности дейксиса и анафоры в речевом дискурсе. Автор статьи считает, что выделение дейктического и анафорического отношений в качестве самостоятельных объектов исследования в лингвистике связано с рассмотрением проблематики дейксиса, как коммуникативно-функциональной, прагматической и когнитивной лингвистики, а анафоры — как категории лингвистики текста/дискурса, обеспечивающей его структурносинтаксическую и семантическую связность. Этим объясняется переход от изучения характеристик синтаксической анафоры, главным образом местоименной, внутри предложения/высказывания к рассмотрению текстовой / дискурсивной анафоры.

Keywords: deixis, anaphora, speech discourse, structural-syntactic, semantic coherence, sentences, utterances, pragmatic and cognitive linguistics.

Ключевые слова: дейксис, анафора, речевой дискурс, структурносинтаксическая, семантическая связность, предложения, высказывания, прагматическая и когнитивная лингвистика.

Discussion

Representing the two global functions of language — communicative and cognitive — deixis and anaphora as indexical means of language, along with modality and reference, are the system-forming components of speech interaction. Since these indexical elements are served by the same linguistic means, the question of their correlation remains unresolved in modern linguistics. The study of speech behavior from the position of linguopragmatics allowed to deeper comprehend not only the structure of interaction between interactants, but also the mechanisms of realization of their intentions in the process of communication [1].

All indicative means in the language are traditionally divided into two large groups: deixis¹ and anaphora², but the question about the relationship between deixis and anaphora has not received unambiguous coverage and is controversial in modern linguistics. In the modern linguistics the boundary between the anaphoric and deictic uses of linguistic means cannot always be made: some language forms, traditionally related to the deictic, under certain conditions can be transformed into the anaphoric indicative form.

The way the language is written is not always clear. Precisely because the same linguistic means can realize the function of both deictic and anaphoric references depending on the conditions of their use, anaphora was originally distinguished as a subtype of deixis [2, 3].

The separation of anaphora as a subtype of deixis (a concept known from ancient times) goes back to the ideas of K. Bühler [4], who strictly distinguished between deictic and nominative language signs. Deictic language signs according to C. Bühler do not name a class of objects, phenomena, actions, in contrast to nominative signs. He described the deictic system of language in the form of an index field (Zeigefeld), based on the linguistic designation of the positions of the center of coordinates (Origo): “I” — “here” — “now”. K. Bühler characterizes these deictic linguistic signs as the main ones in the deixis sphere [4]. They serve as a reference point for the semantics of deictic units in the system of deixis and point, respectively, to the speaker “I” (personal deixis), to the location of the speaker “here” (spatial deixis) and to the time of the statement “now” (temporal deixis).

Relying on the ideas of C. Brugmann, K. Bühler considers deixis as a linguistic tool for focusing the attention of the addressee, on some element of the rapidly changing deictic space, i. e. as a function of the relation of the statement with the spatial and temporal coordinates of the act of speaking. He distinguishes three types of deixis as a way of linguistic indication:

–Deixis visual (visible) as an indication of what is in the field of view of the speaker and the listener (in Y. D. Apresyan’s terminology it is “primary deixis” [5]).

–Contextual or anaphoric deixis, containing a reference to a previously used word.

Deixis am Phantasma (or “secondary deixis” [4, 6, 7]), indicating what is absent from the speaker's sight and not mentioned in the context, but known to the interlocutors on the basis of their interlocutors on the basis of their knowledge about this subject, with the knowledge acquired before the given situation [4].

Thus, K. Bühler explicitly pointed to two phenomena derived from deixis proper: anaphora and deixis to the imaginary. Anaphoric indication in his concept is a special case of deictic on the basis of the general nature of the indication. He argues that the Indo-European languages use largely the same words for referencing in anaphora as they do for indicating in the imaginary deixis [4].

This is the understanding that anaphora receives in many studies. Thus, O. Ducrot and C. Todorov speak of the indicative deixis ‘deixis indicielle’ and the anaphoric deixis ‘deixis anaphorique’ [8], thus emphasizing the similarity of the mechanism of referent identification for language expressions of this type. Taking into account the “inclination of deixis”, S. G. Proskurin and O. M. Orekhova distinguish situative deixis, imaginary deixis, discursive deixis and anaphoric deixis, the functional features of which are revealed in the use of certain lexical and grammatical constructions [9]. These units are introduced to describe the orientational properties of language,

¹ Deixis (Greek *δείξις* — *indication*) in linguistics is an indication as a meaning or function of a language unit, expressed by lexical and grammatical means.

² Anaphora (from the Greek *ἀναφορά* “*anaphora*”, lit. “*ascent*”) is a stylistic figure consisting in the repetition of linguistic elements: sounds, words or word groups at the beginning of each parallel row, that is, in the repetition of the initial parts of two or more relatively independent segments of speech (half verses, verses, phrases or sentences)

correlating objects and situations, relative to which in language the reference is made with the spatio-temporal zero mark — here-and-now — in the context of the statement [10].

There are three most common points of view on this problem.

According to the first point of view, anaphora is derived from deixis, which is explained by the presence of a unifying categorical criterion — the function of instruction [4, 6]. This point of view goes back to the ideas of C. Buhler [4]. In his concept, the language deictics, unlike the nominative signs naming objects and phenomena, form their deictic system in the form of an indicative field (Zeigefeld) on the basis of linguistic actualization of the center of speech act coordinates (Origo): “I” — “here” — “now” [8]. K. Buhler considers anaphora a partial case of deixis, justifying his point of view by the widespread use in the Indo-European languages mainly the same words for reference as for adocus ‘visual deixis’ [4]. A similar interpretation of the phenomenon of anaphora received in the studies of O. Ducrot and C. Todorov [8].

They distinguish index deixis (deixisindicielle) and deixis anaphorique (deixisanaphorique) [8].

According to the second point of view, deixis and anaphora have no clear boundaries and are closely interrelated, since the nature of these two linguistic phenomena is identical. According to N. D. Arutyunova, the difference lies in the subjectivity of deixis and objectivity of anaphora [6], which allows us to explain the ability of some language units, traditionally belonging to the typical deictic, to perform anaphoric function under certain conditions. Conducting a similar differentiation of deictic and anaphora on the example of the use of spatial adverbs, the object valence of which can be filled in implicitly in the absence of the preposition combination with the name in the indirect case in the text (I am far from home and I am far away) [11], E. S. Yakovleva speaks of two possible interpretations: anaphorically — when the adverbial phrase is correlated with the previously mentioned object (Ivan sat down in the first row and Masha was situated nearby) and deictically, when the speaker acts as a point of reference in relation to which the description of the situation is constructed (Masha is nearby) [11].

According to the third point of view, deixis and anaphora are independent phenomena of different order: deixis is an indication of the elements of the situation of the speech act, anaphora is an indication of the elements of the context [2]. According to a number of researchers, the differences between deixis and anaphora should be sought in the procedural aspect of the analysis of linguistic material [3, 9, 11]. Thus, the deictic procedure allows the speaker to focus the attention of the listener on some component of deictic space — the situation of the outside world, accompanying the communicative act. In each specific case this deictic space is filled “With the anaphoric procedure, the speaker directs the addressee to maintain the established focus of attention on the already mentioned element” [12].

Analyzing the differences between the mechanisms of the anaphoric and deictic types of pointing in the framework of the theory of reference, E. M. Wolf notes that, despite the presence of a unifying anaphora and deixis-function of pointing, the difference consists in the object of pointing and its localization. Based on two elements — the deictic sign and its referent, the relationship between which is established directly, deictic pointing implies a single operation: deictic element → referent. On the basis of the ratio of three elements — two linguistic signs, one of which should be deictic, and the referent, to which both of these signs refer [13], anaphoric indicating as a procedure for building a relationship between the antecedent as the independent sentence member already mentioned in this text and the anaphor is more complex and involves at least two operations: source → referent, referent → anaphor.

The functional difference between deixis and anaphora, according to A. A. Kibrik, is that anaphora is necessary for the coagulated mention of information already actualized and contained in the continuum of discourse, while for deixis this parameter is irrelevant [12].

Thus, deixis and anaphora, in spite of the presence of a universal categorical criterion — the function of indicating, act as independent linguistic phenomena with unique characteristics in procedural, semantic and functional aspects.

References:

1. Kadirjanovna, R. O. (2021). Pragmalinguistic Concepts of the Phenomenon of Speech Behavior and Speech Discourse. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(5), 495-500. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i5.2699>
2. Kleiber, G. (1991). Anaphore-deixis: où en sommes-nous?. *L'information grammaticale*, 51(1), 3-18.
3. Paducheva, E. V. (1996). Семантические исследования: Семантика времени и вида в рус. яз. Семантика нарратива. Moscow. (in Russian).
4. Byuler, K. (2000). Теория языка. Moscow. (in Russian).
5. Apresyan, Yu. D. (1995). Избранные труды. Moscow. (in Russian).
6. Arutyunova, N. D. (1988). Типы языковых значений. Moscow. (in Russian).
7. Veselkova, O. N. (2004). Temporal'naya organizatsiya nemetskogo narrativa: Deikticheskaya traktovka preterita: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Tambov. (in Russian).
8. Ducrot, O., & Todorov, T. (1972). *Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage*. FeniXX.
9. Proskurin, S. G., & Orekhova, O. M. (2008). Autopoezis deikticheskikh matrits. *Kritika i semiotika*, (12), 126-134. (in Russian).
10. Laionz, D. (2009). Язык и лингвистика: вводный курс. Moscow. (in Russian).
11. Yakovleva, E. (1994). Fragments russkoyazychnoi kartiny mira: modeli prostranstva, vremeni i vospriyatiya. Moscow. (in Russian).
12. Kibrik, A. A. (2003). Analiz diskursa v kognitivnoi perspektive: avtoref. dis. ... d-ra filol. nauk. Moscow. (in Russian).
13. Volf, E. M. (1974). Grammatika i semantika mestoimenii: Na materiale ibero-roman. yaz. Moscow. (in Russian).

Список литературы:

1. Kadirjanovna R. O. Pragmalinguistic Concepts of the Phenomenon of Speech Behavior and Speech Discourse //International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding. 2021. V. 8. №5. P. 495-500. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i5.2699>
2. Kleiber G. Anaphore-deixis: où en sommes-nous? // L'information grammaticale. 1991. V. 51. №1. P. 3-18.
3. Падучева Е. В. Семантические исследования: Семантика времени и вида в рус. яз. Семантика нарратива. М., 1996. 464 с.
4. Бюлер К. Теория языка. М.: Прогресс, 2000. 501 с.
5. Апресян Ю. Д. Избранные труды. М.: Восточная литература, 1995. 472 с.
6. Арутюнова Н. Д. Типы языковых значений. М.: Наука, 1988. 338 с.
7. Веселкова О. Н. Темпоральная организация немецкого нарратива: Дейктическая трактовка претерита: автореф. дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Тамбов, 2004. 24 с.

8. Ducrot O., Todorov T. Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage. – FeniXX, 1972.
9. Проскурин С. Г., Орехова О. М. Аутопозис дейктических матриц // Критика и семиотика. 2008. №12. С. 126-134.
10. Лайонз Д. Язык и лингвистика: вводный курс. М.: Либроком, 2009. 317 с.
11. Яковлева Е. Фрагменты русскоязычной картины мира: модели пространства, времени и восприятия. М.: Гнозис, 1994. С. 343.
12. Кибрик А. А. Анализ дискурса в когнитивной перспективе: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. М., 2003. 90 с.
13. Вольф Е. М. Грамматика и семантика местоимений: на материале иберо-роман. яз. М.: Наука, 1974. 224 с.

*Работа поступила
в редакцию 21.09.2021 г.*

*Принята к публикации
24.09.2021 г.*

Ссылка для цитирования:

Rakhmatova O. Peculiarities of Deixis and Anaphora in Speech Discourse // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2021. Т. 7. №10. С. 420-424. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/71/46>

Cite as (APA):

Rakhmatova, O. (2021). Peculiarities of Deixis and Anaphora in Speech Discourse. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 7(10), 420-424. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/71/46>