

CORRELATION OF IT-DEIXIS AND DISCOURSE REGISTER

The present paper is focused on the IT-deixis investigation and its correlation with some discourse registers – fiction register (judicially marked and non-marked) and newspaper register (banking-marked and non-marked) in English. The defined IT-deixis functions in various discourse registers reveal its contentive complexity.

Key words: deixis, discourse, register, correlation, function, anaphora, cataphora.

Discourse analysis is a rather young linguistic discipline, which was mainly established in the 1960s and 70s emerging from three linguistic trends: rhetoric, text and communication. Among discourse forming constructs, one can reveal deictic markers of person (the Speaker, the Receptient, the Person/Object spoken of), time (NOW::THEN), place (HERE::THERE).

Person deixis: (1) **I/WE** and (2) **YOU**

Person deixis involves the speaker (I) and the addressee (you). In conversation, each person constantly changes from being “**I**” to being “**YOU**”. This kind of deixis operates on a three-part division, exemplified by the pronouns for the first person I, second person you , and third person he, she, it.

Anaphoric deixis is backward pointing, and is the norm in English texts. Examples include personal and demonstrative pronouns: he, this, such, similar, (the) same. Cataphoric deixis is forward pointing. Examples include: the following, certain, some (“the speaker raised some objections...”), this (“Let me say this...”), these, several.

Time deixis : **NOW:: NOT-NOW** → Before NOW + AFTER NOW → THEN→

Time deixis: **NOW** :: **THEN** is reference made to particular times relative to some other time, most currently the time of utterance, for example, the use of the words *now* or *soon*, or the use of tenses.

Place: **HERE** (near the Speaker) :: **THERE** (far from the Speaker). This deixis has the most basic distinction between deictical expression being "near Speaker" (proximal terms) and "away from Speaker" (distal terms). Place deixis is a spatial location relative to the spatial location of the speaker. It can be proximal or distal, or sometimes medial. It can also be either bounded (indicating a spatial region with a clearly defined boundary, e.g. in the room) or unbounded (indicating a spatial region without a clearly defined boundary, e.g. over there). According either to the Speaker or to the Receptient factor we can distinguish between (A) the Speaker's oriented deictic words and (B) the Receptient's oriented deictic words:

A. **I** :: **HERE** :: **NOW**. B. **YOU** :: **THERE** :: **THEN**

Wherein the place of the IT-deixis of the Person/Object spoken of is not defined in the formulae. However the whole anglo-phone world view can be referred to by the IT-deixis, the Speaker's (It's me) and the Receptient's (It's you),

Deictic words link the features of reality with their verbalized units within the discourse itself. K.Ehrlich focused his study on the common and differential features of anaphora and deixis [Ehrlich 1992, c.315-338]. Discourse deixis is reference to a fragment of a discourse relative to the speaker's current “location” in discourse. Therefore the discourse unit is an internal means of reference. Contextual use of deictic expressions is known as secondary deixis, or endophoric deixis. Such expressions can refer either backwards or forwards to other elements in a discourse. Their interpretation depends on the discourse register, the context, and the speaker's intention.

The discourse functions of IT-deixis and its correlation with a definite discourse register is investigated in the present paper for a further development of Deixis theory and Discourse-analysis. The object of the present investigation is the “it”- third person pronoun functioning in the fiction discourse to determine its functional semantics. Personal Pronouns in English are used to replace nouns that refer to people. They can be used as the sentences subject or object [See our paper on the correlation of the personal deixis and the imperative sentence [Михайленко 2002, с.80-84]. The NE third person pronouns Singular distinguish number, case and gender in NE and OE with some peculiarities: neuter nominative and accusative singular forms are the same in NE (*it*), cf.: OE forms are the same (*hit, hit*);

neuter and masculine nominative and accusative singular forms are not the same in NE (*it, him*), OE forms are not the same (*hit, he; hit, hine*);

neuter and masculine genitive singular forms are not the same in NE (*its, his*), cf.: OE forms are the same (*his, his*);

neuter and masculine dative singular forms are not the same in NE (*it, him*), cf.: OE forms are the same (*him, him*);

neuter and masculine accusative singular forms are not the same in NE (*it, him*), cf.: OE forms are not the same (*hit, hine*).

The NE third person pronoun Singular: Masc. Fem. Neut. Nom. *he, she, it*; Poss. *his, her, hers, its*; Obj.

him, her, it. In OE these three were formed from the same root; namely, masculine *hē*, feminine *hēo*, neuter *hit*. The form *hit* (for *it*) is still heard in vulgar English, and *hoo* (for *hēo*) in some dialects of England [Ehrlich 1992, c.315-338].

One of the discourse strategies is employed to interpret zero anaphora *it* used in the novel “A Time to Kill” by John Grisham. The pronoun *it* is one of the most frequent words in the English language, accounting for about 1% of tokens in discourse and over a quarter of all third-person pronouns. See the statistics:

nominative/objective *it* -1885;
 nominative/objective *it* + ‘s (contracted *is* or *has*) – 228;
 nominative *it* + ‘ll (contracted *will*) - 24;
 nominative *it* + ‘d (contracted *would*) – 5;
 possessive *its* – 41.

Cf.: *he* – 5031; *his* – 1859; *him* – 860; *himself* – 76; *she* – 784; *her* – 961; *herself* 10.

There are totally 2183 *it*-units in the discourse length -910033 word forms. In comparison with *it*-units third persons singular *he* (*he* - 5031, *his* -1859, *him* 860, *himself*- 76) and *she* (*she* -784; *her*- 961; *herself* – 10) constitute the total number – 9581. These simple counts strongly indicate whether another noun can replace the pronoun. Thus we can distinguish between a) pronouns that refer to nouns, and b) all other instances: including those that have no antecedent,

We suggest a discourse processing task - to comprehend the meaning of *it* which is difficult presumably because coreference of *it* – pronoun and its antecedents is not revealed. As part of this task, coreference resolution systems must decide which pronouns refer to preceding noun phrases (called antecedents) and which do not. Let’s process the following context:

A. Lawyer and Client’s Discourse:

Carl Lee (father of the suffered girl):"You ready for another one?"

Jake (a lawyer):"Don't do it (1), Carl Lee. It (2)'s not worth it (3). What if you're convicted and get the gas chamber? What about the kids? Who'll raise them? Those punks aren't worth it (4)."

Carl Lee "You just told me you'd do it (5)."

Jake walked to the door next to Carl Lee: "It (6)'s different with me. I could probably get off."

We shall correlate the registered *IT* with its antecedent:

1. ← (Don't) Kill them “(offenders)

In this case the sentence in the pre-context is the antecedent of it (1)

2. Here (1) and (2) have one and the same antecedent (Don't) Kill them “(offenders)

3. → What if you're convicted and get the gas chamber?

In the second example the sentence in the post-context correlates with *IT*.

4. ← What if you're convicted and get the gas chamber?

In the third example the semantic component of the three sentences in the pre-context “your death” is the antecedent of *IT*-3.

5. ← Kill them “(offenders).

Here the antecedent of *IT* – 3-4.

6. (the situation) ← It's different with me.

The situation and its consequence described in the pre-context of *IT*-6 is quite different [3.]. The goal of coreference resolution is to determine which noun phrases in a discourse refer to the same real-world entity. As part of this task, coreference resolution systems must decide which pronouns refer to preceding noun phrases (called antecedents) and which do not. In particular, a long-standing challenge has been to correctly classify instances of the English pronoun *it*.

Thus let’s substitute *it* with the semantic components defined due to the discourse processing strategy: (1) –“killing”; (2) –“killing”; (3) – “life”; (4) –“death”; (5) - (3);

(6) – “situation”:

B. Carl Lee (father of the suffered girl):"You ready for another one?"

Jake (a lawyer):"Don't kill them(1), Carl Lee. To kill them (2) (i)'s not worth your life (3). What if you're convicted and get the gas chamber? What about the kids? Who'll raise them? Those punks aren't worth your life (4)."

Carl Lee "You just told me you'd kill them (5)."

Jake walked to the door next to Carl Lee: "The situation (6) is different with me. I could probably get off."

Now we shall define the functional semantics of *IT* through its correlation with antecedents/

C. Lawyer’s Assistant’s Discourse:

Look, *it*'s a thorough study of the law by a gifted law student with a remarkable ability to think and write clearly. *It*'s a work of genius, and *it*'s yours, and *it*'s absolutely free. J.Grisham.

In this case all *IT*'s have one referent: *IT* 1-4 - a *brief* (a *study*, a *dissertation*) linking this fragment of discourse by means of the anaphoric *IT* and the same antecedent.

D. Father and Son's Discourse:

"**It** ain't right," he muttered, all the way to the corner of the square where we found Atticus waiting. Atticus was standing under the street light looking as though nothing had happened: his vest was buttoned, his collar and tie were neatly in place, his watch-chain glistened, he was his impassive self again.

"**It** ain't right, Atticus," said Jem.

"No son, **it's** not right." Harper Lee.

IT 1-3 refer to the trial's verdict "guilty", so the trial is a referent of the deixis.

E. Trial discourse:

"Mr. Hailey does not deserve the death penalty. But the two men who raped his daughter certainly did."

"I see. How do you determine who gets **it** (1) and who doesn't?"

"That's very simple. You look at the crime and you look at the criminal. If **it** (2)'s a dope dealer who guns down an undercover narcotics officer, then he gets the gas. If **it**(3)'s a drifter who rapes a three-year-old girl, drowns her by holding her little head in a mudhole, then throws her body off a bridge (...). If **it**(4)'s an escaped convict who breaks into a farmhouse late at night and beats and tortures an elderly couple before burning them with their house, then you strap him in a chair (...). And if **it**(5)'s two dopeheads who gang-rape a ten-year-old girl and (...), then you happily, merrily, thankfully, gleefully lock them in a gas chamber and listen to them squeal. **It**(6)'s very simple."

Every *IT* has its referent in this fragment of discourse: It1 – a death penalty; It2-5 – a criminal; It-6 – a criminal case. In all these cases *IT* refers to a criminal case under discussion, despite their different referents. Thus the anaphoric *IT* though referring to different antecedents it links the given fragment of the discourse. M.A.WALKER tries to relate anaphora to the discourse structure relationship [WALKER, P.401-435].

F. The character's inner discourse:

Was **it** a novel? A short story? Just looking into the box, **it** was impossible to tell. (...) If **it** was a novel, and this box contained all of **it**, **it** had to be longer than "Gone With the Wind". Was that possible? Lisey supposed **it** might be. Scott always showed her his work when **it** was done, and he was happy to show her work in progress if she asked about **it** (...), but if she didn't ask, he usually kept **it** to himself. Stephen King.

IT-1 and IT-3 are anaphoric units and sentence structuring means; IT-2 is attitudinal marker; IT- 4-5-6 refer to the antecedent "novel"; IT-7-8-9 have their referent "work". The referents "novel", "story", "work" are synonyms their use depends upon the author's intention. IT - 4-9 help to avoid the noun redundancy making the language authentic.

G. Newspaper Discourse

The visit to Dublin would be the last piece in the normalisation in relations between the two neighbours and fellow European Union members, and important trading partners. (...)

It follows key landmarks such as the publication of the [judicial report last year into the Bloody Sunday killings](#), when 13 civil rights protestors were shot dead by British soldiers in Londonderry in 1972. (...)

It also follows last year's important decision to restore responsibility for policing to local Northern Ireland politicians.

"As Republicans, Sinn Fein is very aware of the symbolism of a state visit by Queen Elizabeth of England and of the offence it will cause to many Irish citizens, particularly victims of British rule and those with legacy issues in this state and in the North." Queen to visit Ireland. FT, March 6, '11. IT 1-3 (in the article of 600 word length) refer to the antecedent "visit". We can compare another article of the same length ("Banks face up to a personal touch" FT, March 4 2011.) wherein IT-1 and ITS- 1-2 have one and the same referent "bank"

Conclusions.

1. A comparative analysis of the register type and the use of IT-deixis we can draw the conclusion on their close correlation – the more topically marked register, the more linked IT-deixis and the antecedent. Mainly, the antecedent remains the same reflecting the article title, for example, in the newspaper discourse.

2. IT-deixis is used to link the discourse structural parts.

3. At the same time to help the Interlocutors or the Reader support the discourse contentive plane.

4. In case of IT-deixis verbalizing the discourse may lose its authenticity and include some redundant units.

References

Михайленко В.В. Дейкитичність займенника-підмета у спонукальному реченні давньогерманських мов./В.В.Михайленко // Наукові записки Тернопільського державного педагогічного університету. Серія: Мовознавство. - Тернопіль: ТДПУ, 2002. –С.80-84. Ehrlich K. Anaphora and deixis: Same, similar, or different? /K. Ehrlich // - Jarvella, Klein (eds.). -Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. - Pp.315-338. Walker A. 1998. Centering, anaphora resolution, and discourse structure. / M.A. Walker, A.K. Joshi , E.F.Prince (eds.). // Centering Theory in Discourse. - Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998. – Pp. 401-435.