

LINGUISTIC BINDING TOOLS: REFERENTIAL EXPRESSIONS AND CONTEXTUAL POINTERS

Hamroyev Sardor Akmaljon o'g'li

*Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Faculty of English Language, Intern Teacher,
Department of English Language Theory*

Annotation: *This article examines deixis, anaphora, and cataphora in discourse cohesion, in linguistics. It reviews theories by Bühler, Halliday, Hasan, Kesik, and Fauconnier, focusing on how referential devices like pronouns and demonstratives create textual continuity. The study explores how language users balance syntax, semantics, and pragmatics for effective communication. It analyzes complex narrative and expository structures, contributing to our understanding of discourse cohesion across languages. This research is relevant to linguists, discourse analysts, and semantics/pragmatics scholars studying in contexts.*

Keywords: *Deixis, Anaphora, Cataphora, Pragmatics, Cohesion in Language, Discourse Analysis, Referential Devices, Linguistic Semantics.*

Anaphora: A Complex Linguistic Phenomenon

Anaphora remains a contentious topic among linguists. Comparing it with cataphora and deixis offers fresh perspectives on past research and new areas to explore, while illuminating anaphoric functions.

Cataphora and Anaphora

Cataphora research has evolved from a structural view to a discourse phenomenon similar to anaphora. Various factors influence cataphora usage.

K. Bühler introduced 'cataphora' in his book 'Sprachtheorie', identifying 'prospective' (cataphora) and 'retrospective' (anaphora) syntactic indications [1, 121-122]. Halliday and Hasan explored this distinction in *Cohesion in English* [2, 35], noting the role of substitution and ellipsis.

Experts describe cataphora as anticipatory, maintaining structural connections with the right-hand context. Halliday and Hasan argue that 'cohesive cataphor' is less common and less crucial in text formation.

Kesik challenges Halliday and Hasan's ideas, highlighting two issues: the separation of structural and cohesive cataphora, and the categorization of the definite article 'the'. Kesik suggests treating certain noun phrases as single cataphoric expressions [3, 22].

M. Maillard's work introduces 'diaphore', encompassing both anaphora and cataphora, over 'endophore'. Halliday and Hasan, however, prefer 'endophore' in their studies [4, 50].

Maillard categorizes cataphoric units by distance from the referent and by levels - thinking, meaning, and sign-based. He further divides semiotic cataphoric units into metalinguistic and metadiscursive, and groups summarising anaphoric and cataphoric units as 'segmenting' or 'unifying' [4, 56].

T. Fraser and A. Joly's research shows cataphora has no connection to discursive memory, initially grouping it with exophora [5, 45]. M. Wilmet sees cataphora and synecdoche as essential components, a view M. Kesik disagrees with [6, 25]

Cataphore in Text Cohesion

J. Härma's study 'La cataphore pronominale en français' examines cataphore as a component of text cohesion. Härma takes a descriptive approach, viewing cataphore as a common thread connecting various relationships between pronouns, determinatives, and the following text [7, 50-70].

Charles Bally's book *General Linguistics and Questions of French Language* greatly influenced structuralism and linguistics. Bally proposed using "anticipation" instead of "cataphora" for signs that aid understanding before another sign [7, 170].

Generative linguists use different terms: 'regressive/backwards pronominalisation' for cataphora and 'progressive/forwards pronominalisation' for anaphora, based on Fauconnier's 1984 work.

M. Kesik explores cataphora's traits, distinguishing cognitive and metalinguistic cataphors from wide and narrow sense cataphors. He defines cataphora as a non-structural link between an indication expression and the following context that identifies the referent [3, 25-70].

Kesik builds on Maillard's work, explaining segmental diaphora (cataphoric unit before a simple text segment) and summarising diaphora (cataphoric unit before a predicate syntagm) [3, 40-56].

Kesik agrees with Maillard on the space between cataphoric unit and following text, noting 'intraphrastique' (elements in one sentence) and 'transphrastique' (all other cases) cataphors. Interphrase cataphora occurs through neutral pronouns and nominal summarizing syntagms [3, 41].

Kesik distinguishes cognitive and metalinguistic cataphora based on their indirect and direct relationships. Cognitive cataphora requires recognizing both elements to understand the referent, while metalinguistic cataphora allows quick grasp of the referent in the following linguistic unit [3, 44]

For cataphor in narrow and broad sense, Kesik limits the narrow sense to cases where context is crucial for referent identification. The broad sense includes situations where context isn't needed or acts as an optional addition [3, 47].

Cataphor and anaphor differ in information summarization and positioning. In summarizing cataphor, the following text isn't a complete sentence, while in anaphoric position, the referring sentence becomes a noun. This highlights cataphora's similarity to speech acts using performatives [3, 49].

Most cataphora studies focus on the anaphora/cataphora difference. Kesik notes two pre-existing approaches: the 'weak version' building on a backward vector idea, and the 'strong version' viewing cataphora as preparation for the anaphoric unit [3, 65]. Researchers like Maillard, Halliday, Hassan, Vilme, and Harm follow the first approach, while Lyons and Lehr follow the second.

Cataphora and Anaphora

M. Kesik's research shows cataphora is more than reversed anaphora [3, 102]. They work together to create references, with key differences:

1. Anaphora points to living people (first-order units), while cataphora connects to non-noun units (second and third-order units like events).
2. Cataphora introduces new information in impersonal sentence sections, while anaphora handles familiar elements in the main part.
3. Anaphora uses third-person pronouns, while cataphora often uses neutral pointing words.

These differences suggest that viewing cataphora as reversed anaphora isn't helpful. They're usually not interchangeable, except in periphrastic cataphors.

Deixis

Anaphora relates to deixis ('indication' in Greek), which interests many scholars. It's described using terms like 'deictic', 'shifters', and 'egocentric elements' [10, 5].

Deixis makes things real by putting words into specific time and place settings. It centers on three points - I, here, now - tied to reality [10, 5].

As a space-time tool, deixis impacts communication by helping speakers locate themselves and objects. This suggests deictic elements show how we perceive space and time.

Some experts group personal pronouns with deictic elements, contrary to B. Pottier's view. This creates a third connection point. Deixis occurs in three areas: place, time, and people in communication, identifying spatial, temporal, and personal deixis [9, 188].

J. Dubois' dictionary also recognizes these three types. Deixis happens when someone mentions the speech situation, connecting words to time, people, and place [8, 637]. J. Kleiber agrees, seeing deictic elements as words indicating text parts, placing speech in context [10, 5].

Summarizing the connections between anaphora, cataphora, and deixis, our understanding of cataphora has evolved. Once seen as repositioned anaphora, it's now viewed as similar but distinct in speech, with unique core, details, and shape. Deixis places speakers in time and space. While anaphora and deixis are linked, calling anaphora a special deixis type is debated.

REFERENCES:

1. **Karl Bühler** - *Language Theory: The Representative Function of Language*. - M.: 1993.
2. **M.A.K. Halliday., R. Hasan** - *Cohesion in English*. London - New-York: Longman, 1976. 15th ed., 1997.
3. **M. Kesik** - *La cataphore*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1989.-P. 21-65.
4. **M. Maillard** - *Comment ÇA fonctionne*. Thèse de doctorat d'État. Université de Paris X-Nanterre, 1987.P-50-70.
5. **T. Fraser., A. Joly** - *Le système de la déixis: Endophore et cohésion discursive en anglais // Modèles linguistiques*. - 1980.

6. M. Wilmet - *La détermination nominale*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1986.
7. Charles Bally - *General Linguistics and Questions of French Language*, –M.: 2001. - 403 c.
8. J. Dubois - '*Le dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage*'. Éditeur: Larousse, 2013
9. B. Pottier - *Linguistique Générale*.(Research related to deixis and personal pronouns). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.
10. G. Kleiber- *Référence, texte et embrayeurs // Semen*. – 1989.