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ABSTRACT

The process of communication is based on two types of information: given (old) and new. Given information is the information shared by the speaker and the addressee; new information is the information known to the speaker only or the given information actualized (made relevant) by the speaker. In the process of communication the speaker uses two bare mechanisms or environments to generate given information: non-linguistic and linguistic. The purpose of this study was to demonstrate the generation of givenness in a linguistic and a non-linguistic environment in monologues and dialogues in literary text. The novel by Curt Vonnegut “Cat’s cradle” was selected as a corpus for the analysis of given information in literary text. The research demonstrated that the choice of mechanism used for the generation of given elements is directly related to the choice of linguistic means: using a non-linguistic mechanism the speaker heavily relies on the physical context, the dominance of deictic expressions were used. Using a linguistic mechanism (first and second mention sequence) the speaker relies on the following linguistic devices: the article, personal and demonstrative pronouns. The considerable part of given items was established by so called ready-made given items which express given information derived from the shared geographical and cultural environment. The functioning of non-linguistic mechanism, which was realized by the interactions (monologues), was restricted by the specificity of the presentation of the situation: unlike natural-non verbal situations, situations in fiction are designed for the reader, who would be not able to identify the entities by the direct pointing, with the help of demonstratives. Therefore, the interaction did not indicate such deictics.
INTRODUCTION

In producing an utterance, the speaker generally presupposes some information. The information presupposed is information familiar to both the speaker and the addressee. In the linguistic literature, shared information is generally referred to as given information. The information familiar to the speaker only is new information to the addressee. The speaker producing the sentence has the addressee in mind; he or she uses the sentence to make contact with the addressee by telling him or her something he or she does not know yet. Both types of information, given and new, are two inalienable parts of the text sentence. The function of given information is to serve as a peg on which new information is hung. Being a peg, given information organizes the sentence syntactically: the choice of one or another given entity as the starting point (the theme) affects the syntax of the sentence. It is through thematic given information that the text sentences are linked communicatively. In creating a connected text, the speaker continuously generates or uses ready-made given constituents and uses them as themes in the sentences. If the “new” constituents move the text forward, “given” constituents organize the text syntactically.

The notion of Givenness is a relatively old notion. It dates back to the time of Prof. Mathesus, who was the first linguist to introduce the notion of functional sentence perspective, the terms given and new information, and theme and rheme.

Firbas (1992) associated thematicity with the constituent conveying a lower degree of communicative dynamism (CD), which in practice refers to given information: given constituents convey the lowest degree of CD. However, not all such constituents present shared knowledge.

In the process of communication, the speaker has to identify the entities he or she refers to the addressee. He or she does it by referring to the entities using appropriate words. The entities referred to present either shared (given) information or non-shared (new) information: e.g: *a book* vs. *the book*. The speaker has to mark words expressing Given information. The types of markers of Givenness are determined by the type of shared environment the entity is used in.

We can distinguish the following types of shared environments:

- Non-linguistic
- linguistic
- cultural
- geographical
How is givenness generated in a linguistic environment?

To generate Givenness, the speaker has to introduce an entity into the discourse. An entity thus introduced turns into given information: now the information is in the consciousness of the addressee, too. The entity, which is now familiar to both the speaker and the addressee, can be used for a second time and thus serve as a communicative link between the sentences. As can be seen, givenness in a linguistic environment is realized in two stages:

- First mention stage
- Second (subsequent) mention stage. In other words, it is realized anaphorically or cataphorically.

Givenness can be expressed verbally and non-verbally. The markers of givenness can be found both in monologues and dialogues placed in literary texts and produced immediately by the speaker. In the further analysis, we are going to analyze givenness in monologues and in dialogues in literary text.

The purpose of the study is to find out which markers of givenness are used in a non-linguistic environment and a linguistic environment.

The objectives of the research paper

In order to achieve the aim, the following tasks were set:

- To overview the theoretical material on Givenness and its realization presented by different linguists;
- To reveal how Givenness is generated in a linguistic and a non-linguistic environment in monologues and dialogues;
- To describe and compare the use of markers of Givenness in a linguistic and a non-linguistic environment.

The research methods and materials

To achieve the best results, the descriptive, the inductive and the deductive methods were used: the examples selected were described and appropriate conclusions were made.

The examples used for the analysis were taken from Kurt Vonnegut’s novel “Cat’s cradle” (1970).
The novelty of the research

Current work presents the first attempt to describe the realization of givenness in monologues and dialogues in literary text.

The theoretical and practical value of the research

The paper presents a contribution to the general theory of production and interpretation of a connected text. The results of the research can be used in teaching students the art of writing and the analysis of the text.
1. THE PROBLEMS OF THE INFORMATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE SENTENCE

1.1. The sentence as dialectical entity of given and new

Language is the most powerful and unique semiotic system which gives humans the possibility to interact and to convey their thoughts. Communication is the process of interaction between the speaker or the writer and the listener or the reader. Communicating information, the speaker or writer has to choose language means that are the most appropriate for the circumstances of the interaction. According to Valeika (2002:4), the speaker/the writer chooses an appropriate sentence pattern to convey the information. The pattern he or she chooses is often determined by the content of the information.

Halliday defines information as “a process of interaction between what is already known or predictable and what is new and unpredictable.” (1985: 274-5). The said interaction constitutes the informational structure of an utterance, and the theory concerned with the informational structure of the sentence is generally referred to as functional sentence perspective (FSP).

The theory of communicate sentence analyses is a relatively new field of study. Consequently, there is still disagreement and confusion concerning the pragmatic aspects of given and new information.

The Czech scholar V Mathesius, who initiated the theory of functional sentence perspective, thought that text- beginning sentences express only new information, or there is nothing that can be inferred from the preceding text: the reader was not familiarized with the information presented in the sentence. Such sentences, according to the aforementioned scholar, contain no given information; they cannot be said to have the Theme, which is given information, used as the point of departure.

Mathesius (1975), identifying thematic elements as the elements recoverable from the context, concluded that text initial sentences are communicatively indivisible units: they contain only new or rhetorical information. Accepting the scholar’s view, we shall not be able to account for the arrangement of constituents in such sentences: Consider:

\textbf{Once upon a time there lived a king.}

The circumstance of time is used at the beginning of the sentence, instead of being put in end position. In point of fact, this sentence does contain given information, and the given information has been turned into the Theme. The sentence is built on the information the speaker and the addressee know. The speaker cannot violate this principle. If he or she does, the sentence has no communicative validity, or to use a pragmatic term, it has no
perlocutionary effect. The sentence discussed above, according to Valeika (2001), is not an initial sentence. It could have been used by the father, at the child’s bed:

“Now listen to me. I will tell you a story. (which happened a long time ago). Once upon a time…”

As can be seen, once upon a time is given information (it is recoverable from the preceding text), which functions as the Theme in the sentence. Givenness is presupposed information, as it is known to both the speaker and the addressee; it does not have to be introduced according to the scheme given information → new information. The speaker may begin with given information by by-passing the first stage. When the speaker begins his story in the way mentioned above, we can say that his presupposition is in the subtext, in the deep level of the text, it is not realized in the surface structure.

It should be observed that in the linguistic literature there is a lot of confusion in the treatment of the informational-pragmatic structure of the sentence: given information is often identified with the Theme only and the Theme is identified with the starting point of the sentence. So, for instance, Halliday (1985:278) argues that “The given information is what you, the listener, already know or have accessible to you”. As for the Theme, the scholar claims that “the Theme is what I, the speaker, choose to take as my point of departure”. Although he admits that a speaker will generally choose the Theme from what is given, in practice he differentiates givenness and thematicity: themes can be both given and new.

Quoting Valeika, (2001: 7), Halliday’s analysis of the informational sentence structure suggests that the Theme is in practice the Psychological Subject.

Consider an example:

A man walked into the room. , the Theme A man coincides with the Psychological, i.e. the entity subject which comes first in the mind of the speaker/the writer. The sentence-initial position of the constituent helps to recognize the Theme. Thus, the conclusion must be drawn that the Theme is deprived of its semantic content.

Other linguists identify the subject of the sentence with the Theme. Proserova ( 1991) thinks that the subject in such sentences as A man walked into the room, functions as the theme only, and the room is the rheme. She points out that at the same time that the sentence can be externally oriented. It may attribute a characteristic to a theme given in the preceding context or implied and thus, the whole sentence may function as a complex rheme related to a preceding theme (given or implied)

Lyons (1999) argues that subjects show a strong tendency to be thematic. Furthermore, according to the scholar, the theme can also be picked out with the help of certain syntactic patterns placed in initial position giving greater prominence.
According to Sheviakova (1980), the Rheme can be expressed by the Subject and the Theme can be expressed by other parts of the sentence. Consider: *An accelerating voltage was maintained between the heater and the grid, and a retarding voltage was maintained between the grid and collector.* (J. Powell). The scholar points out that in such sentences the use of the definite article with the adverbial modifier of place (*the heater and the grid*) and the use of the indefinite article with the subject (*An accelerating voltage*), suggests that the carrier of new information (Rheme), can be the Subject *An accelerating voltage and a retarding voltage*. In such a case, given constituents are expressed by the adverbial modifier of place.

Firbas (1992) presented his own theory of the informational structure of the sentence. According to the linguist, the sentence consists of the Theme, the Transition and the Rheme. The constituents of the sentence express different degrees of informativity, or to use the scholar’s terminology, they have different degrees of “communicative dynamism”. The Theme carries the lowest degree of CD, the Transition being the dividing boundary, and the Rheme carries the highest degree of CD. Consequently, the sentence shows an uneven distribution of CD. Communicative dynamism, also called the communicative importance, of a sentence constituent increases when moving to the right and decreases when we move to the left.

Firbas’s distinction between the Theme and the Rheme is also based on the distinction between Given and New. Nevertheless, it contrasts with the treatment of the problem by other scholars. As pointed out by Valeika (2001:8), Firbas narrows the concept of given information. By saying that thematic given information is information recoverable from the immediately relevant context, which is generally the immediately preceding sentence.

As for text-initial sentences, Firbas, unlike Mathesius thinks that they contain given information as well. The scholar illustrates the statement with the following examples:

*At midnight the café was crowded.*
*He really was an impossible person.*
*And then, after ten years, she saw him again.* (O. Henry).

All the sentences presented above function as text-initial sentences in the text. The subjects of the sentences convey unrecoverable information; however, it is presented as recoverable. Firbas notes that the reader is forced to accept the writer's or the speaker's vision. It is evident that in this case the author makes use of the implicature. The implicature, called the implicature of precedence, in English is generally realized by definite determiners (the definite article, personal and demonstrative pronouns, etc.). The constituents thus “recovered” form the sub-context and used in sentence-initial position carry the lowest degree of Communicative Dynamism and are thematic.
However, since Givenness and Newness belong to the deep informational layer of the text, they do not necessarily always coincide with Thematicity and Rhematicity. The relation of Given versus New is largely equivalent to what is often referred to as Background versus Focus and is considered to be a wider phenomenon than the Theme and the Rheme.

1.2. Givenness vs Newness

The notion of ‘Givenness’ has been attributed in the literature to different levels. They apply either to the cognitive states of discourse referents relating to the notions of ‘identifiability’ and ‘activation’ or to the pragmatic role of a discourse referent in a proposition, expressed by the distinction between ‘focus’ and ‘background’.

Baumann (2000) treats givenness as a cognitive notion reflecting the activation status of a discourse referent which the speaker assumes to be present in the addressee’s consciousness at the time of utterance. Referents are understood as ideas corresponding to "real-world" entities in the mind of the speakers and the addressee. These entities consist of people, objects, and abstractions rather than events and states, the latter being less persistent in a person's consciousness and thus not serving as anchor points for new information over a larger stretch of discourse.

Givenness is mostly established by a linguistic and an extralinguistic context and involves the shared knowledge of the speaker and the listener or the writer and the reader. Consequently, given or accessible information can be generated in an environment shared both by the speaker and the addressee.

Givenness can be described in terms of the information activation theory as well. The theory implies the assumption of different degrees of givenness. Chafe (1976) postulates three states of information in terms of the activation, which a speaker has to invest in order to transfer an idea from a previous state into an active state; they are the following: given, accessible, and new. If a referent is already active in the listener's consciousness at the time of the utterance, it is given; if a referent gets activated from a previously semiactive state, it is accessible; if a referent gets activated from a previously inactive state, it is new. Lambrecht (1994:109) further divides accessible information into textually, inferentially and situationally accessible information, taking the nature of the context into account. He states that referents which can be inferred from a textually given entity (inferentially accessible) and referents which are present in the visible environment do not necessarily have to be in the peripheral consciousness of the listener/the reader, whereas he considers cognitive accessibility rather than a state of a referent in a person's mind. Thus, the question is not
whether a referent is "objectively" active or inactive in a listener’s mind, but whether a speaker assumes that a listener is willing and able to draw the intended inferences on the basis of the linguistic forms chosen by the speaker (Lambrecht, 1994:105). This theory focuses on the referent’s place in the participants’ mind.

Valeika (2001:10) points out, that “in idealized form, given information is necessary known or predictable information.”

In a linguistic situation given information is the information recoverable from the preceding text (implicit or explicit). The sentence consisting of the Subject and the Predicate, and it contains given information and new information.

As already indicated, controversial is the analysis of text-initial sentences: text beginning sentences contain unrecoverable information which is presented as recoverable. In this case, the implicature is treated as a language economy device, presenting the information as Given by the narrator and placing the reader/listener into the middle of the story.

Quirk et al (1972:940) defines given information as “information already supplied by the context (perhaps by a preceding part of discourse)”, which makes it possible to treat whole sentences as containing new information only. Consider:

John has married a blonde.

Quirk treats the sentence presented above as containing new information in case the question “What’s the news?” is asked, whereas according to Valeika’s approach, this sentence is a binary structure. Both constituents (John and has married) are treated as Given information due to the fact that Quirk’s question can be paraphrased as What has happened? . As a result, John presents Given information and has married presents the Transition which express information recoverable from what has been said before. The constituent a blonde – conveys New information in the sentence.

From the point of view of the organization of the sentence, sentence constituents conveying Given information are of greater importance than constituents conveying New information: they can function as the point of departure of the message. Being the point of departure, such a constituent has considerable influence over the order of the elements within the sentence. Furthermore, being recoverable from the verbal or non-verbal context, the elements conveying Given information function as communicative cohesives. To quote Halliday (2001:14), cohesion in its most normal form is simply the presupposition of something that had been done or said before. This form of presupposition implies anaphoric pointing to a particular item given or identified previously.

Given information not only organizes the sentence syntactically; it serves as a “jumping board” for New information, the information the sentence is used for.
The realization of Givenness

In the process of communication the speaker has to identify entities for the addressee. He or she does it by referring to the entities using appropriate word and subjecting them to appropriate grammatical processing. The speaker has to mark words expressing Given and New information. As for Givenness, the types of markers of Givenness are determined by the type of shared environment the entity is used in. We can distinguish the following types of environments (situations):

- a linguistic environment
- a non-linguistic environment
- a culturally shared environment

A non-linguistic environment is visually shared by both the listener and the speaker: the entities present in such an environment are visible to both the speaker and the addressee. Consequently, the referents, mentioned in such an environment can be easily identified as given information. Consider the following situation: We are in a lecture hall. The speaker can identify an entity by pointing to it: *Give me that book!* It will be obvious that the analysis of the realization of Givenness in a usually shared environment presents considerable difficulties: it requires direct participation on the part of the speaker in the act of communication. An imperfect replica of such a situation may be dialogues described in fiction or plays where participants make reference to the entities, the processes, the attributes, and the circumstances directly without first introducing them into a discourse. It should be observed, however, that in such a situation the communication between the speaker and the addressee is not restricted to the identification of the entities there: the entities identified become part of the text which involves entities that are not to be found in the environment. Such being the case, the speaker generates givenness on the basis of a linguistic situation. Thus a dialogue or an interaction presents a mixture of Given referents.

A culturally shared environment covers specific cultural background knowledge which is shared by both the speaker and the addressee. If the speaker and the addressee share the cultural background, the identification of an entity does not cause much difficulty. So, for instance, in the situation when the speaker asks the addressee: “*Have you read Shakespeare?*” *Shakespeare* generally refers to the famous British playwright and the plays he wrote. Both the speaker and the addressee must possess this information.
Prince, (1981), divides entities referring to given information into following groups: inferable entities, situationally evoked entities, textually evoked entities, predictable information and salient information.

An inferable entity is a referent that may be inferred by the addressee from other information that has already been given. It is recoverable from the background knowledge of the participants.

*I got on a bus yesterday and the driver was drunk.*

In the above sentence, the mention of a bus makes a driver inferable; a bus is assumed to have a driver. Thus the addressee may assume, without further specification from the speaker, that it is the driver of the bus who is spoken of.

(Prince, 1981: 233)

A situationally evoked entity is a referent that is given information, because of the prominence of the referent in the non-linguistic context.

*Could you shut the door?*

The door is previously unmentioned, but it is given information because the entity door is visually shared by the both participants of the current communication.

A textually evoked entity is a referent that is given information because it has been previously included in the text. (Anaphoric, cataphoric use)

*A guy I work with says he knows your sister.*

Predictable information is given information that the speaker assumes can be or could have been predicted by the addressee to occur in a particular position in the sentence.

(Ellipsed material in utterances is predictable information.)

Salient information is given information that the speaker assumes to be in the addressee's consciousness at the time of the speaker's utterance. (Cultural or general knowledge) (Prince, 1981: 228)

It will be obvious that the said classification is merely the manifestation of the three types of environment presented above.
1.4. Givenness expressed by the definite article

The linguistic means used to realize Givenness in English fall into the following groups:

1) grammatical (the definite article);
2) semi-grammatical (the pronouns, demonstratives, possessive pronouns);
3) lexical (proper nouns).

The most common marker of Givenness is the definite article which has been the target of linguistics particularly since it came into existence. To account for the use of the definite article, linguists have put out two hypotheses: familiarity and identifiability. The hypotheses are based on the analysis of the definite article developed by P. Christophersen (1939) on the basis of Apollonius Dyscolus (second century AD) studies. Jaspersen (1943) followed Christophersen and differentiated “stages of familiarity”. The term familiarity is defined by Jaspersen as “knowledge of what item of the class denoted by the words is meant in the case concerned” The linguists recognizes the stage of complete unfamiliarity, corresponding to indefiniteness, and the stage identified as “nearly complete familiarity”, where the referent is found in linguistic or extra-linguistic context, corresponding to the use of the definite article THE with the common noun. The third stage represents the complete familiarity which corresponds to proper nouns, vocatives, and a few other cases, where the absence of the definite article is observed.

Lyons follows Jaspersen saying that the referent can be familiar not from “the physical situation, but from the previous discourse” (1999:5). The anaphoric usage of the definite article the is revealed by the previous mentioning of the referent in the preceding sentence. The associative anaphoric use is claimed to be the usage of a referent connected to the entity mentioned before. It can be thought of as a combination of the anaphoric and general knowledge types. The situational usage of the definite article contributes to the referent which is clear to both participants from the non-linguistic/extralinguistic context-visible and immediate situation. Consider: Just give the shelf (visible given information) a quick wipe, before I put this vase on it. Jaspersen finally presents “constant situational basis”, involving unique entities which take the definite article. (The moon, the Earth-homophonic use of the article).

The concept of familiarity, which presents Givenness is, definitely, not unproblematic. Taking into consideration the sentences They’ve just got n from New York. The plane was five hours late. can be ambiguous. The referential expression the plane may refer to the plane that brought people to New York (in this case it is the representation of cross-reference or
associative usage), however, getting to New York does not necessary involve flying (this case shows the failure of the message perception, or strong context dependent utterance, where the plane could represent situational usage of the article, immediately recovered from visual environment. (Lyons, 1991: 3)

Identifiability is, as Lambrecht (1994:87) states, “imperfectly and is non-universally matched by the grammatical category of definiteness”. The hypothesis states that the use of the definite article directs the listener/reader to the referent of the noun phrase by signalizing that he/she are able to identify it, due to the previous mention or the features of the context. The article itself does not identify the referent; it “invites the addressee to exploit clues in the linguistic or extralinguistic context” (Lyons: 1991:6).

Familiarity allows the listener/reader to match the referent of the definite noun phrase with some real world entity which he knows to exist; because he can see or hear it or infers its existence from something else he had heard, (Pass me the salt, please- visible item on the table), while identifiability tells the listener/ the reader that she/he knows or can work out. (The president of Ghana visits us tomorrow- the person must already know from his knowledge that there is such an individual and has to work out his significance).

Givenness may be associated with uniqueness. The definite article may signal that there is just one entity satisfying the description used. The uniqueness of the definite article is claimed to be related to the particular context, all in all, it is not absolute. The following example should be taken into consideration:

I’ve just seen the anaesthetist in the operating theatre.

The listener/reader is aware that there is only one anaesthetist taking part in the operation.

In case nouns, used to identify the entity, are inherently unique, the uniqueness of the definite article can also be absolute. The absolute uniqueness may be particularly attractive in cases where the referent is hypothetical, potential or in the future:

The man who comes with me will not regret it.

Assuming that no one has yet agreed to accompany the speaker, the uniqueness of a single male companion, clearly implied in the sentence, should not be ignored.

Givenness can be expressed with the help of the definite article used with plural nouns or with mass nouns. Hawking (1978) offered the term inclusiveness, assuming that the reference is to the totality of the objects or mass in the context which satisfies the description used. In this case, the referent is supposed to be a part of a shared set of entities known by both: the speaker/writer, and the listener/reader to constitute the previous discourse, the immediate situation or an association set, for instance:
We’re looking for the vandals who broke into the office yesterday.

I wonder who the anaesthetists are.

It appears that with plural and mass nouns the is a universal quantifier, similar in meaning to “All”.

I’ve washed the dishes.

I’ve washed all dishes.

All in all, however, the definite article used with singular nouns should not be perceived as a signal of uniqueness and inclusiveness associated with the use of plural nouns and mass nouns. It seems uniqueness can be indicated as inclusiveness. According to Lyons (1991), when the noun phrase is singular, inclusiveness turns out to be the same as uniqueness, because the totality of the objects satisfying the description is just one.

Hawkings (1978) proposes that the use of markers of definiteness might be a signal to the reader/listener that the referent item can be isolated (i.e. particularized) from many others items taking into consideration the context and the knowledge, shared by the both participants.

The field –change theory was proclaimed by. Heim (1988), where the metaphor of a “file”, is used to express the information built up in the course of a discourse. The linguist put forward the idea of understanding discourse as a file in which each discourse referent item is represented by a numbered card. In case a new discourse referent is introduced, a new card is added to the file, whereas the same referent (given already) is mentioned again, whatever new is said, it must be added to the (given) discourse (card).

The following are the cases when the Givenness is realized by the definite article:

- Known with the regard to some extralinguistic factors, or some particular circumstances Consider the following:
  Don’t forget to water the flowers. (the flowers can be changed into my flowers = flowers in my flat)
- Mentioning for the second time, previously presented in the discourse/ co-text:
  Last week I have bought a dress. I haven’t worn the dress yet. (the dress, can be easily changed into it. )
- The only one for the class, subclass: e.g. the capital, the population:
  London is the capital of England.
- Given in a certain context/situation, or unique:
  The winner of the races will be announced soon.
Standing for the whole class/subclass (generic definiteness). It can express Givenness if the speaker is applying his background knowledge to work out the referent. Consider:

*My favourite flower is the violet.*

In order to perceive the utterance, the reader/listener must be aware that *the violet* is small wild or garden plant with purple or white flowers with a sweet smell.

Brown (A First-Language. Cambridge, 1973) suggests eight circumstances under which a noun may have given reference for the speaker and the addressee:

1) Unique for all: *the man, the earth, the sun.* (non-linguistic geographical environment);
2) Unique for a given setting: *the blackboard, the ceiling, the floor* (non-linguistic environment);
3) Unique for a given social group: *the car, the dog, the baby, the president* (the home, country environment);
4) Unique by pointing: *the book, the chair* (non-linguistic environment);
5) Unique because the characteristics that get attention: *the explosion* (non-linguistic environment);
6) Unique by entailment: *the window, the garden, the kitchen* (the home environments)
7) Unique by definition: *the girl, who spoke to Brown* (linguistic environment)
8) Unique by prior utterance: *I saw a funny looking dog. The dog.* (anaphora) – (linguistic environment.)
1.5. Givenness expressed by the indefinite article

Givenness as was already noted is associated with the use of the definite article. Nevertheless, in some cases, nouns used with the indefinite article, can be admitted being given at least partially, when the nouns phrases expresses the meaning of a partitivity. Sheviakova (1980) speaks about partial givenness related to the use of indefinite article presented by the Theme in the sentence. The linguist points out that Givenness (Given entity) is the information that is referred to; information in reference to which something is claimed (or disclaimed). This given entity, the “entity of thought” can be any object, person, and phenomenon, not mentioned for the second time, or implied in the context, but used for the first time, as a point of departure of the “entity of thought”, from the speaker’s point of view. It includes the presence of theme- given entity with the meaning “one, one of particular set, one – as any, one, not two, one – not many”. Such a meaning motivates the use of indefinite article. Consider the following example:

*A boy took us into the physics classroom, where Howard was sitting.* (Ch, Snow) here a boy is the Theme, but it does not express shared information. The addressee cannot yet identify the referent. What is known to the addressee is that the entity is part of a given set: one of the boys. In view of this such themes are partially given.

*John has gone to a theater.* In this case, the speaker intends the contrast: John has gone to a theater, not to the cinema, and there are several theatres in the local area. As a result, the Givenness of the entity theater might be partial as well.

All in all, the definite article, used with the noun, is a signal of Givenness, it signals that the entity used with the article is identified as given (an exception is taken by partitive phrases).
1.6. Givenness expressed by semi-grammatical definite determiners and lexical determiners

The pronouns can be treated as semi-grammatical means due to the fact that they are not possessed lexically empty. The demonstratives and possessive pronouns convey the component of givenness including as well the component of closeness or distance of the referent entity to and from the speaker/writer or particular point of the text.

Possessive pronouns express an additional meaning component either: the possession of an entity. Consider: the table/ my table (identification + possession).

The demonstrative pronouns, in contrast to the definite article, do not require mentioning in the preceding text. They indicate the entity by directly pointing to the item near the deictic centre (the speaker /writer, character) or the reference point of the act of communication (Sriubaitė: 2002:15). Give me this book, please.

Proper nouns are regarded as definite since they name particular referents:

We are from Lithuania.

Maria is loved by John.

The extralinguistic or linguistic contexts are of great importance as the means of the realization of Givenness. Sometimes, only the context or extralinguistic factors (background knowledge of the listener/reader) can fully reveal the givenness of the item.

Generally, Givenness can be established

- Endophorically, by linguistic context, inside the language

This can be achieved in two ways:

1) Anaphorically, through prior mentioning of an item in the text. The anaphoric referent may be found in the preceding sentence and in other earlier sentences as well. The number of antecedent definite elements is unrestricted, as a result, the noun group or a noun with definite restrictors can be found throughout the text.

I have one friend. She is younger than me. She lives in the centre of a city.

2) Cataphorically; For instance, the bus coming now, the box on the table
2. THE REALIZATION OF GIVENNESS IN A LINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENT

In the majority of cases Givenness in a linguistic environment is marked with the article **the**. The definite article, according to its place in the noun phrase, could be classified into prepositional, preceding the head noun; and postpositional, following the head noun. The definite article is a part of wider group of determiners and appears before the following modifying expressions: adjectives, numerals, and cardinality expressions. (“**all**” is the exception).

The definite article does not contain much meaning by itself; it indicates that the particular item is specific and identifiable, that somewhere, in the situation or in the text, the information, necessary for identifying the referent/the item, is recoverable (given). The function of the definite article is to signal givenness, locating the entity.

To generate Givenness (Given information), the writer must place the entity in an appropriate textual (linguistic) environment. In the linguistic literature we find two types of linguistic environment: **anaphoric** and **cataphoric**, or endophoric, which covers both terms.

The distribution of markers of givenness in a linguistic environment (monologues)

- The definite article 60%
- The personal pronouns 25%
- The demonstrative pronouns 10%
- The indefinite article 5%
2.2. Anaphoric Givenness

Anaphoric marking of givenness with the help of the definite article is very common in monologue speech presented by the literary text. Consider the following examples from Kurt Vonnegut’s novel “Cat’s cradle”:

(1) Once knew a lady in Newport, Rhode Island, who asked me to design and build a doghouse for her Great Dane. The lady claimed to understand God and His Ways of Working perfectly. (Vonnegut, 15)

(2) On the day they dropped the bomb Frank had a tablespoon and a Mason jar. What he was doing was spooning different kinds of bugs into the jar and making them fight. (Vonnegut, 19)

In the examples presented above, Givenness is established anaphorically, through the use of the antecedent. The reader, dealing with the context, identifies the antecedent, (a Mason jar) mentioned in the preceding sentence. The identification of the referent does not require the additional knowledge of the reader; the second mention of the item turns the referent into Given information - information known to both the writer and the reader (the addressee). Givenness generated in this way is discourse- new givenness; it is established through the introduction of an entity into the discourse.

However, in some cases, the anaphoric givenness cannot be immediately recognizable. The referent expressed by the definite expression may occur in an earlier text, but not in the immediately preceding text. Consider:

(3) Bokonon cynically and playfully invented a new religion. […] Truth was so terrible, so Bokonon made it his business to provide the people with better lies.” (Vonnegut, 142-145)

(4). The crystals were useful in certain operations, he said. (Vonnegut, 39)

Examples (3), (4), examplify the anaphoric use of the article the as well. However, the givenness of a particular referent cannot be evidently worked out without the co-text and the general discourse. In sentences (3), (4), the reader must constitute a previous co-text; he or she must recall only that the people, the crystals – refers both to the entities; they are mentally anaphoric. To identify the entity the reader must go back in thought. The people are previously mentioned as San Lorenzo citizens and appear throughout the novel as the people or the San Lorenzens. (Vonnegut, 121) The crystals refer to the previously mentioned big crystals of ethylene diamine tartrate. (Vonnegut, 38). In order to identify the entity expressed by the anaphor and the given element, the reader must activate his pragmatic “vigilance” (Pipalova 1998: 194), and recognize the previous discourse. Consider another example:
(5) Father took the string from around the manuscript that a man in prison has sent him. The name of the author was Marvin Sharpe Holderness and he told my Father in covering letter, that he was in prison for killing his own father. (Vonnegut, 16)

The above example illustrates the anaphoric realization of Givenness, though the anaphor is established indirectly. The author uses a synonymous expression, still marking it by the definite article the. In the context, the entity The name of the author could have been replaced by the expression used with another demonstrative, this author, this man.

(6) We got drunk. The bartender was very nice to Sandra. (Vonnegut, 24)

(7) The trolley tracks had caught the wheels of Dr. Breed’s Lincoln again. (Vonnegut, 24)

In sentences (6), (7) only the context of the novel, the information presented in the previous discourse, combined with epistemic context, can provide the identification of the given item. In sentence (6), the reader must be aware that the participants of the action got drunk in a particular place (the pub), which has the bartender, who made them drunk.

(7) The newspapers picked up the story when little Zinka asked for political asylum in the United States. (Vonnegut, 22)

This sentence also includes the same marker of givenness. However, the preceding sentence could not help to identify the referent of the newspaper. The entity the newspapers do not refer back to newspapers. How can the reader identify the entity? The identification of the entity is effected through its connection with the reference point or the deictic centre. Such a reference point is the United States: the newspapers in the United States.

In traditional linguistics, the term Givenness is not used. It is the term of linguistic pragmatics. In traditional semantics, we found the term “definite descriptions.” According to Lyons (1977), definite descriptions are expressions which identify the referent not only by naming, but by providing the reader with the particular detailed description of it in a definite context of utterance, separating the items from others in the universe of the discourse or context. It will be obvious that Lyons is not interested in the speaker-addressed relationship in establishing Givenness. To him and other semanticists, definiteness is associated with the meaning of the noun recovered from the situation.

It should be mentioned, that anaphoric Givenness in a linguistic environment is also marked by the use of pronouns.

The grammatical term “pronoun” is referred to as a closed set of items which can be used to substitute for a noun phrase or a single noun. (Crystal, 2004: 376). Most subclasses of pronouns not only stand for an antecedent noun or noun phrase but also perform indexical
function. Deixis is the way in which the reference of particular elements in a sentence is determined in relation to a specific speaker and an addressee and specific time and the place of utterance. (Mathews, 1997:89-90).

The class of pronouns that is frequently used as markers of givenness is personal pronouns. Hatch (1992:210) states that personal pronouns, functioning as person deixes in the text, “refer to grammatical markers of participant roles in a speech event. First person is the speaker’s reference to himself or herself; second person is the speaker’s reference to addressee(s), and third person is reference to others who are neither speaker nor addressee.”

It will be obvious that it is only the third person pronouns are used the most frequently as markers of anaphoric Givenness.

The distribution of personal pronouns as the markers of givenness in monologues

Consider:

(12) One week after that, little Zinka presented herself at the Russian Embassy. She said Americans were too materialistic. (Vonnegut, 22)

(13) Dr. Breed made an appointment with me for early the next morning. He would pick me up at my hotel (Vonnegut, 23-24)

(14) So, about my karass than. It surely includes the three children of Dr. Felix Hoenikker. (Vonnegut, 14)

It is evident that the third person pronouns she he and it stand for the persons and entity (it) mentioned in the preceding clause. The proper nouns Zinka, Dr. Breed the word karass,
invented by the writer, used as antecedents in the immediately preceding sentence, present discourse-old information: the names and the abstract concept karass were introduced in the previous discourse and are familiar to the reader. In this pattern, the speaker does not generate givenness; he or she only reactivates, or actualizes, the information the addressee has prior to the speaker’s mention of the entity.

Interesting data were found while analyzing the examples concerning given information generated by the use of first person in the monologue. Let us consider:

(15) When I was a younger man – two wives ago, 250, 00 cigarettes ago, 3,000 quarters of booze ago… (Vonnegut, 11)

(16) I was a Christian than. (Vonnegut, 11)

As already mentioned, first person is the speaker’s reference to himself or herself. In the examples presented above, the reader identifies the pronoun with the narrator of the novel, who was introduced into the discourse in the preceding clause: (Call me John. My parents did or nearly did. (Vonnegut, 11) As a result, the narrator, introduced as John, functions as antecedent. The writer uses this marker of givenness in interaction only. Every time the personal pronoun is used in interactions the reader reactivates his knowledge, and the information he possesses can be called old- given information.

However, first person does not always refer to the narrator. The referent can be the character mentioned in the preceding sentence.

(17) To which Newt Replied. “I am sorry to be so long answering your letter. That sounds like a very interesting book you are doing. (Vonnegut, 15)

The use of the quotation marks helps to differentiate I, – the narrator and I, –the character. In comparison with example (16), the identification of an entity does not require the reader to return “back in thought” for the identification of a marker. The personal pronoun refers to the person mentioned in the preceding clause. The example presents typical anaphoric givenness.

Special attention should be paid to the use of the personal pronoun “we” as a marker of givenness in a linguistic environment. In the narration or the monologues we can find two types of this pronoun, according to the type of reference: “inclusive” we refers to the speaker and the addressee, and “exclusive” we- refers to the speaker and another or other (characters) but not the addressee. As the analyzed corpus has shown, the author of the selected novel uses only “exclusive” we, due to the fact that he does not communicate with the reader (the addressee) directly. The most frequent use of “exclusive” we that marks given information refers to the narrator (the speaker) and another character. Consider:
(18) I had a silly, cinematic notion of climbing peak with Mona. We were walking into the wrinkles now at the foot of Mount McCabe. (Vonnegut, 181)

(19) The whore, who said her name was Sara, offered me delights unobtainable outside of Place Pigalle and Port Said. As things turned out, we had both overestimated our apathies, but not by much. Before we took the measure of each other’s possessions, we talked about Frank Hoenkker, and we talked about the old man, and we talked a little about Asa Beed, and we talked about the General Forge. (Vonnegut, 24)

(20) We Bokononists believe that humanity is organized into teams, that do God’s Will without ever discovering what they are doing. (Vonnegut, 13)

The above long stretch of the text (18) presents the exclusive use of the personal pronoun we. In this example all repeated pronouns refer to the same antecedents: the narrator and the whore Sara. All personal pronouns “we” generate given information presented in the preceding text, the reader only has to reactivate this information every time another we is used in the stretch of the text.

Givenness marked by the “inclusive” we in the example (20), is more difficult to identify. The personal pronoun “we” refers to the narrator previously identified as John previously and other people who are Bokononists. In this example information presented by the use of personal pronoun “we” could be identified as partial Givenness due to the fact, that in the first chapter the context does not provide the reader with the information who are Bokononists. However, it is evident from the preceding clause that the author belongs to somebody called Bokononists. As a result, the reader could only partially identify the entities marked by the personal pronoun “we”. The same marker of givenness produced in a similar sentence but later at the end of the novel: We Bokononists believe that it is impossible to be sole-to-sole with another person without loving the person. (Vonnegut, 109) provides the reader with fully given information. The discourse of the novel step by step in every chapter provides the reader with the knowledge who are Bokononists. When the above-mentioned sentence is produced by the author, the reader already possesses all the needed information about Bokononists and can identify exclusive “we” as fully given information.

The researches focused on the realization of givenness by the use of demonstrative pronouns. The demonstrative pronouns this/that and these/those imply proximity from the point of view of the speaker. According to Halliday and Hasan, (1976: 57), this and these here means near the speaker and that/ those there- remote from the speaker. However, in the monologues analyzed demonstrative pronouns this/ these and those are functioning as modifiers of the noun phrase and pointing back to the noun phrases functioning as antecedents in the preceding sentence or discourse.
Consider the following examples:

(21) My father never read the book, I’m pretty sure. [...] As I say, all he wanted from that manuscript was the string.

(22) She was looking down raptly into a broad, natural bowl. She was not crying. In that bowl were thousands upon thousand of dead. (Vonnegut, 181)

(23) I understood that each person had delivered himself to this melancholy place and then poisoned himself with ice-nine. (Vonnegut, 181)

(24) There were men and women and children too in the attitudes of book-moru. All faced the centre of the bowl, as though they were spectators in an amphitheatre. Mona and I looked at the focus of those frosted eyes. (Vonnegut, 181)

In above examples (21) and (22) the noun phrases that manuscript and that bowl refer anaphorically to the definite noun phrase the book and indefinite noun phrase a broad, natural bowl. There is no doubt that the entities manuscript and bowl are given elements in the sentence, due to the use of demonstrative pronoun, which identify the entities by pointing back to them in the preceding sentence.

In comparison with the analyzed sentences, it can be seen that examples (23) and (24) are different. The noun phrase this melancholy place could not be referred to as the entity used in the preceding sentence. The identification of the entity as given requires the reader to activate his memory and to relate the entity to the place described earlier in the discourse. We were walking into the wrinkle now at the foot of Mount McCabe. The demonstrative pronoun those in the noun phrase those frosted eyes could be identified as a marker of givenness. However, the entity the demonstrative pronoun points to is not realized by the use of a concrete word functioning as an antecedent in the preceding sentence or discourse. The antecedent is implied in the context. The reader applying his general knowledge and linguistic competence has to identify the antecedent as eyes of men women and children, mentioned in the preceding portion of the discourse.

The pronouns this and that used without a noun can refer to a whole situation or something inferred from it. Swan claims (2001:589) that the demonstrative pronouns this/these can refer to situations and experiences which are going on or just about to happen. That/those can refer to 1) experiences or situations which have just finished; 2) are distant in the past. If such pronouns are used to generate givenness, the reader has to reactivate the entities and the situations this pronoun refers to.

(25) “Go get your clarinet”, urged Newt. That’s always helps.

I thought at first that this was a fairy comical suggestion. (Vonnegut, 123)
(26) The mountebank told them that God was sure trying to kill them, because He was through with them and that they should have the good manners to die. **This**, as you can see, they did. (Vonnegut, 162)

(27) That sounds like very interesting book you are going to write. (Vonnegut, 15)

In the monologues the reader has to reactivate the entities that are placed in the preceding sentence. The personal pronoun **this** in examples (25) and (26) refer to entities described by the preceding context; **this** refers to - **that helps** which could be changed into *playing clarinet helps*. As a result, in the sentence *I thought at first that this was a fairy comical suggestion*, **this refers to playing clarinet.** **This** in example (26) could be changed into *They died*. It should be mentioned, that the demonstrative pronoun **this** implies not only givenness but also points to the situation close to the deictic centre.

The demonstrative pronoun in example (27) points to the intentions of the narrator to write about the creator of the atomic bomb. These intentions were not expressed in the previous sentence. The reader has to take into consideration the information presented in the previous chapter. As can be seen, the expression of givenness by the use of demonstrative pronouns is a context dependent process.
2.2. Cataphoric Givenness

As a rule, Givenness is established by the second mention of an entity. However, the order of the antecedent (first mentioning) and the anaphor (second mentioning) may be reversed: first goes the anaphor, than goes the antecedent. A typical example of cataphoric vs. given information can be found in Yule’s book “Pragmatics” (1996: 23): *I turned the corner and almost stepped on it. There was a large snake in the middle of the path.* As can be seen, the pronoun *it*, which expresses Given information, cannot be interpreted until the noun phrase *a large snake* is presented in the next line. According to the scholar, “cataphora is much less common than anaphora”. This is also confirmed by the analysis of the corpus: such examples are far or few between. Much more common are cases when Givenness is established by the so-called limiting or particularizing co-text (environment). Similar to cataphora proper, a Given entity is presented without introducing it. To motivate the use of such a Given entity the writer has to use an appropriate linguistic environment. The question may arise now: is this another linguistic environment or a vision of cataphora. We think it is a vision of cataphora since *Givenness* is generated by the application of the same principal: Givenness is motivated by preceding appropriate succeeding information.

Consider:

(1) *The room that had been the laboratory of Dr. Hoenikker* was on the sixth floor. *(Vonnegut, 44)*

(2) *The seating on the airplane, bound ultimately for San Lorenzo from Miami* was three and three. *(Vonnegut, 64)*

(3) *While I didn’t feel that purposeful seas were wafting me to San Lorenzo, I did feel that love was doing the job. The Fata Margana, the mirage of what it would be like to be loved by Mona Aamons Monzano, had become a tremendous force in my meaningless life.* *(Vonnegut, 64)*

(4) *We climbed the slope of Mount McCable* *(Vonnegut, 112)*

(5) *So, I looked at the people, she loved.* *(Vonnegut, 81)*

In the above examples particularizing information about the referent is presented by the limiting clause. The purpose of the clause is to single out one particular member of the class, *the room- one particular room in the building; the airplane- particular plane, flying to San Lorenzo,*, or to clarify the item, by attaching a limiting clause. The writer assumes that the reader will now possess all needed information for the identification of an entity. As the analysis of the corpus, has shown, Givenness realized by the use of a definite noun phrase
with limiting clause, could not be identified as **old-givenness**; such givenness is generated in
the process of the identification of an entity.

Givenness can be expressed cataphorically by the use of personal pronouns, and
demonstratives, nevertheless such examples, as already mentioned, are far and few between.

(6) *I suppose it means something different to everyone who sees it. It’s cat’s cradle.*

*(Vonnegut, 113)*

As can be seen, the referent of the pronoun *it* could not be identified, until the noun
phrase *cat’s cradle*, is introduced. Nevertheless, taking into consideration the fact that the
sentence is taken from the text presented in the text, we should note, that the writer may have
already introduced the description of the entity identified as *it* somewhere else in the
preceding discourse. (His fingers made the string figure *(Vonnegut, 17)*) In this case, even if
the item, referring to *it*, is not mentioned in the immediately preceding text, (we don’t know
what kind of figure was made), the reader could try to identify, the referent, considering the
previous discourse. As a result, this example could be identified an illustration of associative
Givenness, or partial cataphoric Givenness with associative elements.

(7) *At a limp, imperious signal from “Papa”, the crowed sang the San Lorenzan National Anthem. The words were written by Lionel Boyd Johnson, by Bokonon. The words were these: Oh, ours is a land

Where the living is grand...* *(Vonnegut, 97)*

In the above example the demonstrative pronoun *these* refers to the poem presented
later. The reader simplifies the task for the reader and introduces the antecedent later in the
text. For this reason the example cannot illustrate Cataphoric givenness proper, though
grammatically it contains cataphora - the antecedent (the poem) was placed after the given
entity had been expressed by the use of the demonstrative pronoun.

2.3. **Givenness expressed by the use of the indefinite article**

As already mentioned, Givenness can be expressed by the use of the indefinite article as
well. The statement that some nouns, used with the indefinite article *a* can be partially given,
may be supported by the following example found in the novel:

(1) **A servant** greeted me politely. *(Vonnegut, 112)*

(2) *I am a Bokonon* now. *(Vonnegut, 119)*
Taking into consideration the fact, that a servant, is the Theme, we can presume some given element. However, the addressee cannot yet identify the referent. What is known to the addressee is that the entity is part of given set: one of the servants. The context provides the reader with the information that the scene presented by the narrator in sentence (1) is set in the castle, full of servants. As a result the servants are already given entities in the mind of the reader and A servant- one of the servants could be identified as partially given.

In sentence (2) a Bokononist could be identified as Rheme, though it expresses partially given information. The reader identifies the narrator as a Bokononist- one of those people, called Bokononists. The context of the novel provides the reader with information that Bokononists are people who believe in a religion invented by the person called Bokonon. (Bokonon playfully invented a new religion (Vonnegut, 54). As a result, a Bokononist –one of the Bokononists could be identified as a partially given entity.
3. THE REALIZATION OF GIVENNESS IN A NON-LINGUISTIC ENVIRONMENT.

Givenness is a two-side phenomenon: it is the information shared by the speaker and the addressee. Entities that surround the speaker and the addressee can easily be turned into **Given information**. The environment the speaker and the addressee communicate in may be different: the communication may take place in the home environment, the town environment or the universe environment. On the other hand, the environment may be cultural, i.e. the speaker and the addressee both share the same culture.

In the corpus examined, we found relatively little linguistic evidence relating to the generation of Givenness in the physical environment. The dialogues that generally serve as the source were rather poor in this respect: they cannot reveal the potential of English. Such being the case, we will restrict ourselves to a few observations concerning the generation of Givenness in the non-linguistic physical environment. Before we can do it we must define the non-linguistic environment. What is it? It is a situation in which the speaker can express givenness by the use of deictic expressions only, that is to generate givenness the speaker does not have to introduce the entity into the discourse and than use it as given (shared) information. Can such situation exist in the text? We can answer this question in positive. It does exist in interactions. However, interactions used in fiction differ from interactions used in plays where the spectator, the speaker and the addressee visually share the situation. In interactions used in fiction the speaker can “see” the entities. For instance, the speaker cannot say: “*Give me this pen!*” since the spectator and the addressee will not be able to identify the entity. The deictic *this* can only be used if the entity has been introduced before, but then this deictic is part of the linguistic environment. To sum up, the situation in fiction, as well as in plays, is not a typical non-linguistic situation. It is a mixture of non-linguistic and linguistic environment.

On the basis of the corpus analysis we can distinguish the following non-linguistic environments:

1. **The environment of the home;**
2. **The environment of the town/country, world;**
3. **The environment of the universe;**
4. **Cultural environment.**
The following markers of givenness were observed in a non-linguistic environment (monologues).

**The distribution of markers of givenness in a non-linguistic environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>Proper nouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Personal pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Demonstrative pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Demonstrative pronouns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1. The environment of the home

A home environment is a particular physical environment of a house, or another building where given entities are placed or described.

Givenness in the home environment is mostly generated by the use of definite noun phrase, deictic expressions, personal and place deixes. According to Saeed (1997), “deictic elements are elements of language that are contextually bound.” Deictic expressions are related to both the speaker (the primary deictic centre) and the addressee (the secondary deictic centre).

The analysis of the corpus has shown that givenness in the environment of the home is generated by the use of definite noun phrase and personal pronouns. Consider:

1. *The walls of my chamber were canvas.* (Vonnegut, 113)
2. *So I went out in the corridor to see if there was a chambermaid who would equip me a little more completely.* (Vonnegut, 108)
3. *And there weren’t any coat hungers in the closet; and there wasn’t any toilet paper in the bathroom.* (Vonnegut, 108)
(4) They were sitting on a shelf that ran the width of the window wall. (Vonnegut, 108)

Sentences (1), (2), (3), (4) illustrate Givenness generated by the use of definite noun phrase unique in a particular environment- environment of the house or room. The preceding discourse provides the reader with information that the entities presented are of one particular environment the house of Mr. Castle. The reader can identify the uniqueness of the object without any problem; in case he identified the environment it is put in. The environment of the chamber requires one closet— the closet, one bathroom— the bathroom. In some cases the writer simplifies the task for the reader and points to the environment of the entity- The walls of my chamber. With the help of the context the entities are as if “visualized” by to the reader.

(5) So I went out in the corridor to see if there was a chambermaid who would equip me a little more completely. And there wasn’t anybody out there, but there was a door open. (Vonnegut, 108)

(6) So I was the only guest in a one-hundred- room hotel. My room was a pleasant one.

(7) Philip Castle was installing a roll of a toilet paper in my bathroom. (Vonnegut, 110)

(8) So we went down steps cut into a cliff and into a natural cave that was beneath and behind the waterfall. There were a couple of drawing chairs down there, a bookcase containing books on architecture (...). This - where Mona’s father worked? (Vonnegut, 132)

(9) I didn’t have to ask Frank how old the cave paintings were. I was able to date them by the subject. (Vonnegut, 132)

Examples (5) – (7) illustrate the use of deictic expressions personal pronouns and place deixes as markers of given information in the home environment or other similar physical environment (room environment, house environment). The personal pronoun my specifies the entity and the reader easily identifies the entity as given. The place deixis there is contextually bound; it refers to the antecedent, placed in the preceding sentence, and shows the distance between the narrator and the entity. The demonstrative pronoun this in example (8) refers to the environment of the cave and to its described objects presented before. Moreover, it implies closeness of entities to the deictic centre (the narrator is in the cave).

The personal pronoun them in (8) and the adverb there generate anaphoric givenness, their antecedents are found in the preceding sentence.

The analysis of the corpus has shown that, the environment of the home appears in the descriptions of a particular place in the narration. The entity with the use of deictic expression is as if “visualized” for the reader by the presiding text. Very often, givenness in such an environment is generated by the use of definite noun phrases. Personal and place deictics functioning as markers of givenness refers to the antecedents in the preceding text.
3.2. The environment of the town/country, world

Givenness in this type of environment was established by the use of proper nouns and nouns used with the definite article. A proper noun is a noun which name of a specific individual or of a set of individuals distinguished only by their having a name. (Mathews, 1997: 300) Proper nouns pick out or refer to entities in some possible world about which statements are being made (Lyons, 1996: 295). They have “unique” reference, which means that they refer to particular entities that are unique in the situation (Leech, Svartvik; 1994: 357). The entities, proper nouns refer to, belong to three types of environment: town environment, country environment or world environment. Proper nouns, used in non-linguistic environment mostly denote information shared by both the speaker and the addressee. Consider:

1) *My sister is Mrs. Harrison C. Conners, 4918 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis.*

*(Vonnegut, 15)*

In the example presented above we observe two given entities generated by the use of personal pronouns. The proper noun phrase *North Meridian Street* is related to the town environment (Indianapolis) and refers to a particular unique entity (the street) in a particular town. The proper noun *Indianapolis* could be identified as an element referring to a unique entity (the town) in the environment of particular country. The entities are given in the consciousness of both participants if they were previously included in the background knowledge of both participants. The two characters of the novel belong to the same environment; they are from the Indiana State. Otherwise, these entities are Given information to both participants.

Considering secondary participants - the reader and the writer, the analysis may face a problem. If the reader belongs to the same environment as the writer (the environment of the country- USA), or these entities are included in his background knowledge, the proper noun activates given elements in the mind of the reader, and givenness is successfully established. If the reader does not possess such knowledge, the proper nouns would not establish Givenness; the reader would not identify the referents.

The statement can be illustrated by more examples:

2) *(...)Zinka asked for political asylum in the United States.* *(Vonnegut, 22)*

The item *the United States* is related to the environment of the world. The entity is one of the countries used with the definite article, while according to the main rule; the article
does not precede the proper nouns denoting the names of the countries (China, Lithuania etc.) (E. Gordon, P. Krylova: 1980, 255). The proper nouns themselves imply givenness, and the use of the definite article is redundant. Moreover, taking into consideration the fact that the writer (the addressee) of the novel itself was American, and the first readers (the addressee) were supposed to be the residents of the United States, the item might be immediately identified as given by both communicative participants. As a result, the example presented above, activates givenness together with general or specific cultural knowledge (resident of another country.) It should be noticed that the extralinguistic knowledge of the reader is a more significant tool, for rendering the item given. If the reader does not possess the knowledge about the item, it could not be given in the text, and will not make any sense to the reader.

(3) Pleased to have the rank of Ambassador. (Vonnegut, 65)

(4) So I had a night to kill in Ilium, Del Prado Hotel. (Vonnegut, 24)

(5) He enrolled in the London School of Economics and Political Science. (Vonnegut, 75)

(6) One of the oldest games there is cat’s cradle. Even the Eskimos know it. (Vonnegut, 114)

(7) Then he went to Indianapolis and Fabri-Tek (Vonnegut, 83)

(8) “I hope San Lorenzo is every bit as good as you’ve heard it its”, I said. (Vonnegut, 68)

Examples (3), (4), (5) contain proper nouns which are used to refer to the entities that are part of the environment of the town. The proper noun used with the definite article refers to a unique race. This entity is related to the environment of the world. The examples perfectly illustrate the generation of old -given information, which represents the entities that are in the mind of both participants of the conversation. The writer generating given elements by the markers also assumes that these elements will be activated as part of the general knowledge of the reader. Examples (7) and (8) are related to the same subclass of the environments, however, unlike the analyzed examples; these sentences contain the markers of givenness that refer to the items in the imaginary world of fiction. San Lorenzo, according to the context, refers to the imaginary republic on the island (the world environment) and Fabri-Tek – refers to the imaginary company in Ilium (the environment of the town). These entities are Given only to the characters of the novel; they all belong to a particular fiction world and share the environment. The vigilant reader may recognize the allusion implied: San Lorenzo is the allusion on the Republic of Haiti. In this case the reader will identify the referent with a
particular entity in the real world (country- Haiti). As a result, givenness will be successfully generated in the process of the perception of the text.

A part of the world environment is the geographical environment. The realization of givenness in the above environment is marked by the use of the definite proper noun phrases. Consider:

(9) *The Raven was bound for the Mediterranean, but it never got there.* (Vonnegut, 76)

(10) *And he sailed her about the Caribbean, an idler, still seeking the storm that would drive him ashore.* (Vonnegut, 77)

In sentences (9) and (10) we deal with the elliptical noun phrases the Mediterranean and the Caribbean. They indicate entities related to the geographical environment. The use of the definite article implies uniqueness (unique in the current environment). The information marked by the definite noun phrase could be identified as salient information. The speaker assumes that the reader will activate this information at the moment of reading. As a result, such information does not require prior mention or explanation.

3.3. The environment of the universe

The entities, which are part of the universe, express Givenness in the non-linguistic physical environment. The following examples express givenness established by the use of the definite article: the entities are unique and are part of the environment of the universe:

(1) *His pores looked as big as craters of the moon.* (Vonnegut, 16)

(2) *The sun comes out, may be I’ll go for a walk through one of the gorges.* (Vonnegut, 17)

(3) *He [father] sang “when the wind blows, the cray-dull will rock.* (Vonnegut, 17)

All the sentences present unique items which are the parts of the physical environments of the universe. The definite noun phrase in examples (1), (2) denote concrete exclusive items. Such items can be identified as given, in case the reader, with the help of background knowledge, relates the definite noun phrase to a concrete item that exists in his physical environment (*The Sun is the star; the earth orbits the sun, it influences the weather on Earth.*) These items are parts of general truth that is included in the main extra linguistic knowledge of the reader and are normally inherently given elements.

(4) *What can a thoughtful Man hope for Mankind on Earth given the experience of the past million years?* (Vonnegut, 164)

The said example illustrates the existence of cases when a given entity can be realized by the use of the proper noun. The entity marked by the proper noun *Earth* belongs to the
Universe environment and implies uniqueness. As the reader possesses the basic knowledge of the environment of the Universe, he will identify the entity as given. The proper collective noun *Mankind* refers to the same type of environment.

### 3. 4. Cultural environment

A cultural environment covers information related to art, literature, history, music, architecture, religion. Due to the fact that the novel chosen as the source for the examples of givenness is culturally bounded (it is written by American writer and contains the allusions to specific historical events related to American and Christian culture) it possesses a variety of examples where givenness is culturally bound as well.

Givenness in a cultural environment is expressed by the use of common noun phrases and proper nouns. Consider:

*(1) There was a color gourd before the band. It carried two banners, the Stars and Stripes and the Flag of San-Lorenzo. The flag of San-Lorenzo consisted of a Marine Corporal’s chevrons on a royal blue field. The banners hung lank in the windless day. (Vonnegut, 116)*

Example (1) presents an interesting case of the givenness expressed by the use of specific cultural elements. In order to perceive the proper noun phrase *the Stars and Stripes* as a given element, the reader must recognize *the Stars and Stripes* mentioned in the utterance as a metonymical name of the American flag originated from the marsh “The Stars and Stripes Forever” written by John Philip as an ode to the American flag.

The indefinite noun phrase *Marine Corporal’s chevrons*, refers to the American Marine forces. The writer intending that the reader as well possesses specific cultural background knowledge related to American culture builds on the Givenness of the analyzed entities ironic meaning of the whole utterance. The ironic meaning of the utterance would be as following: the writer shows that the Republic of San-Lorenzo is not an independent country. The presence of the flag of San-Lorenzo in the utterance symbolizing independence contrasts with the presence of the American flag (*the Stars and Stripes*). If the reader perceives the entity-*the Stars and Stripes*, he recognizes the irony. As a result, the establishment of given elements in the current stretch of the text would be as following: *linguistic markers of givenness (proper nouns) + metonymy+ cultural or encyclopedic knowledge = irony.*

Given information generated in the cultural environment is *old- given information*; it is the
information the participants of the communication possess in their mind. They activate this information in the process of communication.

As a result, the analyzed entities could be fully perceived as given only if the reader is an American, if he or she possesses specific encyclopedic information related to American flag symbolism and American history. If the reader does not possess such knowledge, he will not be able to interpret the phrase *the Stars and Stripes* and will not be able to identify the entity as given. Such being the case, the intention of the writer would fail and the communicative message would not be fully perceived.

The following example illustrates the expression of given information by the use of a specific culturally bound proper noun, preceded by the indefinite article.

(2) Crosby asked me what my name was and what my business was. I told him, and his wife Hazel recognized my name as an Indiana name. She was from Indiana, too.

“My God,” she said, “are you a Hoosier?”

I admitted I was.

“I’m a Hoosier, too,” she crowed.... “Hoosiers do all right. Lowe and I’ve been around the world twice, and everywhere we went we found Hoosiers in charge of everything.”

“That’s reassuring. (Vonnegut, 80)

The proper noun *Hoosier* refers to the resident of the Indiana State, the USA. The preceding context supplies the reference. However, only the reader- American or a very vigilant reader could identify the entity as fully given. The use of the indefinite article with the proper noun refers to the following meaning: *a Hoosier- one of the Indiana residents.* The specific name of the citizens of the Indiana State implies the importance of being a resident of Indiana, a strong sense of the community and the pride of being American. All these connotations could be recognized by an American citizen only. The reader that does not know all the connotations of the word cannot fully identify the referent. Moreover, the ironic meaning of the passage is built on the given information marked by the use of the specific world.

More proper nouns were found and refer to the environment of American culture.

(3) The hotel was called the Casa Mona and was named after Mona Aamans Monzano, the blonde Negro on the cover of the supplement to the New York Sunday Times. (Vonnegut, 74)

(4) “Harry Truman didn’t look anything like Harry Truman” said Crosby. The statue of Harry Truman didn’t really look like him. (Vonnegut, 83)
Both entities are culturally bound. The proper noun phrase *The New York Sunday Times* refer to the specific newspaper published and read by Americans. The existence of the name of the town makes it easier to identify that the entity as related to a USA newspaper. *The statute of Harry Truman* refers to he thirty-third President of the United States *Harry Truman*, whose statute is situated in New York. The item will be given to those readers, who possess this information as their cultural background knowledge. The writer, using the given item had in mind that the entity will be given for the reader, too; he did not present the appropriate information.

A large group of Given culturally dependent entities were related to **Christian culture**, culture of Christian religion. Consider:

(5) Hazel said: “They all speak English and they’re all **Christians**.” (Vonnegut, 68)

(6) She believed that God liked people in sailboards much better than He liked people in motorboats. (Vonnegut, 13)

(7) The old man died on Christmas Eve, having told only his children about ice-nine. (Vonnegut, 42)

(8) Anything can be a wampeter: a tree, a rock, an animal, an idea, a book, a melody, *the Holy Grail*. (Vonnegut, 42)

(9) There was a big sex orgy when everybody new that the world is going to end, and then Jesus Christ Himself appeared ten seconds before the bomb went off. (Vonnegut, 16)

(10) She always sends me a Christmas cards (Vonnegut, 128)

All examples above illustrate the use of proper nouns which belong to one particular religion, Christian religion, which is very popular in Western culture. The author expressed givenness through the use of proper nouns referring to the entities that are familiar to every person who belongs to the said religion. For the readers of Western culture all entities presented by the examples are given; they do not need specific explanation by the context. However, not all readers of Eastern culture, representatives of other religions, such as Buddhism, Hinduism, would identify the entities marked by the above proper nouns as given. Most of them will identify entities as new, and will need explanation provided by the context.

There were few examples of given information produced by the use of proper nouns that require specific background knowledge to identify a culturally bound entity. For instance:

(11) Call me Jonah; my parents did, or nearly did. (Vonnegut, 11)

(12) At another point in *The book of Bokonon* he tells us, “Man created the checkerboard; God created the “karass”.(Vonnegut, 12)

In example (11) the proper noun *Jonah* refers to a Biblical hero, who is considered to be a prophet. The proper noun *Jonah* has the meaning of a prophet in Christian culture. The
reader, a representative of Christian religion will identify the entity as given immediately. If it happens, he can intend that the narrator will function as a prophet of new ideas in the novel. This example evidently shows how new information (The narrator is a prophet) is hung on given information. **Jonah- a prophet (old information) + the narrator is Jonah (new information = the narrator is a prophet).**

Example (12) is of great importance as well. Sentence (12) contains the entity, marked as given by the use of the definite article and the preceding discourse of the novel. With the help of the discourse, the reader can identify the entity as already known, though in order to identify the entities intended by the writer, the reader must decode the allusion: *The book of Bokonon* = *The Bible* If the successful perception of allusion is made, the reader deals with a given entity related to Christian culture. The generation of the givenness in the analyzed sentence is as follows: **The context + the allusion on the Bible + the uniqueness of the item + cultural knowledge (what is the Bible).** As already seen from the analysis of the corpus the perception of cultural givenness in a text can be complicated by the use of allusion.

A number of Given entities used in the corpus and expressed by the use of proper nouns were related to Western Culture and the history of western Europe. Consider:  

(13) *Down in the Chamber of Horrors in the basement; they had a wax person handing from the hook.* (Vonnegut, 69)

(14) *There were two beverages offered. Both un-iced: Pepsi – cola and native rum.* (Vonnegut, 153)

(15) *“We used to call him Agent X-9.”* (Vonnegut, 25)

The use of the proper nouns or the noun phrases in examples (13), (14), generates given entities that belong to the environment of Western culture. In sentence (13) the proper noun **The Chamber of Horrors** refers to the entity well known in the Western countries, - a part of the museum displaying entities used to kill people in a cruel and painful way or scenes showing how they died (Oxford Advanced learner’s dictionary, 2007). The entity is given for all members of Western society who are aware of its existence. The use of the definite article as a grammatical means of establishing givenness implies the uniqueness of the entity for a given social group.

The example is of the same kind as the preceding one. The givenness of the entity is established by the use of the proper noun **Pepsi – cola** that refers to a drink consumed by western society. The writer introducing the entity into the discourse expects that the reader’s background knowledge will help him or her to identify the referent without further explanations.
The proper noun *Agent X-9* in example (14) is an allusion to *Agent OO7, James Bond*, a fictional character, well known to the representatives of Western society. The generation of givenness will be successful if this entity is his or her background knowledge or general knowledge. The establishment of given information in this example would be as follows: **lexical marker of givenness (proper noun) + allusion.** As can be seen, such a construction complicates the generation of Givenness. The allusion might not be decoded by all readers; in this case the identification of givenness may not be fully successful. The reader in this case might identify partial givenness, i.e. givenness marked by the use of proper noun.

The generation of given information in the following examples requires specific background knowledge related to the history of Western Europe and the USA:

(16) *We talked about birth control, about Hitler, and Jews.*

(17) Bokonon’s paraphrase was this

“Pay no attention to Caesar. Caesar doesn’t have the slightest idea what is really going on.” (Vonnegut, 88)

(18) *His education was interrupted by the First World War.* (Vonnegut, 75)

(19) *He was gassed in the second battle of Ypres, was hospitalized for two years and than discharged.* (Vonnegut, 76)

The proper nouns *Caesar, Hitler, and Jews* indicate particular people that are well known as historical figures. The definite proper noun phrases *the First World War* and *the second battle of Ypres* refer to events that are part of Western European history. The identification of information as given involves the activation of the general knowledge of the reader.
4. REALIZATION OF GIVENNESS IN DIALOGUE

Dialogue in fiction is a common phenomenon. It is identified as a direct discourse by various scholars. This type of discourse is used to convey information, develop the plot, show emotions of the characters, to intersperse the narration, to simplify the understanding of complicated passages. In direct discourse both participants of communication share the same knowledge about the entities involved and the situation that is discussed.

Dialogues in fiction also contain some given elements generated by the use of linguistic means. Thus, not all markers of givenness discussed previously are used to generate givenness in direct discourse. The analysis of the corpus revealed that deictic expressions as markers of givenness were more commonly used in dialogues than in monologues. Moreover, the context is of great importance; it influences the generation of given information in dialogues. Personal pronouns I and you were extensively used in the dialogues.

The distribution of markers of givenness in dialogues

Consider the following examples:

(2) Two painters were not painting as I appeared. (...)

“Excuse me”, I said.

“Don’t tell. Please- don’t tell.”

“Tell what?”

“What you saw!” (Vonnegut, 108)
As we can see, the personal pronouns I, you and me in the dialogue point directly to the speaker (the characters of the book). However, similar to monologues, we cannot identify the referent without considering the preceding text. The narrator here can be identified as an inferable entity. The reader would indicate that the writer points directly to previous monologue and the pronoun I in *Two painters were not painting as I appeared* refers to narrator, who was introduced earlier in the discourse. Consequently, the context simplifies the identification due to the fact that the first turn of the dialogue is made by the narrator himself: *I said*. Without identifying I in the preceding monologue, we cannot identify the pronoun I as given information in the dialogue.

Consider more examples:

(2) ”Tell, me doctor”. I said to Julian Castle. “How is Papa Monzano?”

“How would I know?”

“I thought you probably been treated him”

“We don’t speak...” Castle smiled. ”He doesn’t speak to me, that is. (Vonnegut, 117)

As can be seen, both participants are introduced by the narrator. The dialogue of this kind does not cause any difficulties in identifying the information generated by the use of personal deixis.

The writer tends to introduce the participants of the dialogue in the preceding discourse; however, in some cases the participants of the dialogue can be changed in the process of communication. The process of the identification of the referents becomes ambiguous and needs further explanation in the monologue:

(3) I learned closer in order to hear the message from “Papa” to “Bokonon”.

“Tell him I’m sorry I didn’t kill him, said “Papa”

“I will.”

“You kill him”

“Yes sir”

“I mean really!”

I said nothing to that, I was not eager to kill anyone. Papa gained control of his voice.

(Vonnegut, 147)

At first we identify the participants of the dialogue from the preceding sentence. “Papa” to “Bokonon”) Thus, taking into consideration the following sentence we make the conclusion that the personal pronoun you points to the narrator but not to the second participant of the conversation Bokonon. Such examples kind complicate the establishment
of given information in the dialogue and require the reader to pay more attention to the context of the dialogues.

Place deixis appeared more frequently as markers of givenness in the dialogues than in the monologues. The demonstratives this, that and adverbs of place here/there functioning as markers of givenness were contextually determined. The entities or situations they referred to cannot be identified without taking into consideration the co-text as well.

(4) When I got back to my room, I found the Philip Castle – hotel-keeper – was installing a roll of toilet paper in my bathroom.

“Thank you very much”, I said

“You are entirely welcome”

“This is what I’d call a hotel with a real heart.” (Vonnegut, 110)

In example (4) we can obviously see that the demonstrative pronoun this refers to the situation described in the preceding text. The pronoun this refers to the situation relatively near to the speaker. The identification of a given entity (the process preceding the conversation) requires form the reader to return to the preceding narration.

(5) “Weren’t you raised at your father’s hospital?”

“That’s right. Mona and I both grew up there.”

“Well, aren’t you at all tempted to do with your life what your father’s done with his? (Vonnegut, 110)

The demonstrative pronoun that and the adverb there refer to the entities discussed in the preceding turn; that refers to the whole question, there refers to the place mentioned in the question there- at father’s hospital. Both participants of the interaction are familiar with the entities marked by the use of the deictic expression. Deictic expressions function here as markers of givenness. The reader may infer that the situation the participants talk about took place in the past. The immediate context supports the given information marked by the use of place deixis. Consequently, the entities are identified initially with the help of the context.

The analysis of the corpus has shown that in some dialogues the adverb here refers to place, where the conversation between the characters was set. Consider:

(6) “We have been ordered to protect the president of San Lorenzo”, said the officer in island dialect.

“He isn’t here now”, I informed him.

“I don’t know anything about it”, he said, “My orders are to dig here.”

In the example (6) adverb here indicates the place, where the conversation is being set. The convoy stopped in Frank’s driveway. The context proves the reader with additional information needed for identification of a place.
So far there were no significant difficulties concerning the identification of givenness marked by deictic expressions. However, problems may arise, when Givenness is expressed by the use of lexical means—proper nouns in the dialogues as well as in the monologues. For instance:

(7) He [Frank Hoenikker] pointed them out, counterclockwise. “*House of Hope and Mercy* in the jungle. *Papa’s* palace and *Fort Jesus*. “

  “*Fort Jesus?*

  “*The training camp for our soldiers*”.

First of all we must pay examine the use of proper noun “*Fort Jesus*”, the name of the fort is referred to as an entity related to a non-linguistic environment. The entity belongs to the Christian cultural environment and does not need any specific reference by the context. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, such culturally-dependent entities could not be identified as given by the representatives of other religious cultures.

(8) “*Bokonon* found out he could change the world.”

  “You know him too?”

  “*That happiness is mine. He was my tutor, when I was a little boy. He was Mona’s tutor too.*”

The proper nouns in example (6), except “*Fort Jesus*”, represent entities previously introduced into the discourse. The entities, one being defined and introduced, do not need any additional explanation throughout the novel. Every time the reader deals with them, he or she must reactivate his or her memory, and return “back in thought”. Such entities are old—given information, it they are not generated in the process of communication.

The use of context dependant proper nouns as markers of givenness was quite extensive in the corpus analyzed. Given entities related to a non-linguistic environment were quite rare in the dialogues.

The use of the definite article as a marker of givenness in the dialogues did not differ from the use of the article in the monologues. Cataphoric givenness was not observed at all, however, examples of anaphoric givenness were rather common:

(9) *Christian, said “Papa”*

  “*Good.*”

  “*Anti -Communists. No communists here. ,said “Papa” They fear the hook.*”
The definite noun phrase *the hook* refers to the entity introduced earlier discourse. Similar to the monologues, the marker forced the reader to activate his knowledge previously gained in the process of reading.

The **partial givenness** established by the use of indefinite noun phrase was not observed in dialogues as well.
CONCLUSIONS

The text is a sequence of given and new information units. Given information is generated in two types of environment: linguistic and non-linguistic. The analysis of the corpus demonstrated that the most powerful mechanism used in this respect was the linguistic environment. The non-linguistic environment, which was realized in the form of an interaction, was much less productive.

Givenness in a linguistic environment was realized using deictic expressions and lexical devices. The deictic expressions used constituted two types: non-specific deictics (the definite article) and specific deictics (person, place, temporal). The linguistic mechanism used to generate givenness was anaphora (back-looking and forward-looking). Back-looking anaphora was the most common. Forward-looking anaphora was used as a stylistic device to suspend new information. The use of definite marker as the marker of givenness demonstrated the highest frequency. Of the specific deictics, the highest frequency was demonstrated by third person pronoun deictics — they accounted for 25% of all deictics used in the linguistic environment; the lowest frequency was demonstrated by spatial deictics — 15%, and the use of the indefinite article (partial givenness) — 5% of all linguistic means.

Givenness in a non-linguistic environment was realized using deictic expressions and lexical deictics (proper nouns). The most common markers of givenness were proper nouns and person deictics (first person and second person pronouns). Person deictics accounted for 20% of all deictics; proper nouns accounted for 60% of all linguistic means. Demonstrative deictics as markers of givenness were rarely used in a non-linguistic environment. If they occurred, they referred to given propositions. Considering the specificity of functioning of the non-linguistic mechanism (the interaction is not presented directly; it is described by the writer for the reader), the use of demonstrative deictics refers to the environment the entities are ruled out: the reader will not be in position to identify such entities. Such being the case, interactions (monologues) in fiction are not non-linguistic situation proper. They are a mixture of the linguistic and non-linguistic environment.

The corpus analysis revealed that the study of givenness in dialogues presented in fiction cannot serve the potential of a language concerning the expression of givenness in a non-linguistic environment. However, the specificity of the non-linguistic environment used in fiction restricts the use of demonstrative deictics; as previously mentioned, the interaction in fiction is described by the writer for the reader. Hence, it became evident that demonstrative deictics cannot be used to point to the entities that surround them. As a result, demonstrative pronouns in dialogues in fiction are used in case the writer creates an
appropriate linguistic environment. The analysis of the material confirmed that demonstrative pronouns were used in the dialogues of the novel in reference to propositions only. The most common deictics were first and second person pronouns, temporal and spatial deictic expressions.

The analysis of the corpus demonstrated that the entities realized by the use of lexical deictics in a non-linguistic environment are the so called ready-made entities. They are perceived by the reader as given in case the reader possesses the same specific cultural or geographical background knowledge as the writer does. If the reader does not possess the specific background knowledge, the entities are not perceived as given and cannot be properly interpreted by the reader.
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