Yelena YERZNKYAN
Yerevan State University

ON THE METAPHORIC DEVELOPMENT
OF DEICTIC VERBS

The paper introduces the results of the study based on the assumption that the idiomatic usage of deictic verbs develops some additional semantic features which can be characterized as metaphoric development of their literary meaning. The paper will present how items with a definite prototypical deictic meaning develop the emotional-evaluative meaning fulfilling a pragmasemantic function of deictability. The research is determined by the necessity to study the structural and semantic features of different types of linguistic signs as well as by the anthropocentric approach according to which the language is observed not as an abstract system but as a background for the individual's communicative and cognitive activity.

Key words: *deixis, deictic verbs, pragmasemantic function, emotional-evaluative meaning, phraseological unit/idiom, semantic metaphorization, metaphorical extension*

Throughout the whole history of language development, changes have occurred continuously and regularly motivated by a wide variety of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. The changes have taken different directions and affected different layers and categories of language.

This study is an attempt to reveal the mechanisms of those developments according to a cognitive approach involving a comprehensive analysis of language data from linguo-pragmatic, semantic and functional perspective. As is mentioned not once in literature, cognitive linguistics has become a well-established field within linguistic research manifesting the peculiarities in the conceptualization and further categorization of the real world that are observed in linguistic categories of various languages.

The research is aimed at a study of phrases with deictic verbs of motion in English with special reference to the metaphorization processes accounting for the rise of their idiomatic usage.

Before proceeding with the main ideas concerning the deictic phrases under study it is reasonable to introduce the basic features of deictic signs as we understand them in order to show how they fit into the general system.

The continued and long-standing interest in deixis as a linguistic and cognitive phenomenon shows that it is in the mainstream of linguistic thought and research. It is widely recognized among linguists that deixis plays a paramount role in the use and understanding of everyday language. Nevertheless, given its theoretical importance, this linguistic category is one of the most understudied core areas of linguistics, especially *semantically*. Assuming that the 'deictic centre' – the Origo

(in K. Bühler's terminology) – is not always the speaker, deixis is dealt with here from a much broader point of view and covers a far wider range of phenomena including different linguistic means: grammatical, lexical, as well as phraseological.

Deixis is a universal phenomenon and every language has a set of deictic means which are frequently used and highly and systematically categorised in languages. The phenomenon of deixis is generally regarded as a specific pragma-semantic category which plays a significant role in the very process of human communication. While interacting speaker and hearer share a joint established aim. For understanding to be successful between communicating partners both the speaker and the hearer need to be simultaneously engaged in cognitive processes within which they must be similarly oriented.

"Deixis" is the name given to categories of the lexicon and grammar that are controlled by certain aspects of the communicative situation in which the utterances are produced. These aspects traditionally include *inter alia* the identity of the participants (the speaker and the hearer) in the communicative act, their location and orientation in space, and the time at which the utterance containing the deictic expression is produced. This is how deixis is defined in most of contemporary papers and primarily in the classical work by Karl Bühler on the psychological and linguistic foundations of deixis /Bühler, 1934.

Deixis is considered to be *a type of nomination* constituted by the meaning of a linguistic sign being relativized to the situational context in which the sign is used. Thus, at the heart of the notion of deixis is the notion of *situation*, more precisely that of *speech situation*. Being linguistic evidence of how *what* is said is grounded in the context of the situation in which it is said, it provides an interface linking language and situational context, the denotational situation and the speech situation.

We can say that deixis is conceptualized in terms of an idealized cognitive model and a deictic expression is one that builds up a 'mental space' which necessarily involves the conceptualization of some reference point, the Origo, i.e. the deictic center and the central issue of the whole system of deictic nomination.

The main semantic characteristic feature of deictics is that they encode a certain type of *relation*, the relation between the Origo and an intended referent. Every act of such reference presupposes a commonly established ground, from which the pointing as a specific type of nomination starts.

It is the default assumption that the 'Origo' of a pointing act coincides with the speaker of the speech act. However, the 'Origo' may be shifted to some other person (or other point in space and time), a process which then has to be marked by certain linguistic means.

It is for this reason that we argue for an extension of Bühler's concept, in which the centre of the deictic field is too narrowly associated with the actual speech act and the speaker. The scope of deictic relations is much larger. There is much in language that goes beyond this framework. A great variety of language

units, mostly with very abstract meanings, have been found to share deictic characteristics, although they do not fit into the interlocutor-place-time-of-utterance format. Regarding deictic signs the main complication to be aware of is that they can also operate relative to a reference point which is neither necessarily the actual situation of utterance nor obligatorily associated with the speaker. Thus, deixis in its broad sense, as we understand it, is "a marking off point" in relation to which actions and persons, phenomena, objects and events of the real world are characterised.

Below we shall turn to illustrating how these observations lead to the analysis of deictic phrases.

Recent linguistic and psycholinguistic research in the field has shown that the traditional approach to the study of idioms should be reconsidered and the existing model of idiomaticity be regarded from a new angle. In numerous publications on the subject it has been convincingly pointed out that in a particular context such units undergo metaphoric changes as a result of which the original (literal) and figurative (metaphoric) meanings of the components are brought to correlate to develop some new senses and to make a new metaphor.

As is known, analyses along the lines of the standard conception regularly acknowledge the existence of deviations from the assumed basic meanings. One traditional solution attributes them to speaker's "subjectivity", or to differences between *physical* and *psychological* space or time.

In a similar vein, metaphorical extensions may be said to be at play, or a distinction between *prototypical* and *non-prototypical* meanings invoked. Clearly, then, such deictic elements are underdefined if only orientation to the actual speech situation is taken into account.

To illustrate what was said above let's turn to language material. For empirical data we have taken idioms with classical deictic verbs of motion and tried to reveal the mechanisms of the development of metaphoric meaning conveyed by these deictic verbs. How do deictic verbs such as *come* and *go* and their causative counterparts *bring* and *take* acquire new senses in the process of semantic metaphorization, gradually developing the evaluative meaning fulfilling a pragmatic function of intention and evaluation? Due to the apparently emotional function of this secondary semiosis process, deictic verbs are very likely to acquire new meanings for the sake of *expressivity*. The meaning conveyed by the phraseological unit using verbs of motion expresses the attitude of the speaker to the speech event, his vision of the speech situation. It is to be noted here hat the previous studies on deixis have paid little attention to emotional and evaluative involvement of the speaker in the process of conceptualization of the speech event. And this is where idioms with their specific loading come to be at play.

The majority of such units have figurative or transferred meaning and are based on the semantic relationship of metaphor (mainly metaphorical extension). As we know, metaphor is commonplace in language and an important characteristic

of cognitive semantics. As natural language processing moves beyond surface-level analyses into deeper semantic analysis, accurate identification and representation of metaphoric meaning becomes more important.

In discussing metaphor, we proceed from Lakoff and Johnson's definition, in which one conceptual domain (the source) maps to another domain (the target) /Lakoff and Johnson, 1980/. Generally the source domain is a concrete, everyday domain that is used to elucidate a more abstract domain, the target. The metaphoric nature of an idiom accounts for its idiomaticity and results in the unpredictability of the global meaning of the whole from the literal meanings of the constituent parts.

The motion verbs under study are commonly used both literally and metaphorically. This distinction becomes far more clearer when we consider and compare both their literal and metaphorical meanings. We see that the metaphoric reinterpretation of word meanings is an active and peculiar lexico-semantic process of idiomatic derivation.

Analyzing these language means of space semantics in their primary direct nominative meaning we perceive the rules in the view of concrete practical physical activity of a human being, i.e. movement from some place, say A, to another place B. When looking at them in the light of cognitive metaphorization mechanisms, we reveal the direction of this secondary semiosis process, assuming that it is preconditioned by discourse requirements and is based on the literary meaning of the words under study. This dynamic approach to word meaning makes it possible to perceive the metaphoric development of the literary meaning of the word under the influence of the context. The nominative value of the new lexical meaning is directly and closely connected with the meaning of the basic unit, what is actually expressed in the nominative function of the derived, newly acquired meanings, their choice and collocability being syntagmatically preconditioned by the use in the sentence.

When used idiomatically deictic verbs do not indicate physical movement as such, but actually a 'change of state'. In idiomatic usage the deictic centre (the Origo) goes to "the normal state of being" or a "desired state". It does not refer to any physical location as such – what we usually have when these verbs are used literally. This "normal state" implies that a man, being both physically and psychologically healthy, behaves in accordance with some norms, some rules existing and working in the society and does what s/he is normally expected to do.

As we know, these verbs when used literally do convey the same meaning of physical movement, but in *opposite* direction (towards the Origo / away from the Origo). The same is true when they are used metaphorically: the verb *come* conveys movement *towards* the normal state, i.e. some positive change is being expressed, whereas *go* indicates movement *away* from the normal state, i.e. negative change is being implied. It is important to say that the choice of the word to be used in this or that context depends on how the speaker evaluates the situation, this is his vision of

the situation and the speech event. The speaker himself when using *go* considers the resulting state as not normal.

The following sentences illustrate widespread idiomatic uses of the verbs under study: on the one hand – '*He came back to his senses*' and '*He will soon come round*', on the other – '*She went pale*' and '*He went out of his mind*' Obviously, the verbs indicate opposite 'directions': *to/towards* the normal state and *away from* the normal state.

And this very difference in the directional component of movement in the deictic verb constituting the phrase may account for the meaning discrepancy between *come* and *go* in such expressions as *go (*not *come) mad, go (*not *come) berserk, go (*not *come) out of one's mind, go (*not *come) off one's head*, on the one hand, and, *come (*not *go) down to earth, come (*not *go) down to one's senses*, etc., on the other.

Thus, idioms in which *come* is used to express a change of state describe changes that are *in the direction of normality* or in the direction of *positively valued* conditions, whereas idioms with *go* indicate '*movement away from the normal or desired,* convey some deviation from the accepted norm and accordingly are *valued negatively.*

One should emphasize once again that this kind of semantic derivation is based on the *literal* meaning of the lexemes constituting the phrase, i.e. their movement in opposite directions.

Besides we assume that the positive orientation of the verb *come* may be also accounted for by the so-called *home base effect*. As we know, the prototypical meaning of *come* is defined as "the movement towards the location of speaker and/or the hearer at either coding time or reference time" as well as "movement towards the 'home-base'". This 'home base' being the location that the participants of a described event are associated with, i.e. their normative location, is universally emotionally valued as *normal, usual, accepted, desired, safe,* etc. Thus, it is commonly observed in many languages that the motion toward the speaker's home is usually described as *coming* and *not going* regardless of whether or not the speaker is actually located there.

It should be also noted that the semantic dichotomy of 'normal – abnormal' is relevant for the whole system of conceptualization of emotions in languages, and especially in English. Moreover, the opposition of *come* and *go* based on this feature of 'normal – abnormal' is preconditioned by their deictic nature. As far as the verb *come* indicates movement 'towards the speaker/observer', it is quite logical to assume that the emotional state, described with the help of *come,* will be evaluated as 'normal' and 'positive'. And as the verb *go* presupposes movement 'away from the speaker/observer', the emotional state, described by this verb, will be considered as 'abnormal' and negative'.

The same way we can interpret such phrases as *go to the dogs, go to pigs and whistles, go broke, go bust, go down the hill, go by beggars' bush, go to wreck and*

ruin, go bankrupt, go to the devil, go (be) on short commons, *go on the parish*, on the one hand, and *come good*, *come up in the world,* on the other.

As can be seen from the examples adduced, the idioms with the global meaning of 'growing poor', 'becoming poor', 'losing all money' more often convey this meaning with the help of the verb *go* (mind: '*come to poverty*'), whereas the meaning of 'getting rich', 'making a fortune', 'growing rich' goes to the verb *come*. And it is quite natural and logical to assume that 'getting poor' is accepted as something 'negative', 'abnormal', whereas 'getting wealthy', 'gaining success, wealth or importance, on the contrary, as something 'normal' with positive connotation.

Here are some other examples to illustrate that *come* and *go* are opposed as units indicating different evaluation of the situation. Compare two sentences: '*The plane came down near the forest*' and '*The plane went down near the forest*'. These two sentences realize two possible outcomes – *successful/safe landing* of the plane and *not successful/crash landing*. Thus, the objective evaluation of the situation preconditions the choice of the verb – 'come' or 'go'. In the first sentence we can normally use the adverb *safely*, whereas in the second sentence the use of the verb 'go' excludes it, makes it impossible /Tanz, 1980/.

Consider other examples: (1) 'She *came* through a lot' and (2) 'She *went* through a lot'. In the first sentence an auspicious end is implied, with a favourable outcome, a happy end, as they say ('She has overcome all the difficulties and came up with good results'), in the second sentence some negative fact is being recorded – an unpleasant situation. Here is another example with the use of negatively connoted idiom with go: '*She has gone through the hoop*' (It has had a lasting impact, that is why the result is evaluated as unfavorable).

Analogously function the verbs *bring* and *take/send* as the causative counterparts of *come* and *go*. Consider the following sentences: '*The glass of cold water brought him to very soon*' and '*His play was a failure and it sent him out of his mind*'. As we can see *bring* means 'coming back to normal state', whereas *take/send* mean 'deviation from the normal state'.

Examples of this kind prove that the lexical meaning of an individual lexeme constituting the phrase as well as the idiomatic meaning of the whole complex are represented in the speaker's mind by complex semantic configurations. In other words, the speaker is aware not only of the overall idiomatic meaning of the phraseological unit but of the literal and metaphoric meanings of the constituent parts as well. And quite often the interplay of these literal and metaphoric meanings coexists in a very specific way in the speaker's mind to constitute the complicated semantic configuration of an idiom.

And as there is no rule without exception, it is worth mentioning that this general observations in some rare cases do not work. The data we have at our disposal show that to a degree we cannot overstate that these verbs invariably indicate movement in the hypothesized direction.

For example, if we agree that when the temperature is described as *going*, whether *up* or *down*, what is implied is the change away from the normal, or the desirable, then the sentence '*The temperature went down today.*' allows only one interpretation: that is the weather got colder/has changed to the worse with the result of being or becoming less comfortable.

But it is not the case, as becomes evident if one acknowledges the acceptability of the sentence '*The temperature is finally going down*'. The context uses this *finally* which undoubtedly points to the long-waited decrease of temperature and accordingly is to be valued positively.

Furthermore, there are idioms using *come* that indicate changes of state 'away from the normal or the desirable'. Compare: '*This dress is coming apart at the seams*'; '*The ribbon came undone*'; '*The cat came into heat today*'; '*That girl is going to come to grief (end badly; wreck, fail)*', etc.

Still, in the great majority of cases, the picture comes to prove the positive orientation of *come* and negative for *go*. In favour of this generalization we can add the following: the prefixes *over-* and *under-* in *overcome* and *undergo* emphasize the positive tone of *come* and negative tone of *go*: compare *to overcome difficulties*, on the one hand, and *to undergo an operation, an accident*, on the other.

Summarising the aforesaid it is possible to say, that the new values of deictic signs can be created as a result of various semantic shifts, by semantic development of a lexeme. In this kind of enrichment of lexical systems, metaphor participates actively and plays a great role.

In view of the fact that languages vary with respect to the degree to which they grammaticalize or lexicalize deixis, that even superficially similar languages may differ considerably in various details and each of the deictic dimensions could be elaborated into a set of semantically and pragmatically related deictic categories, it is worth exploring the subtleties of the deictic systems in different languages taking into account different distinctive features, such as normativity, desirability, intention and others. But this might be a task for a separate research.

REFERENCE

1. Bühler K. Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache. Jena: Gustav Fisher Verlag, 1934/ 1965 (2 Auflage)/ 1985 (3 Auflage).
2. Fillmore Ch. Lectures on Deixis. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 1997.
3. Lakoff G. and Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
4. Lakoff G. Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What categories reveal about the mind. Chicago: Universty of Chicago press, 1987.
5. Lakoff G., Johnson M. Philosophy in the Flesh: the Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought. New York: Basic Books, 1999.

6. Lenz F. (ed.) Deictic Conceptualization of Space, Time and Person., Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2003.
7. Ерзинкян Е.Л. Ерзинкян Е.Л. Дейксис слова: семантика и прагматика. Ереван: Изд-во Ереванск. ун-та, 2013.
8. Tanz Ch. Studies in the Acquisition of Deictic Terms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Ե. ԵՐԶՆԿՅԱՆ – *Ցուցային բայերի փոխաբերական իմաստի զարգացման շուրջ.* – Սույն հոդվածը փորձ է բացահայտելու ցուցային բայերի փոխաբերական իմաստների զարգացման մեխանիզմները՝ ճանաչողական մոտեցման համաձայն՝ հիմնված լեզվական տվյալների բազմակողմանի ուսումնասիրության վրա՝ իմաստագործառական և գործաբանական տեսանկյուններից: Ցույց է տրվում, թե ինչպես են շարժում արտահայտող բայերը փոխաբերականացման ընթացքում զարգացնում զգացմունքային-գնահատողական իմաստ՝ այդպիսով իրացնելով ցուցայնության իմաստագործաբանական գործառույթը: Հետազոտությունը կատարված է մարդակենտրոն մոտեցման լույսի ներքո, համաձայն որի՝ լեզուն դիտարկվում է ոչ թե որպես վերացական համակարգ, այլ որպես հենք անհատի հաղորդակցական և ճանաչողական գործունեության համար:

Բանալի բառեր. ցուցայնություն, ցուցային բայեր, գործահմաստաբանական գործառույթ, զգացմունքային-գնահատողական իմաստ, դարձվածք/ իդիոմ, փոխաբերականացում, փոխաբերական ընդլայնում

Е. ЕРЗИНКЯН – *К вопросу о формировании метафорического значения в дейктических глаголах.* – Статья посвящена изучению процесса метафоризации прямого значения слова, которой подвергаются дейктические глаголы движения при образовании фразеологических единиц со значением изменения состояния, сопровождающегося общей оценкой всей ситуации. Метафора рассматривается в работе как универсальный когнитивный механизм, позволяющий выявить средства образования переносного значения и определить один из источников формирования метафорического значения в дейктических глаголах, проявляющийся в актуализации эмоционально-экспрессивного оценочного коннотативного компонента. Когнитивный подход к исследованию данного явления основан на признании роли человека в образовании языковых значений.

Ключевые слова: дейксис, дейктические глаголы, прагмасемантическая функция, эмоционально-оценочное значение, фразеологическая единица/идиома, метафорическое переосмысление, метафорическое расширение