

Hirschová, Milada

## Some remarks on spatial deixis in Czech : a semantic-pragmatic approach

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná.* 2007, vol. 56, iss. A55, pp. [191]-200

ISBN 978-80-210-4335-0

ISSN 0231-7567

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100959>

Access Date: 05. 12. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

MILADA HIRSCHOVÁ

## SOME REMARKS ON SPATIAL DEIXIS IN CZECH. A SEMANTIC-PRAGMATIC APPROACH

0. Any communicative event (act of utterance) creates a spatio-temporal context, an essential element of a communicative situation, components and participants of which are a speaker, at least one addressee, time and space localization, i.e. location and identification of persons, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about or referred to. Each act of utterance has its deictic center composed of the primary indices *já, ty zde, teď* (I, you, here, now), cf. the Bühler's "origo" (1999, p. 102–120). As for spatial meanings, in addition to lexical items with local and spatial semantics, the most prominent means of expression of the mentioned location and identification of places and spatial relations are deictic words, indices in the first place. The broad domain of spatial meanings can be divided into three basic sub-domains: localization (static meanings), motion (dynamic meanings) and dimensional meanings. Dynamic meanings are often implicitly included in static meanings, e.g., *Stůl je teď u okna* (The table is now at the window) implies that in some temporal segment preceding *teď* (now) the table was located somewhere else which means that it had to be moved from one place to the other one. The temporal index *teď* is the specific element introducing the presupposition of "changing the location" – without it (*Stůl je u okna*), the sentence would not implicate any dynamic spatial meaning. (At the same time, this example shows how difficult it is, to separate temporal and spatial meanings in sentence semantics.) Similarly, static locations accompanied by particles (working as presupposition triggers) *už/již* (already, yet) and *ještě* (still) launch presuppositions suggesting that the mentioned location is either a result of a completed motion or that a motion is just about to start: e.g., *Už jsme doma* (We are at home already) means that in a moment prior to the time of utterance we were in a place "out of home"; *Ještě jsme doma* presupposes that in the following moment we are ready to change the location. In Czech, the specification of spatial relations is mostly distributed over all the sentence (sentence utterance, respectively), many of the deictic expressions remaining implicit. In addition to indices and expressions related to them, verbal prefixes and related prepositions are utilized.

1. The starting point of expression of spatial relations in any utterance is the primary index *zde/tady* (here). (The intension of these indices is a "place of utter-

ance”, their extension as well as their reference varies depending on a particular utterance, therefore *tady* can mean “at this point”, “in this room”, “in this company”, “in this town” etc. *Tady* is often used with an accompanying gesture.) *Zde* represents a starting point from which all the other elements referring to space unfold their meaning and towards which they are delimited. (For the purpose of this paper, we leave out of consideration that to separate the place location, i.e. *zde*, from the time location of an utterance, i.e. *now*, is an act of artificial abstraction.) The index *zde* is defined by the spatial location of the speaker and, as well as its basic counterpart, *tam* (there), it is semantically non-specific. *Zde a tam* are closely connected with corresponding demonstratives *tento* (this) and *tamten* (that). From the viewpoint of the proximity - distance opposition of *zde* and *tam*, the other demonstratives, *ten*, *tenhle a tenhleten*, are underspecified: depending on the context, they may refer both to proximal and to distant objects. (Nevertheless, *tamhleten* is always marked as expressing distance from the speaker.) Since the indices *zde* (and *now*) are primarily related towards the spatio-temporal location of the speaker, the location towards the addressee has to be explicitly specified (*Stojím na druhé straně ulice, hned proti tobě.* – “I am standing on the other side of the street, right opposite you.”). The basic expression of dynamic spatial relations is *sem* (motion towards the speaker); the related demonstrative *tam* can be used to express both static and dynamic meaning, i.e. either the motion “away from” the speaker or a distant location. The other related demonstratives are compounds including prefix *od* (from); their meaning is often given by the context: *odsud* (from here), *odtud* (from here / from there), *odtamtud*, which occurs also in a disassembled form *tam odtud* (from there). *Potud*, including prefix *po-* (up to) expresses “border marking” with context-dependent meaning “up to this point” or “up to that point”. Other means of expression of spatial relations will be discussed in following paragraphs. (Toponymy, the system of place names, usually studied in the field of etymology and history, is not considered here.)

1.1. The structure of spatial descriptions (in most of the languages of various types, cf. Lyons, 1977, Levinson, 2001) is generally based on the object to be located (O) and the object with respect to which the location of O is specified – the (back)ground P. There seem to be three basic types of location specification: (1) Where O and P are contiguous or coincident, a static O may be said to be “at” (*u*) P; if P is presented as dimensional, O can be “in” (*v*) or “on” (*na*) P. Spatial relations of the type (1) are sometimes called topological because they obviously belong to language universals, representing the most general core of spatial concepts. (2) Where O and P are separated in space, it is necessary to specify an angle or direction in which O can be found. This involves three main types of the frames of reference: intrinsic, relative and absolute (see 1. 2.). (3) Where O is in motion, two kinds of P are relevant: a source (starting point) *P<sub>v</sub>* and a goal *P<sub>c</sub>*. Possibly, a path / trajectory of the motion can be described, too. In principle, the motion is specified as increasing the distance of O from *P<sub>v</sub>* or decreasing the distance of O towards *P<sub>c</sub>*. Also, motion can be specified as taking place within a location. For closer description of the motion, configurations (1) or (2) (or both) can be

utilized. It means that if the relation of O and P is dynamic, it can be topologically expressed by prepositions *ke* (“towards”), *na* + Acc. (“onto”), *do* (“into”), or *od*, *s/z* (“off the surface”) or *z* (“from”). The domain of deixis can be seen mainly in the configurations (1) and within the relative frame of reference.

1. 2. The mentioned frames of reference are the following (cf. Lyons 1977, Levinson 2001, 2003; Imai 2003):

a/ The intrinsic frame of reference is binary and is based on a mix of functional and orientational information taking into account that objects or human beings have some kind of natural or functionally preferred organization, offering a chance to differentiate a “front” and a “back” part, as well as “top” or “bottom” or, anthropocentrically, “left” and “right” section. Lyons (1977, 690–691) describes the vertical dimension as the most salient among the spatial concepts given by the primary human experience with gravity. Certain objects can have the so-called canonical orientation – the front of a building is the side where entrance is located, the front of a car is defined according to the direction where it primarily moves, we stand *in front of a person* if we face him/her etc. Canonical orientation can be found in the vertical dimension, too – a *top* and a *bottom* of a bottle or a boat remains top and bottom even if the object is turned over - cf. *upside down / dnem vzhůru, vzhůru nohama*. Such orientation shows itself in connection with the concepts “inside” and “outside”, too – cf. *inside out / naruby*. The right – left orientation depends on the front – back orientation: the location *left* or *right from the house* depends on the fact if the viewer stands *in front* or *behind the house*. The right – left and the front – back orientation can be shared by the speaker and the addressee if they talk to each other in a side-by-side arrangement, e.g., a driver and a person in a passenger seat share an identical view. In other arrangements, the orientation has to be specified like in b/.

b/ The relative frame is ternary because it always includes the viewer and his perspective; the location of O in relation to P depends on the location of the speaker (or addressee, or another person or point involved) – *před stromem* or *za stromem* (“in front” or “behind the tree trunk”) depends on the position of the speaker, or, like in *ta kniha na polici po tvé levé ruce* (“the book on the shelf at your left hand”), on the position of the addressee. Nonetheless, the meaning of

(1) *A. stands in front of the car*

can be either 1. “A. stands between me and the car”, i.e. relative, depending on the speaker’s perspective, or 2. “A. stands in front of the hood”, i.e. intrinsic. In similar cases, where the intrinsic and the relative frame of reference overlap, the actual meaning is given by the context. Sometimes, the a/ and b/ frames cooperate regularly, e.g.

(2) *Rosický střelil do pravého horního rohu branky* (“R. took a right upper corner kick”)

is localised both intrinsically (“upper corner”) and relatively (“right corner”) because, as a result of the established convention, the “right” and “left” side here is assigned from the perspective of a shooting player, not a goalkeeper.

c/ The third basic frame of reference is absolute, using parameters *sever, jih, východ, západ* (“north, south, east, west”), i. e. conventionalized geographical coordinates. Even in this frame a high level of relativity can be seen, e. g.

(3) *Praha leží na východ od Berlína, ale na západ od Vídně* (“Prague is located east from Berlin but west from Vienna”),

which means that for the precise location, an elaborated system of geographical coordinates has to be employed. Within the c/ frame, the intrinsic orientation can be seen in the fact that on all maps, geographical *sever* is always located on the upper side. (More exactly, the conventional location of geographical coordinates has become the intrinsic property of the objects called *maps*.)

2. The main topic of this paper, deictic expressions, occur mainly in the domain of topological relations and in the relative frame of reference. In par. 1., we have already mentioned the basic repertory of them. In the following we will discuss other deictic expressions. The elementary oppositions within the spatial deixis are the positional deixis: *zde / tady* vs. *tam*, and the dimensional deixis: *vlevo* (“on the left”) – *vpravo* (“on the right”), *nahoře* (“at the top”) – *dole* (“down here/there”), *vpředu* (“in the front”) – *vzadu* (“in the back”). In the framework of spatial deixis, the relations seen as static (*nahoře – dole, vpředu – vzadu*) have their dynamic counterparts: *sem – tam* (see par. 1.), *doleva* (“to the left”) – *doprava* (“to the right”), *nahoru* (“upwards”) – *dolů* (“downwards”), *dopředu* (“forwards”) – *dozadu* (“backwards”). (English spatial descriptions are more specific and context-sensitive than their Czech counterparts.) Important group of means of expression in this domain are prepositions together with noun case forms and corresponding or non-corresponding verbal prefixes, see par. 3. In those constructions, the description of spatial relations can be seen as multi-dimensional since the semantics of lexical items depending on prepositions as well as the semantics of verbs modified by prefixes represent an important semantic contribution to the spatial description. Also, the relation of the speaker and the object spoken about (localized O) and P can depend on the semantics of the respective predicate and its adjuncts involved:

(4) *Petr našel klíče v kufří* (“Peter found the keys in his suitcase”)

launches different implicatures than

(5) *Petr našel klíče v zahradě* (“Peter found his keys in the/his garden”).

In (4), the sentence describes only the spatial relation of the keys (O) and the suitcase (P) and it does not say anything about the location of Petr. (It is only

implicated that P and Petr were in a close distance.) On the contrary, sentence (5) implicitly means that both Petr and O shared the location (in P). Semantic (in)compatibility of O, P and the predicate plays a decisive role in the actual or metaphorical interpretation of a spatial construction, cf.

(4a) *Petr sáhl pro klíče do kapsy/kufru/zásuvky* (“Peter reached for his keys to his pocket/suitcase/drawer”)

(4b) *Město sahá až do pouště* (“The town reaches into the desert”).

2.1. With certain verbs of motion, if modified by the prefixes *po-*, *při-* and *od-*, the spatial element becomes an integral part of the sentence semantics (proposition) without being verbalized:

(6) *Pojd’te* = “Come with me, follow me, i.e. the speaker”; the speaker and the addressee mostly share the location; in

(6a) *Pojd’ večer na pivo* the speaker and addressee may or may not share the location in the moment of the utterance, but definitely the shared location is situated in the future;

(7) *Přijd’te* = “Come to the place where I (the speaker) am or will be”; the speaker and the addressee do not share the location;

(7a) *Přijd’te zas* = “Come again” – the speaker and the addressee are parting, i.e. finishing a period of time during which they shared the speaker’s location;

(8) *Honza zrovna přišel* = “H. has just arrived to the place where I am”;

(9) *Honza zrovna odjel* = “H. has just left the place where I am”.

(On the syntactic status of similar “generalized” expressions, cf. Panevová, 1980, p. 29–31.)

2.2. It seems apparent that speaking about location or transfers of persons and objects in relation to speaker and addressee delimits and describes what we can call a **social space**. The relation to social deixis can be increased by simultaneous expressing of not only a topological but also a personal (possessive, pertinent, functional, like “being in charge of”) relation of the speaker, addressee or some other person to a location: *u mě, u nás, u tebe, u vás, u Honzy* (“at my, our, your, Honza’s place”), as well as *k nám, k vám* (“to our/your place”). Locations of this kind are different from sheer spatial expressions – if we speak only about close distance between, e.g., a speaker (functioning here as P) and some kind of O, we unmarkedly use constructions *vedle mě, přede mnou* (“next to me, in front of me”) etc., while the locations with *u* + personal pronoun or proper name predominantly mark the mentioned relation. The “socialized location” can be further

specified as for the complementing spatial meaning – *tady/ tam u mě, tady/tam u nás, tady/tam u vás* (“here / there at my place ...”) or *u mě v pracovně* (“at my office”), *u nás doma* (“in our house”), *tady u vás na zahradě* (“here in your garden”), etc. In common with *zde/tady*, the intension of those expressions is a place of utterance, their extension being context-dependent, even though plural constructions tend to obtain more stable meaning in phraseology:

(9) *Co je u vás nového?*

almost exclusively means “What’s the news in your family?” If the location meant by *u vás* is different, it is regularly represented by a complementary location description: *Co je nového u vás na fakultě?* (“at the University”). If the complementary location is an entity exceeding a “personal” social space of a communicative partner, the relation changes. If we compare

(10) *Co je nového u vás v Brně?*

(10a) *Co je nového v Brně?*

we can see that (10) presupposes that the addressee lives or works in Brno (the relation cannot be described by a possessive pronoun), while (10a) presupposes only the fact that the addressee can be expected to be able to provide such an information. The conceptualization of a social space deserves a more detailed exploration in the future.

2.3. The group of expressions with spatial meanings includes also adverbs referring to places and directions as indefinite, uncertain or vague. In general, they are compounds: *někde, kdesi* (“somewhere” static), *někam, kamsi* (“somewhere” dynamic), *kdekoli, leckde, kamkoli, leckam, bůhvikde, bůhvikam, čertvikde, čertvikam*. The compounds with *ně-* are semantically neutral, the others express referring plus additional semantic information, namely randomness (those with the segments *-koli, lec-, bůhvi-*) or a negative evaluation (those with *čertvi-* “the devil knows”). Spatial adverbs *všude* (“everywhere”), *nikde* (“nowhere” static), *nikam* (“nowhere” dynamic), *někde, kdekoli* (“anywhere” static), among others, have a strong semantic feature of quantification (they can be arranged in the square of oppositions).

3. Specific means of expression in the area in question are the primary prepositions cooperating, especially in the sub-area of dynamic spatial relations, with verbal prefixes. It is more accurate to describe their functioning with respect to the prepositional phrase as a whole since the semantics of the nouns depending on the prepositions in the spatial constructions is of a fundamental importance. Nevertheless, not all the prepositions and related prefixes can be considered deictic. In the group of topological spatial relations, their language means of expression (their “names”) are not of deictic nature – they refer to spatial orientation as direct appellations. Among the static spatial relations it is true about the prepositions *u (při), v, na + Loc*. Among the dynamic spatial relations this feature con-

cerns *ke, do, na* + Acc. *s, z* + Gen. On the other hand, primary prepositions *před, za, pod, nad, proti, přes, po* and the secondary prepositions *vedle, kolem a mezi* can be considered typical representatives of deixis since the spatial constellations they refer to are relative, their delimitation depending on the stance (a viewpoint) of the observer. The prefixes can be divided into two analogical groups as well: *při-* (*ke, do, na*), *v-*, *za-* (*do*), *na-* (*na*), *vy-* (*z*), *od-* (*od, z*), *s-*, *se-* (*s/z*) correspond with the topological prepositions; other prefixes are analogous with the deictic prepositions. But, in the constructions “prefixed verb + preposition + noun” the correspondence of a prefix and the preposition as for their meaning and their (non)deictic nature is not default. The so-called dynamic prepositional cases always describe an actual, or a figurative motion with a possibility to express its origin (point of departure), its goal, and, if required, also its route. If we compare

- (11) *Vyšel z domu*  
 (11a) *Vyšel do zahrady,*

we can see that in (11) the prefix expresses the motion “outside of something”, correspondingly with the preposition while in (11a) the preposition contradictorily expresses the goal of the motion and the point of departure remains implicit. Similarly,

- (12) *Přistěhoval se k bratrovi*  
 (12a) *Přistěhoval se z Prahy,*

in (12), the prefix expresses the motion “to a close distance” and the preposition the goal of this motion while in (12a) the relation is “the motion to a close distance” (the prefix) + “point of departure of the mentioned motion”. Here it is the goal remaining implicit which means that it can be identified in the context. In Czech, the occurrence of explicit spatial descriptions including all the delimiting points of the motion are rather exceptional, constructions like

- (13) *Po mostě přešel z levého břehu na pravý,*

describing “the route” (the prepositions are completed by a corresponding prefix) + “the point of departure” + “the goal” usually signal that the context in which they occur for some reason requires this kind of explicitness. In unmarked cases at least one element of the spatial configuration is expressed out of the particular phrase, either at some other element in the sentence, or contextually. On the other hand, descriptions of a motion in an “abstract” space, e.g.

- (14) *Vyšel z radikální vědecké teorie,* (“He proceeded from a radical theory”)

- (15) *Došel k překvapivému závěru* (“He reached a surprising conclusion”)



usually do not imply the implicit location (it is hard to suppose that there is any) and, they show a higher level of correspondence between prefixes and prepositions. In all cases, the relation of prefixes and prepositions can be described as cooperation. With many verbs, prefixes and preposition transfer the semantics of a phrase to figurativeness, e.g.,

(16) *Rozkrájel pomeranč na dílky* (“He sliced the orange into segments”),

(17) *Rozlil čaj do šálků* (“He poured the tea into cups”),

even though the described objects are being put or situated in certain spatial arrangement combining linear and three-dimensional concepts.

3.1. The difference between actual and figurative spatial meaning as well as the difference between the static and dynamic configurations originates in the semantics of nouns and verbs involved in the particular phrase. If a noun with a “concrete” meaning is used, the semantics of prefixes and prepositions can be seen as “concrete”, too. It can be easily depicted by a scheme. In figurative sentences like (14) and (15), analogical effort would be absurd, as well as in the prepositional phrases used phraseologically, e.g. *jít na školu* (“to start to study”). The opposition “static” vs. “dynamic” depends primarily on the meaning of a verb and its aspect. It is given by the difference between “localization” and “motion” in the widest sense, e.g. *sedí na židli* (“he is sitting”, static) – *sedá si na židli* (“he is being seated”, dynamic). Prepositional phrases with the static meaning can function as a “setting” (a spatial region) where a motion takes place (is included in it):

(18) *V domě přenášel knihy z přízemí do prvního patra, z pokoje do pokoje.* (“In the house he kept moving the books from the first to the second floor, from one room to another.”)

From this point of view, the complete specification of spatial relation consists of cooperation of all the elements capable to express spatial concepts, i. e. lexical semantics is always included. In many cases, though, the spatial description is constrained by sheerly empirical (pragmatic) factors. E.g. *nad stolem* (“above the table”) is a portion of space limited, from the viewpoint of an observer, horizontally by the size and shape of the mentioned table and vertically by a ceiling even though, strictly said, no vertical limits are given here – we only know the starting (the lowest) point (points) which is located on the surface of the table. (If a table is outdoors, the vertical space is limited by a “human reach” – *above the table* can be an entity like a lamp or a tree-top, not an airplane passing above.) The same is true about *před stolem, za stolem* (“in front of, behind the table”) – in similar sentences we normally do not consider the spatial region out of the house etc. The choice of a preposition is often motivated empirically, too, cf. *sedí na židli* (on the surface), but *sedí v křesle* (“in” an armchair). The spatial description is mostly

distributed over all the sentence and can cover the elements of spatial relations selectively or in complexity.

4. We have tried to show the most prominent topics and means of expression functioning in the area of spatial meanings in Czech. We have concentrated at the deictic means of expression. Nevertheless, it seems impossible to draw sharp line a/ between deictic and non-deictic spatial expressions, b/ between actual and figurative spatial descriptions, c/ between spatial deixis and situation deixis as a whole. Also, we have omitted a vast area of a textual space which has its own specifics. All the mentioned themes reveal to be a tempting field of a further research.

## REFERENCES

- BÜHLER, K. (1999,1934): Sprachtheorie. Stuttgart : Lucius & Lucius
- HIRŠCHOVÁ, M.(2006): Pragmatika v češtině. Olomouc : Vydavatelství UP
- IMAI, S.(2006) Spatial deixis. <http://web.cc.yamaguchi-n.ac.jp/~imai2002/linguistics/imai2003.pdf> : 20.6.2006
- KAMP, H. – REYLE, U. (1993): From Discourse to Logic 1,2. Dordrecht – Boston - London : Kluwer Academic Publishers
- KAMP, H. (2005): Untitled, <http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/~hans/hpl-drt.pdf>, 9.2.2005
- LEVINSON, S. C. (1983): Pragmatics. Cambridge: CUP
- LEVINSON, S.C. (2000): Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature. Cambridge, Mass. : The MIT Press
- LEVINSON, S.C. (1996): Language and Space. Annual Review of Anthropology 25, s. 353–382.
- LEVINSON, S.C. (2001): Linguistic Expression of Space. In: Smelser, N.J. – Baltes, P. (eds.) International Encyclopaedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 17, pp. 11948–11954. Amsterdam/Oxford : Elsevier Science
- LEVINSON, S.C. (2003): Spatial Language. In: Nadel, L. (ed.) Encyclopaedia of Cognitive Science. Vol. 4, pp. 131–137. London : Nature Publishing Group
- LEVINSON, S.C. (2004): Deixis and Pragmatics. In: Horn, L. – Ward, G. (eds.) The Handbook of Pragmatics, pp. 97–121. Oxford : Blackwell
- LYONS, J. (1977): Semantics 1, 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- PANEVOVÁ, J. (1980): Formy a funkce ve stavbě české věty. Praha : Academia
- VERSCHUEREN, J. (1999): Understanding Pragmatics. London: Arnold

## NĚKOLIK POZNÁMEK O PROSTOROVÉ DEIXI V ČEŠTINĚ. SÉMANTICKO-PRAGMATICKÝ PŘÍSTUP

Článek se zabývá vyjadřováním prostorových významů v češtině, zvláště pak prostorovou deixi a jejími vyjadřovacími prostředky. Popisy prostorových konfigurací jsou založeny na objektu, který má být lokalizován (O), a na objektu, vůči němuž se lokalizace O vymezuje – pozadí P. Rozlišují se tři základní typy prostorové specifikace: (1) Tam, kde s O a P stýkají, statický O může být lokalizován u P; je-li P dimenzionální, O může být v nebo na P. (2) Jestliže jsou O a P v prostoru odděleny, je nutno specifikovat úhel nebo směr, v němž se O vyskytuje. To se děje ve třech referenčních rámcích: intrinsickém, relativním a absolutním. (3) Jestliže se O pohybuje, jsou relevantní východisko Pv a cíl Pc, popř. trasa pohybu. Doménou deixe jsou konfigurace (1) a relativní

referenční rámec. Prostorová specifikace je v češtině zpravidla distribuována v celé větě, přičemž nejméně jedna z dílčích specifikací je běžně implicitní. Kromě indexů a výrazů na ně navazujících vyjadřují prostorové významy předložky a s nimi příbuzné slovesné předpony; na vyjádření se podílí i lexikální sémantika a slovesný vid.

*Milada Hirschová*

*Katedra českého jazyka FP TU Liberec*

*Sokolská 8*

*CZ - 466 01 Liberec*

*e-mail: Milada.Hirschova@seznam.cz*