

SEMANTIC CHANGE OF PRONOMINAL ADVERBS FOR «SO»: MODELS AND MOTIVATION

In this article, the analysis of the secondary meanings of adverbs for «so» in selected Indo-European languages has established peculiar features of the semantic change of such items, linking these features to the semiotic nature of demonstratives as indexical signs equivalent to the pointing gesture used in the prototypical cognitive-communicative situation.

Key words: indexical sign, demonstrative, deixis, semantic change, speech situation, cognitive situation.

The subject matter of the present article is some features of pronominal polysemy, with special reference to the secondary meanings of demonstrative pronouns such as Ukrainian *mak*, its Slavonic cognates and its semantic correlates in other languages, as well as some problems and perspectives that arise in describing and analyzing these meanings.

Although an individual part of speech, pronouns in more general terms are classified with deictic items¹. The deictic class comprises linguistic entities, both grammatical (tense or person) and lexical (pronouns as well as some «notional» adverbs), that refer to their object rather than name it, their reference determined by speech situation and / or context, and within these, by the speaker's viewpoint². In terms of the traditional «notional — functional» part of speech distinction, pronouns belong to the latter, at the same time sharing with the former (as well as the grammatical deictic categories) the feature of polysemy. Polysemy is generally in the nature of linguistic sign, being one of the two aspects of what S. Karcevski called «asymmetric duality» of that sign, its other aspect being synonymy³. Various communicative, pragmatic, and syntactic functions of pronominal deictic items have been a long-standing object of lexicographic description and theoretical study, yet as far as the polysemy of such items as English *so* is concerned it thus far has attracted even less modern linguistic theoreticians' interest than that enjoyed by the polysemy of grammatical as well as some lexical deicticals⁴. Gustav Stern pointed out in his 1931 monograph «Meaning and change

¹ In antiquity, it was pronouns, including demonstratives, that the Greek word δεικτικος «pointing, indicating, reference» was applied to, see: *Matthews R. P.* The concise Oxford dictionary of linguistics. — Oxford, 2003. — P. 89.

² Besides deixis proper, syntagmatic, or text-internal, deixis is also distinguished, with deictic words referring forwards or backwards in discourse, see: *Crystal D.* A first dictionary of linguistics and phonetics. — Malden etc., 2008. — Passim; *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics.* — Elsevier, 2006. — Passim.

³ *Karcevski S.* Du dualisme asymétrique du signe linguistique // *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague.* — 1929. — T. 1. — P. 88–93.

⁴ However, it should be added that the polysemy of grammatical deictic categories, such as tense or person, is studied much better than that of lexical deicticals. On the metaphorical use of the

of meaning» that «most writers have concentrated on nouns: verbs and adjectives (with adverbs) also had a share of attention, while pronouns and particles require much additional attention»⁵, adding that «a complete review of the whole field of sense-change will perhaps be possible in two or three generation»⁶. However in what regards pronominal deicticals for «so», the situation still remains essentially the same⁷. In fact, they are even not classified with demonstratives, and their pronominal as well as deictic nature seems to be generally overlooked.

In terms of Ch. S. Peirce's most widely used general sign typology, the one concerning the way sign represents its object, i. e. representational relationship between them, deictic items belong to indexes (indices), that is, signs that represent their object by virtue of the association of contiguity, such as exists between cause and effect or, say, between a pointer and an item it points to. The other two Peirce's sign representation types are icons, which resemble their object, and purely arbitrary symbols⁸.

Subsuming indexical relationships of various kinds, the semiotic category of index is an abstraction in yet another sense: Peirce maintained that in reality the three varieties of semiotic representation do not occur separately, so that actual signs are a mixture of the three types differing in their relative prominence – a thesis which R. Jakobson, an ardent propagator of Peirce's semiotic ideas, especially singled out⁹. Because of this changeable difference in the representational relationship hierarchy, some of deicticals are, so to say, conspicuously more deictic (or indexical) than other ones. So in personal deixis, the first person, realized pronominally and / or inflexionally, coincides in time and place with its referent, justifying E. Benveniste's definition of «I» as «a person who says I»¹⁰. The use of the second person, too, presumes the addressee's being present at the moment and, albeit in a more loose sense, place of utterance which is addressed to him, while with the third person there are no such presuppositions. Similarly, of the tenses, it is only the present, especially used in its prototypical meaning of something going on right at the moment of speech, that is contiguous in time with its referent (and so are lexical adverbial deicticals sharing the semantic feature «immediate present», such as Ukrainian *сьогодні, зараз, тепер*), whereas the past and the future are only indexical semantically and not semiotically.

Yet with these «true» deictic indices, there is more to them than just temporal and spatial contiguity, that is to say, these linguistic signs and their referents are not linked by their temporal and special contiguity alone. Seen from a cognitive perspective, the relationship between them, mediated by human mind, implies that the referent must be perceived by the speaker, therefore the speaker is at the same time a perceiver, the further implication being that the deictic index's referent, which is also the speaker's perception object, must be sensory-accessible. In other words, speech situa-

latter, see: Bertinetto P. M. Metafore tempo-aspettuali // *Linguistica*. — 1992. — N 32. — P. 89–106; Bertinetto P. M. Avverbi pseudodeittici e restrizioni sui tempi verbali in italiano // *Tra Rinascimento e strutture attuali*. — Torino, 1991. — P. 289–304; Єрмоленко С. С. Про деякі структурно-функціональні характеристики темпоральних мікрополів // *Мовознавство*. — 2003. — № 4. — С. 38–47.

⁵ Stern G. Meaning and change of meaning. — Bloomington, s.a. — P. 8.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ In the already cited Elsevier's Encyclopedia of language and linguistics, the entry «Demonstratives» running for several pages makes no mention of demonstratives meaning «so»; see: Demonstratives // *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. — Elsevier, 2006. — P. 430–435.

⁸ Peirce Ch. S. Logic as semiotics: theory of signs // Innis R. E. Semiotics: an introductory anthology. — Bloomington, 1985. — P. 4–23.

⁹ See: Якобсон Р. В поисках сущности языка // *Семиотика*. — М., 1983. — С. 106–197.

¹⁰ As he put it, «Est ego qui dit ego» (see: Benveniste E. De la subjectivité dans le langage // Benveniste E. Les problèmes de linguistique generale. — Paris, 1966. — P. 260).

tion, from which both person and tense derive, is prototypically situation of perception as well. It is these cognitive features of deixis that underlie the rhetorical and stylistic properties of the present tense, for instance, those of its historical present variety. Because of that, it is only taking into account these features that allows to explain this tense's role as an exponent of the figure of *evidentia* (*εναργία*) defined by ancient rhetoricians as a means of reporting what actually had happened¹¹, or its similar narrative use in colloquial speech both as stylistic device and as marker of evidentiality (either speaker's or reported one) and, consequently, truthfulness (or trustworthiness)¹². Also, approaching them from a cognitive standpoint allows to identify and / or adequately interpret rhetoric and stylistic usages, including some less known ones, of the first and second person¹³.

Also, the semiotic feature of contiguity in time and space as well as of perceptual accessibility within speech situation shared by grammatical and lexical deictic units with the semantic feature «present» can further be found in other language items, such as the old Indo-European injunctive, Slavonic verbal interjections (e. g. Ukrainian *стриб, хан*) and nominal sentences which are statement of existence (Ukrainian *Пожежежа! Гол!* English *Summer — summer — summer! The soundless footsteps on the grass!* — J. Galsworthy). Lacking any formal tense marking, and therefore being even more indexical than the first person or the present tense, items of this kind directly point to their referent like a linguistic gesture (and it is precisely their semiotic nature of «true», extra linguistically motivated indices that precludes from assigning them a zero tense marker, something that A. A. Reformatskiy had argued for)¹⁴. Viewed from such a perspective, all these items can be regarded as making up the functional-semantic field (or category) of the perceptual present. As such, they are also capable of similar rhetoric and stylistic use¹⁵.

Capable of being used as a linguistic equivalent of a pointing hand gesture, items such as Ukrainian *макор* English *so* are *per definitionem* constituents of the said field, although, due to their basic use as the adverbial modifier of manner generally denoting «the how», they belong to its peripheral rather than central part. Besides this primary sense, they also have many other meanings too; for instance, the entry for the headword *мак* in «Dictionary of the Ukrainian language» in 11 vols. (*SUM*) numbers several large pages in small print. In what follows I will analyze the secondary meanings of such words in several Indo-European languages, first of all in Ukrainian, paying special attention to the patterns of sense change they exhibit and also to the reflection of their semiotic and cognitive properties on their secondary meanings. I will do so on presumption that secondary (derived) meaning(s) of a linguistic entity can be determined not only semantically, i. e. by its primary (underlying) one, but also semiotically, i. e. by those properties of this entity which are peculiar to it as linguistic sign.

¹¹ *Гаспаров М. Л.* Античная риторика как система // Античная поэтика. Риторическая теория и литературная практика.— М., 1991.— С. 41–42.

¹² Which means that E. Benveniste was wrong in his assessment of the historical present as nothing more than «un artifice stylistique» (see: *Benveniste E.* Les relations de temps dans le verbe français // Benveniste E. Les problèmes de linguistique generale.— Paris, 1966.— P. 255); see an essentially similar approach in: *Fludernik M.* The historical present tense yet again: tense switching and narrative dynamics in oral and quasi-oral storytelling // Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg.— 1991.— Т. 11.— С. 365–398. More on that, see: *Ермоленко С. С.* Мовне моделювання дійсності і знакова структура мовних одиниць.— К., 2006.— С. 310–320.

¹³ *Yermolenko S. S.* Person in artistic discourse // Мовознавство — 2015. — № 3. — С. 23–32.

¹⁴ *Реформатский А. А.* Глагольные формы типа *хлп* // Изв. АН СССР. ОЛЯ.— 1963.— Т. 22.— Вып. 2.— С. 127–129.

¹⁵ *Ермоленко С. С.* Мовне моделювання...— С. 273–282.

In terms of part-of-speech reference, pronouns of this kind, e. g. Ukrainian *так*, are often defined as adverbs, yet it is quite obvious that they are adverbs of pronominal nature and therefore different from adverbial entities such as Ukrainian *справедливо* or English *warmly*. Accordingly they can be qualified as pronominal adverbs or adverbial pronouns. They differ from other demonstrative adverbs, such as Ukrainian *тут, ось, там*, in that they imply comparison and, sometimes, some other correlation as well, e. g. that between cause and effect (it is this feature of their meaning that make them peripheral, but not central, constituents of the field of the perceptual present). Therefore their use presupposes the existence or necessity of some similarity, in particular, the existence of a criterion, model or standard. As I have already pointed out, these items, both those of them that are genetically related (such as Ukrainian *так* and other Slavonic reflexes of Common Slavonic **takъ*), and their semantic correlates in other Indo-European languages, such as English *so* or Italian *così*, have more or less numerous and ramified sets of secondary meanings, some of these crossing over to other parts of speech, particles or conjunctions. As to their adverbial meanings proper, there, too, are numerous instances of parallel sense development and similar inner form of semantic derivatives. Notwithstanding the regularity of these parallel cases indicative of common patterns of sense development, some of them seem both natural and transparently motivated, whereas other, equally usual and natural-looking, lack transparent extra linguistic motivation.

Arguably, it is the semantic feature of comparison inhering in demonstrative pronominal adverbs such as *so* that underlies their regular secondary meaning «approximately», illustrated by the following examples: Ukrainian «А давно він телефонував? — та *так* годину тому», Polish «*Tak* o piątej, *tak* z litr wody» (USJP¹⁶), German «*So* in zwanzig Minuten binich fertig» (Duden), English *or so* «or something like, or close to, that» (SOED), нім. *oderso* «ibid.» (Duden); on the other hand, cf. the English phrase *just so* «exactly as has been said; in the required or appropriate manner; very closely or friendly; very neatly and carefully; neat and tidy, fastidious» (SOED), its meaning emphasizing precise correspondence, conformity or compliance. However, in the secondary meaning «approximately», the level of accuracy of comparison and the precision of correspondence it indicates are essentially lower, the accuracy of comparison often being within the generic class. That the feature «comparison» can operate as inner form expressing the sense of approximation is also demonstrated by the Russian adjective *примерный*, whose secondary meaning «approximate, rough» develops from the «primary, exemplary, model» (ССРЛЯ, 11, 54), thus exemplifying the same pattern of sense change.

Fairly clear is the motivation behind another regular secondary meaning of these adverbs, namely when they are used as intensifiers, emphatically expressing a high measure of some feature. This line of sense transformation becomes explicit if we compare types of context in which this secondary meaning occurs. So, Ukrainian *так* can express such a meaning used correlatively with *що*, with the high level of the feature's intensity made explicit by the subordinate clause (cf. «Він *так* просив, *що* було неможливо відмовити») *Так* can also convey this meaning by modifying the adverb denoting a relevant feature so as to express a relation of manner, cf. «Він просив *так* гаряче й переконливо!» where intensity and emphasis are only expressed by the joint use of *так* with the intensifying adverbs of manner *гаряче* and *переконливо* it qualifies, and not through the indication of the effect of persuasive intensity of the entreaty. However, *так* can also express this emphatic meaning all by itself, independently, taking all emphasis

¹⁶ See the dictionary abbreviation list at the end of the article.

on itself, as if absorbing it by means of semantic metanalysis of its previously mentioned contexts (a process which Michel Bréal called semantic contagion ¹⁷): «А він *так* їх просив!» (cf. also the adverbial set phrase with the similar meaning, Ukrainian *так* і: «У сонячному промінні ця кришталева карафа *так* і засяє») A similar combination of primary (unspecified) and secondary (emphatic) meaning is exhibited by deictic adverbs of measure and quantity, e. g. by Ukrainian *стільки* (cf.: «Він отримав рівно *стільки*, скільки треба» and «Він *стільки* пережив») or French *tant*, cf. its definition in «Dictionnaire français de définitions»: «Marque la quantité, l'intensité, le grand nombre (c'est le jour ou il a *tant* parlé; il y en avait *tant* que nous n'avons pas pu les prendre tous)» (DFD).

A semantic development analogous in its mechanism as well as result is also found in demonstrative pronominal adjectives such as Ukrainian *такий*: there, too, redistribution of meanings expressed by a deictic item and its context results in the former's absorbing the latter's features of intensity and emphasis, cf. Ukrainian «Це *таке* вино!» (i. e. «the wine is very good», but not «...very bad») «Куди вирушати в *таку* пору» (i. e. «it is much too late or too early to start») / «в *таку* погоду» (i. e. «the weather is too bad to start»). In this way such pronouns come to refer to a feature that is unique or special, cf. the colloquial Ukrainian expressions with *такий* used without a head noun to denote something extraordinary, exceptional, or unusual: «Що з тобою? — Нічого *такого*» (i. e. «there is nothing extraordinary with me»), *таких* пошукати or не *таких* бачили (ILS) or Polish *Co z tobą?* — Nic *takiego* (USJP), також *Coś takiego!* (used to speak about something unusual or incredible) (Ibid).

Unexpectedly different from this is another type of secondary meaning of these items, the enantiosemaic one which they express when used predicatively, in particular as an answer, this meaning qualifying something as average, middling, less satisfactory, or mediocre. The meaning of this kind can be expressed by reduplicative (and typically colloquial) combinations of such items, cf. English *so-so* (SOED), German *нім. so-so* (also *so lala*) (Duden), and Italian. *così-così* (Zingarelli), cf. also the Greek idiom *ἔτσι κι'ἔτσι* so-so, in a mediocre way, just satisfactorily; somehow or other, in any case» (literally «so and so») (HPC, 355). It is possible to construe such reduplications as a periphrastic means of expressing ambivalent contradictory assessment, repetition implying difference or variation, as in the Russian expression *есть французы и французы* (i. e. «there are different kinds of the French»). Mutatis mutandis, these can be compared with the Ukrainian phrase *і так, і сяк* «in any possible way; alternatively well and badly» (ILS) and the synonymous Russian and Polish phrases with the same inner form *так и сяк* (СРЯ, 4, 333), *tak czy siak, tak i siak, albo tak, albo siak* «*różnie, rozmaicie; i dobrze, i źle; wszelkimi sposobami*» (USJP) as well as French *comme si comme ça* «neither well nor badly» (Robert), where the feature of difference is also iconically signaled by the difference of pronominal units. But, as the definition of the French phrase suggests, the initial compositional meaning of difference in general and more specifically — and more idiomatically — of oscillation between good and bad, as conveyed by reduplication, is in its turn open to a subsequent interpretation: when summed up, «well» plus «badly» amount to something that is neither, or in between, that is, something average, mediocre, nothing special, just satisfactory yet far from good.

At the same time, the sense of mediocrity can also be conveyed by a single demonstrative pronoun of this kind used outside a reduplicative combination. As registered in *SUM*, this usage of Ukrainian *так* (assigned here to its particle variety) is said to occur as an answer to a question meaning «nothing special, so-so» («Ви про що там

¹⁷ Bréal M. *Essaie de sémantique* (science de signification).— Paris, 1897.— P. 221–226.

змагалися?.. Та *так*, пуста розмова, ти не турбуйся...») (СУМ, 10, 19), whereas in The Shorter Academic Dictionary of The Russian Language» the corresponding meaning of *так* (also treated as particle) has a somewhat different definition, «used in assessing one's qualities (usually average or mediocre) or actions (insignificant or not serious)», supplemented by the illustrations showing *так* followed by words explicitly specifying its sense, cf.: «Хоронили Пимена Коршунова, русского литератора, не особенно знаменитого, но и не вовсе безвестного, — *так*, средней руки» (М. Салтыков-Щедрин), «Кроме главной улицы, в городе, собственно, ничего и не было, — *так*, слободки, ничем не отличавшиеся от деревень» (Н. Чуковский), «(Настя) и волосы еще не разобрала — *так*, скрутила в жгут и наспех обернула вокруг головы» (Ю. Лаптев) (СРЯ, 4, 332). According to my personal observations, both Ukrainian and Russian *так* can be used in the way jointly described by their definitions. Conveying this meaning, they can be followed by the pronoun *собі*, *себе*, cf. Ukr. *так собі* «neither well nor badly, so-so» (ILS), Russian *так себе* «т. с.» (СРЯ, 4, 332). In Polish, however, this meaning is only registered with *tak* used as part of the collocations *tak sobie*, *tak jakoś* «so-so, just satisfactorily, not too well» rather than autonomously (USJP); however, in Internet I found the following: *hehehe nie oglądaj tego to i tak nic takiego taka beka*. The secondary meaning of mediocrity is also ascribed to Latin *sic*, cf.: *quid rei gerit? Sic, tenuiter* (Петрученко, 807; OLD, 1754).

It is possible that this kind of usage results from the reduction of phrases, reduplicative or other, like those mentioned above, one of their components absorbing the meaning of the whole phrase and the other deleted. However, another explanation seems more plausible and at the same time not necessarily exclusive of the former: it is more likely that the use of these units in such a meaning, especially in colloquial speech, where it is accompanied by an appropriate facial and / or hand gesture, is itself a kind of linguistic gesture, either purely expressive¹⁸ or, when it is not followed by a more explicit statement, euphemistic as well, as if the speaker is unwilling for some reason to elaborate on his, rather negative, assessment. A somewhat similar sense can be expressed by the Ukrainian demonstrative adjectival pronoun *такий* used predicatively without a head and in the neuter: used in such a way, and possibly accompanied by an appropriate gesture, it can convey either a derogatory or deprecating attitude towards what has previously been mentioned («А це — *таке!*») or indicate that it can be assessed in more than one way or from more than one viewpoint («Ну, це *таке!*»), with the speaker, unwilling or unable to be more explicit, in both cases indicating rather than naming.

On the other hand, there are instances where *такий* combined with an explicit head denotes, as its only modifier, an unusual or peculiar feature about which, however, the speaker gives no further information, seemingly (or actually) for want of an appropriate word, so that *такий* is the sole means of indicating unusualness or peculiarity, cf.: «Тут він зробив *такий* жест» or «Шевченко робить *такий* пас через усе поле» where no further explanation is given of what the speaker means by *такий*.

My analysis of the next group of meanings regularly expressed by deicticals for «so» will again involve critique of sources, namely dictionaries, in particular *SUM*, and the way they treat such usages. First of all, a meaning of Ukrainian *так* should be

¹⁸ In narration, the pointing gesture can operate as an expressive performative sign: indicating somebody or something absent as if they were nearby and therefore perceivable, the speaker creates an imaginary, or, in logical terms, intentional, object for his listeners (cf.: McNeill D., Cassell J., Levy E. T. Abstract deixis // Semiotica. — 1993. — Vol. 95. N 1–2. — P. 5–20). Also, cf. in this respect the narrative use of the English demonstrative *this* to introduce some new person or object so making them more vivid: «I met *this* really weird guy last night; Suddenly, there was *this* tremendous bang» (LDCE).

discussed that is very close to the ones already mentioned and therefore presenting an intermediate case between them and this next group. According to *SUM*, used in this meaning, Ukrainian *так* expresses the speaker's unwillingness or inability to give a direct answer («Чому ти не вчишся?.. — Не хочу... — Чому? — Так»); also, this meaning is said to have a variant «indicating a lack of that which has just been mentioned» («У мого батька було три стодоли, в одній був мак, друга була *так*, а в третій миша з розуму зійшла, що їжі не знайшла») (*СУМ*, 10, 19). I will consider the validity of this lexicographic solution a little later, but first it should be added that besides these, *SUM* also registers, along with the others, the following secondary meanings of *так*: «Without result, effect, or consequence; in vain» («...А вже мені *так* не минеться»); «Without using special means, without making any effort» («— Помогло що-небудь? — *Так* пройде»), «Without any definite goal or need; without some reason or intention; by chance, accidentally, unintentionally» («*Так* от спитав собі...») (*Ibid*, 18–20). It is easy to notice a certain resemblance among these definitions: namely, that they are all of an apophatic nature, sharing the semantic feature of absence or privation. Indeed, in all these examples *так* indicates the lack of something essential that is presupposed by the logical structure (frame) of the situation represented by the sentence, such as cause, effect, goal, or indispensable tool. Actually, this, too, applies to the instances qualified — wrongly, in my opinion — by this dictionary as representing situations lacking something that has been mentioned before: in the proverb illustrating these instances («У мого батька було три стодоли, в одній був мак, друга була *так*...») what *так* really means seems to be «not having anything within, empty» and, by generalization, «without anything whatsoever» rather than «lacking that which has just been mentioned». If the latter definition were correct, then it would imply that while there were no poppy seed in the second barn, there may have been something else, yet it is quite clear that both the second and third barns were empty, this proverb describing someone who is utterly poor.

Arguably, illustrations of the apophatic use of *так* can be found elsewhere in this entry as well: there is an example there («Річка Біла неширока. Он через неї перекинулися кладочки, позв'язувані де вірвовкою, де перевеслом, а де й *так* — просто жмутом трави») (Г. Хоткевич) — *СУМ*, 10, 18), which according to the compilers, illustrates the use of *так* occurring before the adverbial modifier specifying its meaning. It is my contention, however, that *так* as employed in such instances points to something that is elementary, prototypical, ordinary or done in the simplest way possible, identifying it as such (i. e. as something elementary etc.) within the framework of a situation where other variants or options of a more complicated nature are possible.

Thus it is these additional, more complicated optional components of the situation presupposed by its logical frame that are implied by *так*, as in the following example from an Internet page: «Грати в карти на чужому простирадлі (спершу — *так*, а потім на поцілунки») (Інтернет-блог С. Осоки). Russian *так* can be used so as well, cf. the following example from an Internet forum on Mail.Ru: «Мне вчера делали мрт гипофиза, сначала *так*, а после делали с контрастом, почему сразу было нельзя это сделать». That this kind of usage of Russian *так* is not as new as Internet is demonstrated by the following passage from A. P. Chekhov's early short story «Комик»: «Замуж еще, пожалуй, можно за него пойти, но *так* жить с ним ... ни за что!»

However, as far as I know, this kind of *так*'s secondary meaning is not distinguished in Russian dictionaries either, although one of the aforementioned examples in the Shorter Russian Academic Dictionary («...и волосы еще не разобрала — *так*, скрутила в жгут и наспех обернула вокруг головы») does seem to suggest that the

sense of *так* should be construed there as «in the simplest possible way» rather than «characterizing a quality as mediocre or an action as not important or not serious».

Also, this meaning should be distinguished from the meaning of complete absence (which *так* expresses in the mentioned proverb «У мого батька були три комори, в одній був мак, друга була *так*...») although there are instances (such as the Ukrainian expression *не так, а за гроші*) where it is difficult to differentiate between the two.

The «apophatic» meanings of Ukrainian *так* are paralleled by those of its cognate counterparts in other Slavonic languages, either wholly, as in Russian, or partly: e. g., among the meanings of Polish *tak* the only one of this kind is «emphasizing the lack of justification, apparent reason or rational motive»: *Z czegoś wnosisz, że nieznanomy był wariatem? O! z niczego, tak!; Ja nie z miłości płaczę, ja tak płaczę* (SJPD). Such parallels can also be found in the meanings of semantic correlates of Slavic *tak* outside the Slavic languages, cf. нім. *Ich habem eine Mitgliedskarte vergessen, da hat man mich so reingelassen* (Duden) (the definition of this usage provided by the dictionary compilers is «ohne den vorher genannten oder aus der Situation sich ergebenden Umstand, Gegenstand», but it would seem more justified to refer this case to the meaning type «without using special means, without making any effort» which is absent in this dictionary). Latin *sic* can convey the meaning «without result, effect, or consequence; in vain», as in *istud scelus non potest sic abire* (JIPC, 927). Although Oxford Latin Dictionary also registers the cases where the use of *sic* implies, according to the compilers, facility or effortlessness (*non, non hoc tibi, false, sic abibit* — Catullus; *nisi facient quae illos aequom est, haud sic auferent*. — Terentius (OLD, 1754), to my mind, they fall under the previous definition. In Greek, too, both New and Old, there are items with the primary meaning «so» that can be used apophatically. In Old Greek it was οὕτως that, unlike αὐτως, could convey not only its usual demonstrative meaning, but also the meaning «without a definite purpose; without effect or consequence, in vain», cf. οὕτως ὀνομάζειν τί; οὐκ ἔχω σοι φράζειν οὕτως (ДРС, 2, 1210; GEI, 1276–1277), whereas in New Greek ἔτσι can be used this way, cf.: τό ἐίπα ἔτσι (i. e. without a definite reason or intention) (HPC, 355).

Thus, the apophatic character of secondary meanings expressed by demonstrative pronominal adverbs under discussion can be different. One type of these meanings, namely that which hasn't so far been registered in dictionaries, refers to something original, prototypal, elementary, simple, unsophisticated, not complicated, yet presupposing the existence of more sophisticated and complicated options. It will be noted that this kind of usage is paralleled by adverbs meaning «just», such as Ukrainian or Russian *просто*, sometimes co-occurring with *так* and sometimes occurring alone, the use of these items making explicit the idea of simplicity, cf. Ukrainian «А *просто* “категорія”, без додаткових окреслень — так можна сказати?» In *SUM*, there is an example illustrative of this kind of usage: «Вони на раді й присудили, Щоб *просто* кесаря назвать Самим Юпітером, та й годі» (Г. Шевченко), yet according to the compilers, *просто* is used in cases like this to emphasize the meaning of another word or the whole sentence (СУМ, 86, 299).

Others refer to a simplified variant of something originally more complicated. Enantiosemaic in this respect, the apophatic meanings are at the same time essentially similar, sharing the semantic feature «lacking, or being without, something».

Having established that, the next question, or rather questions (one should address) are: what are the meanings underlying apophatic ones, in particular, is there a sole underlying meaning from which they all derive or are there several of them? Another question is, how are the apophatic meanings motivated extralinguistically; in other words,

what is / are the association(s) that the extension(s) of the underlying meaning(s) is / are based on? Taking into account the semantic as well as semiotic properties of these items, it seems reasonable to assume that such an extension must be determined not only semantically and extralinguistically, but also paralinguistically (kinetically) and pragmatically. Basically, these pronouns are a linguistic equivalent of a pointing hand gesture used in oral communication to refer to a state of affairs that is here and now, to indicate something that is perceived by the speaker, and generally is perceivable, sensorily accessible. Thus the situation of communication in which they are used so is also the basic cognitive situation of immediate perception. Given this, one can't fail to notice an essential similarity between such a situation as different from cognitively more complicated ones, on one hand, and, on the other, situations / contexts where these pronouns denote something that is basic, elementary, typical, the most simple, such contexts and contexts at the same time indicating, either explicitly or implicitly, that there are more sophisticated options. In both cases the linguistic demonstrative gesture (possibly accompanied by a hand gesture) points to something which is most easily accessible and therefore the first to be noticed and mentioned. By further extension, it can be used of something simplified rather than just simple. Thus it is this similarity that underlies the apophatic use of items under discussion, which therefore should be qualified as metaphor, more specifically a deictic metaphor, like the use of the present tense to express a temporal meaning referring to the past or future¹⁹.

To be sure, temporal and apophatic metaphors differ semantically. However, comparison of the deictic items expressing them in the light of the metaphorical meaning of one of them merits further consideration. Used in their primary meaning, they both relate to the basic cognitive situation of immediate perception, such a meaning of the present tense being that of the perceptual present. The understanding of such a situation as different from more complicated ones, which was brought into relief by comparing the primary and apophatic meanings, brings to mind R. Jakobson's theory which connected the metaphoric uses of the present tense, indeed the latter's very ability to be used metaphorically, with its semantic unmarkedness distinguishing it from other tenses. In the general sense, unmarkedness was understood by him as the lack of a certain distinctive feature, whereas in the particular case of the present tense he maintained that it involves not signaling any temporal meaning whatever, and it is this atemporal nature of the present tense that allows it to refer to the future and past along with the present)²⁰. Jakobson and adherents of this theory, like V. V. Vinogradov²¹, were criticized for disregarding the element of imagery evident, for instance, in the historical present and so indicative of the present tense's distinct temporal meaning rather than the opposite of it²². Yet qualifying this tense as semantically unmarked may be correct, but only if its unmarkedness (not-signalling A) is interpreted in semiotic-cognitive rather than purely semantic terms, that is, if this unmarkedness is identified with the basic cognitive situation reflected in the primary meaning of this tense and opposed to other, more complicated, cognitive situations represented by its more abstract meanings as well as the meanings of other tenses. From this viewpoint

¹⁹ Ермоленко С. С. Образные средства морфологии. — К., 1987. — Passim.

²⁰ Jakobson R. Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums // A Prague School reader in linguistics. — Bloomington, 1964. — P. 347–359.

²¹ Виноградов В. В. Русский язык : Грамматическое учение о слове. — М., Ленинград, 1947. — С. 429–430.

²² See, e. g.: Бондарко А. В. Вид и время русского глагола (значение и употребление). — М., 1971. — С. 61–62; Кржишкова Е. Некоторые вопросы изучения времени в современном русском языке // Вопр. языкознания. — 1962. — № 3. — С. 17–26.

the primary as well as prototypical meaning of the present tense is its use in the role of an indexical sign pointing to directly perceived reality, a reality in which the past and the future yet have to be differentiated from the present²³. In this case, the atemporal or even extratemporal meaning of the present tense (as found in mathematical or theological discourse) can be interpreted as the ultimate case of its semantic development, its maximally abstract semantic variety, one in which all temporal oppositions come to be neutralized.

Naturally, being peripheral constituents of the field of the perceptual present, pronominal adverbs of the type discussed have other patterns of polysemy and models of their semantic change. Among specific features of their secondary meaning sets (some of which still not registered in dictionaries), there are peculiar cases of enantiosemy as well as metaphoric apophatic meaning. However, these, too, derive from the underlying nature of these deicticals as linguistic equivalents of gesture used within the cognitively primary context of oral communication.

DICTIONARY ABBREVIATIONS LIST

- Duden — Deutsches Universal Wörterbuch : Das umfassende Bedeutungs wörterbuch der deutsch seutschen Gegenwartssprache / 7. Auflage.— München, 2003 (Kindle default dictionary).
- GEL — A Greek-English Lexicon compiled by H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott: rev. and aug. throughout by Sir H. S. Jones: with a revised supplement.— Oxford, 1996.— 2438 p.
- ILS — Інтегрована лексикографічна система «Словники України» 3.1.
- LDCE — Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Writing Assistant Edition CD ROM.— Pearson Education Ltd., 2005.
- OLD — Oxford Latin dictionary.— London, 1968.— 2126 p.
- Robert — Le Petit Robert. Version électronique.— Paris, 2012.
- SJPD — Słownik języka polskiego / Pod red. W. Doroszewskiego. Wersja elektroniczna.— Warszawa, 1958–1969.— Т. 1–11.
- SOED — The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary (Fifth edition) on CD-ROM, version 2.0.
- USJP — Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego: wersja 1.0.— Warszawa, 2004.
- Zingarelli — *Zingarelli L.* Vocabolario della lingua italiana.— Bologna, 2011 (Kinlde default dictionary).
- ДРС — *Дворецкий И. Х.* Древнегреческо-русский словарь.— М., 1958.— Т. 1–2.
- ЛРС — *Дворецкий И. Х.* Латинско-русский словарь.— М., 1976.— 1096 с.
- НРС — *Хориков И. П., Малев М. Г.* Новогреческо-русский словарь.— М., 1980.— 855 с.
- Петрученко — *Петрученко О.* Латинско-русский словарь.— М., 1882.— 990 с.
- СРЯ — Словарь русского языка : В 4 т.— М., 1988.— Т. 1–4.
- ССРЛЯ — Словарь современного русского литературного языка.— М. ; Ленинград, 1955–1965.— Т. 1–17.
- СУМ — Словник української мови : В 11 т.— К., 1970–1980.— Т. 1–11.

С. С. ЄРМОЛЕНКО

СМИСЛОВИЙ РОЗВИТОК ПРИСЛІВНИКІВ ЗІ ЗНАЧЕННЯМ «ТАК»: МОДЕЛІ І МОТИВАЦІЯ

У статті проаналізовано похідні значення прислівників з первинним значенням «так» у низці індоевропейських мов, встановлено специфічні риси семантичного розвитку цих одиниць і обґрунтовано зв'язок цих рис із семіотичною природою вказівних займенників як індексальних знаків, еквівалентних вказівному жесту, вживаному в контексті прототипової когнітивно-комунікативної ситуації.

Ключові слова: похідне значення, індексальний знак, вказівний займенник, дейксис, семантичний розвиток, енантіосемія, апофатичність, метафора, ситуація спілкування, когнітивна ситуація, поле перцептивного теперішнього часу.

²³ Cf. *Kuryłowicz J.* The role of deictic elements in linguistic evolution // *Semiotica*. — 1978. — Vol. 2. N 2. — P. 174–183.