

Chiara De Vita*

Karl Bühler's Fantasmatic Deixis Between Motion, Gestures, and Words

1. Definition of *Deixis*

In the field of linguistics, reflection on deixis is an open, evolving issue, characterized by different positions and still-unresolved questions. Over time, numerous attempts have been made to define the phenomenon of deixis, without, however, arriving at a shared and univocally recognized and accepted definition. Referring to the etymology of the word, *deixis* derives from the Greek δεικνυμι (*deiknumi*), which means “to show, to indicate”. In general, *deictic words* are all those terms having the characteristic of indicating their referent, i.e., their “contact person”, in a concrete communicative situation. In the linguistic field, there are some words unanimously considered as deictic words, such as personal pronouns (e.g., *I*, *you*, and *we*), demonstrative pronouns (such as *this* or *that*), or place or time adverbs (such as *here* or *now*). Recently, some authors have supported the integration of the traditional set of deictic words with new elements. For example, the American linguist Fillmore (1929–2014) considered the verbs *to come* and *to go* also as deictics since they acquire meaning in the light of the different positions in space of the issuer and the receiver (see Wang, 2018).

The phenomenon of deixis is inextricably linked to the gesture of indication, which is recognized as a specifically human act. This kind of gesture is similar to a road sign but they both are useful only if they are well placed, namely if they are in their appropriate indication field. Thus, the deictic words are verbal signs working in the same way as road signs: they both have an indicative function. However, the concrete event of speech differs from the immobility of the road sign in an important aspect. In fact, the former is an event, a complex human activity in which the issuer does not simply take a specific position in space but also plays a role, i.e., the role of the issuer, different from the receiver's role. In this sense, *I* and *you* are also deictic words indicating, respectively, the role of the issuer and the receiver.

* University of Trieste, Italy.

2. A Theoretical Framework for the Understanding of Deixis: Philipp Wegener's Linguistic Conception

In order to better understand the phenomenon of deixis, it is useful to refer to Philipp Wegener's (1848–1916) linguistic conception that, in the second half of the 19th century, contributed to the development of the theory of language, in general, and to the pragmatics of communication, in particular. Wegener's linguistic reflection moves around two fundamental linguistic issues: (1) How does language work? and (2) How does the understanding of language happen? On this basis, the author develops a functional and pragmatic conception of language in which it is intended essentially as a tool of interaction. Indeed, according to Wegener, the fundamentals of the linguistic analysis are the real speaker, in a concrete communicative situation, the intentional nature of any verbal reference, and the listener. In particular, the author emphasizes the importance of the interrelation between the speaker and the listener for the construction of meaning.

Wegener proposes a dialogical conception, in which, only in the dialogue between the speaker and the listener (i.e., the issuer and the receiver), language becomes an act endowed with purpose and intentionality, namely, action, and phonic sequences become linguistic tools. Thus, the author recognizes a fundamental role for the inferential ability of the receiver. According to his vision, words and sentences provide clues on the basis of which the listener makes inferences and integrations to complete the message provided by the speaker and understand its meaning. Furthermore, impulses, sensations, and feelings lead a person to express himself/herself, to open themselves up to the world, and to listen. In other words, they lead man to be cooperative, in the broadcast sense of the term. Thus, the construction of meaning consists in a constant work of cooperation between the speaker and the listener in a concrete situation of exchange. Wegener suggests that the main aim of speech is to influence the interlocutor by inducing him or her to provide an appropriate response, not exclusively verbal. In this sense, language can be considered as a form of action. Not surprisingly, Wegener speaks of *linguistic action* (*sprachliches Handeln*) (Wegener, 1921, p. 4), in which each mode, such as tone or prosody, mimicry, nonverbal behavior, and involuntary preferences, does something and all modes contribute to the action. In general, according to Wegener, in the context of speech, we must consider the speaker, the listener, the purpose toward which the words and sentences are oriented, and the situation allowing us to grasp the real meaning of what is communicated. In particular, on the one side, the speaker has to adapt his/her words to the listener; on the other side, the listener is actively involved in the construction of meaning and, through the situation, has to integrate the clues transmitted by the words,

which are mostly ambiguous, and make them relevant, to grasp the actual suggested meaning.

Wegener considers language as a process in which physiological and psychological factors inseparably coexist, as the abstract synthesis in which certain physical muscular movements are linked to certain mental representations, namely, contents or meanings. He shares the “psychological perspective”, opposite to organicist and naturalist conceptions. According to the author, the language does not have a life independent of the speaker. As a consequence, he emphasizes the importance of considering all physiological and psychological mechanisms involved in learning and using the language. Moreover, Wegener highlights the role of situation, considered as a scene serving to identify the subject which the predicate refers to, thus providing an anchorage and disentangling the ambiguity. In this way, the situation becomes a kind of map, allowing the orientation and the attribution of an appropriate meaning to words. The more knowledge that is shared between the interlocutors, the more likely it is that predicates will become appropriate to the situation. Furthermore, according to Wegener, the interlocutors contribute to the linguistic action with the totality of their being, such as prosodic and gestural aspects (e.g., accent, intonation or tone, and gestures), cognitive contents, mental representations, physiological tools (e.g., phonation), experiences, expectations, questions, and needs. Therefore, in the author’s view, the use and understanding of language are complex operations requiring the global involvement of the person.

3. The Contribution of Karl Bühler: From the Two-Field Theory to Modes of Indicating of Deictic Words

Karl Bühler (1879–1963) was a German physician-psychologist-philosopher of the first half of the 20th century, founder of the linguistic studies on deixis. In his reflection, which is in continuity with that of Philipp Wegener, language is considered not only as a means of communication but also as a place of objectification of psychic life. In his most significant work, namely, the *Sprachtheorie*, Bühler exposes a complete theory of language, in an attempt to reconcile psychology and linguistics. A peculiar characteristic of his approach is the attention to the communicative event in its concrete manifestation.

The theme of deixis is involved in one of the most important aspects of Bühler’s thinking, i.e., the two-field theory, which the author developed in order to explain the functioning of deictic words. According to this theory, there are two fields in which linguistic signs acquire meaning: (1) the field of indication/pointing (i.e., situation), i.e., the space–time “place” generated every time a human being talks to another human being and originating in the *here, now, and I*, in which the deictic words act and work; (2) the symbolic field (i.e., semantic field, context, the field

of naming), in which the names act as symbols and achieve their specific fullness and precision of meaning. These two fields convey that the human communicative capacity has enormous – but not infinite – potentialities, whereby it is necessary to take into account its boundaries and constraints. According to the two-field theory, in the field of indication of language, two perpendicular lines intersecting with each other generate a coordinate system, in which the point of intersection *O* is the origin. Bühler argues that, if we replace the origin *O* with the three deictic words *here*, *now*, and *I*, we can represent the field of indication of human language. Each of these three deictic words draws attention both as a sound phenomenon and as a mark. More specifically, *here* is configured as a mark of place, *now* as a mark of instantaneity, and *I* as a mark of the issuer. Based on the point of origin of the spatial *here*, all other positions are linguistically indicated, and based on the point of origin of the temporal *now*, all the other temporal points are referred to. In this sense, for Bühler, the subjective scheme is to be understood as a kind of “universal”.

In line with the consideration of the two fields of language, for Bühler (1965) also linguistic signs are divided into two classes: (1) deictic terms, i.e., terms of indication/pointing (*Zeigwörter*); and (2) denominative terms, consisting of conceptual signs (*Nennwörter*). More in detail, deictic words are the equivalent of the gestures of indication with stretching arm and finger in the language and acquire “*from time to time fullness and precision of meaning (...) in the field of indication of the language and only in it*” (e.g., *here*, *there*, *I*, and *you*). They have the following peculiar functions: (1) directing the attention of the interlocutor onto facts, or individual objects, in the given communicative situation; (2) improving and integrating his/her orientation in the given situation; and (3) hooking the speech to the concrete reality. Furthermore, Bühler highlights that the deictic words not only replace the names, as pronouns, but they are also terms of indication/pointing (*demonstrare necesse est, stare pro nominibus non est necesse*). Finally, as cited by Brugmann (1904) and Maria Paola Tenchini (2008), deictic words are sound gestures of indication, audible nods, which always contain a “*Look there!*” (*Siehe hin*) or a “*Here’s something to see!*” (*hier gibt es etwas zu sehen*) (Wegener, 1885, p. 100). In this way, they allow for a transfer in a particular place or time.

Bühler distinguished three different modes of indicating of the deictic words, depending on the different contexts in which they operate: (1) *demonstratio ad oculos et aures*, which takes place in the face-to-face interaction; (2) *anaphora*, occurring within a written or oral text; (3) *fantasmatic deixis*, taking place in an anamnestic or fantastic context. In all three cases, the author highlights the importance of sensitive aids for the functioning of the deictic words, such as gestures, physical orientation of speakers in the shared space, or source of sound. Indeed, in deixis, the starting point is always of a perceptual–sensory nature.

At the same time, Bühler insists on the psychophysical presence of the subject. According to him, the action of indicating is simple, but cognitively complex, since it requires certain conditions to take place.

The *demonstratio ad oculos* is the proper, actual indication. It is based on prelinguistic natural sensitive indicative aids, such as the gestures that can be caught in the eye, the sound quality of the voice and its spatial provenance, the body's orientation of the participants to the communicative situation. The natural tool of *demonstratio ad oculos* is the index finger. Bühler (1965) provides an example to clarify his point of view on *demonstratio ad oculos*, describing the behavior of two hunters A and B. The author says that if Hunter A loses sight of his/her partner, a “*here*” issued by Hunter B, “*with its clear quality of provenance*”, can certainly be useful for him/her to find his/her way around.

Anaphora is the purely linguistic mode of the indication. It consists of “*An indication of something that must not be searched for and found within the perceptual space, but in the global context of speech*”, retrospectively or prospectively (*anaphora* and *cataphora*, respectively). This mode of indication does not refer to the physical or perceptual space but to the linguistic one. However, it uses terms typically used in the physical space and in *demonstratio ad oculos*. From a psychological point of view, the anaphoric mode of deixis assumes that the issuer and the receiver have in front of them, as a whole, the flow of speech, the parts of which may be recalled and anticipated (*anaphora* and *cataphora*, respectively). For example, the word *this* (anaphoric deictic term) refers to something that has just been said, while the word *this that* refers to something that will be said shortly after. In the case of anaphora, there is an analogy between language flow and musical expression: in fact, performing a piece of music requires a similar procedure. However, the natural indicative aids do not fail even in the anaphora, in which the indicative signs do not point outward but inward, toward the text. Using Bühler's words, anaphora manifests itself as “*(...) an extraordinarily polymorphic connective and relational medium which broadly compensates for the restrictions of the psychophysical law for which words can follow one another in speech only one after the other, like the rings of a chain*” (my translation).

3.1 Focus on Fantasmatic Deixis from a Perceptual–Cognitive Point of View

What happens when we move from the study of immediate behavior to that of mediate behavior, i.e., the field of memories (retrospection) and constructive fantasy (prospecting)? It is the case of fantasmatic deixis, in which the speaker conducts the listener in the domain of memory or creative fantasy, moving in an anamnestic or fantasy field. More in detail, fantasmatic deixis is a cognitive–linguistic operation based on *demonstratio ad oculos*. It is a very creative and productive (not simply reproductive) operation. In this regard, Bühler emphasizes

that while the action of memory is passive, anamnestic, and purely reproductive, the thought is creative and productive, “vital” in a way. Therefore, among the three modes of indicating of deictic words, fantasmatic deixis is the most cognitive and has a precise psychological basis. In this case, the issuer and the receiver must have a common orientation skill within the system in which the object of indication is located. In fact, if the transfer determined by deixis takes place in a place that is incomprehensible to the receiver, then the latter becomes disoriented, losing himself/herself. The system in which the object of indication is located can be a common perceptual space, within which we can refer with terms such as *here* and *there* (or *you* and *I*) to something that can be grasped by hearing and sight, with the external eye and ear. However, Bühler suggests that things seem to change when, for instance, a narrator leads the listener into the domain of memories or creative fantasy. In this case, the narrator addresses him/her with the same indicative terms (i.e., *here*, *there*, *I*, or *you*) so that he/she see or hear what is there to see or hear not with the external eye or ear but with the “interior” or “mental” eye or ear. In fantasmatic deixis, prelinguistic natural indicative aids lose their centrality but do not fail altogether. In fact, it is impossible to follow the direction of the stretching arm and the index finger, to use the spatial provenance quality of the voice as well as to hear its vocal timbre. However, also in fantasmatic deixis, there is an indication of the absent through different terms of indication aiming to arouse the image of absent objects and narrators. Therefore, the underlying psychological question concerns the possibility of moving and being moved with respect to something or someone who is absent. In this sense, fantasmatic deixis suggests an analogy between the speaker (i.e., issuer) and an actor and between the listener (i.e., receiver) and a spectator. Indeed, the speaker and the listener of an intuitive description of absent things and people have skills and means similar to those allowing (1) the actor on stage to make present what is absent and (2) the viewer to interpret what is present on stage as mimicry of what is absent.

Many transpositions occur in fantasmatic deixis and those who undergo a transposition take on with them the so-called present *tactile body image* (Bühler, 1965). In the global orientation, it is possible to distinguish a spatial component (i.e., the *here*) and a temporal component (i.e., the *now*) that can be fantasmatically moved in different ways. Regarding the spatial component, the visual space plays a leading role in the spatial orientation of human beings. However, if a speaker uses terms such as *front-back*, *right-left*, and *upper-below*, he/she also calls his/her body into question, involving it in the indication. Thus, it follows that the spatial orientation can never be an exclusive prerogative of the sense of sight. The origin, the visual *here*, moves into the tactile body image. In this way, it is possible to see or listen not only with eyes or ears, respectively, but with the

whole body. Moreover, the intuitive *here* is not always in the same place in the tactile body image, being able to be associated to eyes, head, bust, or even to legs or pelvis. Thus, from time to time, different aspects of the tactile body image take a leading role, to which the visual data are subordinate. Moreover, in the fantasmatic deixis, there is a shift in the visual spatial orientation from an egocentric orientation/process, which is static and subjective, to a topomnestic one, which is a kinesthetic, not subjective orientation/process (e.g., north–south). For example, when we are in a car or in a train, we immediately assume (and not only with thought) an orientation in accordance with the direction of things that are apparently moving. Thus, Bühler distinguishes an egocentric indication procedure and a topomnestic procedure in which the narrator allows the receiver to follow a conductive wire so that he/she can discover with his/her gaze the object to which the story is leading him/her. This orientation implies a clear enfranchisement from the current position of the body and possibly requires a transposition into an artificial position. In this case, the indications given by the narrator may cause difficulties for the reader, who must concentrate and assume a real inner disposition or attitude in order to interpret them correctly. This possibility gives an account of the great translatability of field values from one orientation frame to another, such as when celestial directions (e.g., north–south, east–west) are involved. In a nutshell, fantasmatic deixis occurs in fantasmatic situations in the presence of an indication if the following two conditions are met: (1) the person should not disengage from the current perceptual situation; and (2) a transfer should occur in conditions of awareness. The latter aspect is the main difference between the awakening from a dream or the ecstasy and the fantasmatic deixis.

3.1.1. Three Cases of Fantasmatic Deixis

Bühler (1965) distinguishes three main cases in which fantasmatic deixis can occur. The first one is when *The mountain goes to Mohammed*. In this case, the imagined object comes to the receiver, i.e., it enters the given perceptual order and there it can be, if not really seen, at least localized. It occurs especially when the imagined object is something that moves, such as a person. This type of fantasmatic deixis is strongly related to studies on eidetic imagery, focusing on the ability to display an object in the absence of the material object itself or the behavior in front of an imagined object. In this case of deixis, the object of the representation emerging in front of the mental gaze can find a place in front of the receiver, next to him/her or behind him/her, or directly between the things of the room where he/she is, things that he/she partly perceives and partly imagines. This first main case of fantasmatic deixis can manifest itself in many variants: (1) visually placing something in front of a receiver (e.g., an imagined vase

of flowers on an actually perceived table); (2) establishing the spatial provenance quality of an interiorly heard voice (e.g., saying whether the voice interiorly heard by the friend, who is the object of memory, seems to come at that given moment from the right or from the left); (3) perceiving a precise vocal timbre (e.g., interiorly hearing the vocal timbre of a known person as if he/she is present next to the person who is hearing).

Exactly the opposite happens in the second main case of fantasmatic deixis, i.e., the one in which *Mohammed goes to the mountain*. In this case, the interlocutors project themselves into the fantasy world. Thus, the reader (or the receiver) projects himself/herself with his/her imagination into the geographical place occupied by what he/she imagines: in this way, the imagined place appears to the mental gaze from a certain point of view that can be specified. By doing this, the receiver moves, transfers himself/herself, which means he/she sees by a certain angle. Therefore, more than a perception, what the receiver has is a feeling. This case of fantasmatic deixis is, in fact, related to an atmosphere. For example, the cinema, with the succession of a few images, quickly moves us from one place to another. Thus, a transposition takes place and when the listener transposes himself/herself, his/her tactile body image connects to a corresponding visual fantasy scene.

Finally, there is a third main case of fantasmatic deixis, intermediate compared to the other two, in which *The mountain and Mohammed remain in their place, but Mohammed sees the mountain from his observation point through the eye of the mind*, i.e., the interior eye. This third case is mostly an initial, ephemeral, and unstable experience. Its main feature is that “*the subject of the experience is able to indicate with his/her finger the direction in which the mental gaze sees that which is actually absent*”. An example of this type of deixis occurs when a tourist on the street asks a Milanese citizen for an indication to reach the cathedral of the city. In fact, in this case, the citizen does not imagine that the cathedral is in the place where the tourist asks him/her for information to be able to give him/her the right indication (it would be the first case of fantasmatic deixis); likewise, the citizen does not even transpose himself/herself to the cathedral square to give the right information to the tourist (it would be the second case of fantasmatic deixis). In this case, the Milanese citizen remains in his/her place and also the cathedral remains in its place, but the citizen can see the cathedral from his/her observation point, using the knowledge that he/she has. This third type of fantasmatic deixis is quite rare in fantasy descriptions that are, to some extent, encapsulated in themselves. In fact, psychologically speaking, the land of fairy tales is located in some place that does not have a precise connection with the *here*.

In sum, in all three cases of fantasmatic deixis, what is absent is included within the perceptual situation of the interlocutors. More specifically, in the first case, the listener or the reader, in his/her mental representation, can bring something absent into his/her *here, now, and me*. In the second case, the listener or the reader may feel displaced, always according to the same coordinate scheme, to the point where the speaker or the narrator leads him/her. Finally, in the third case, the listener or the reader remains in his/her position from which he/she can see the fantasmatic object. In all three cases, it is possible to notice the centrality of the speaker in his/her psychophysical subjectivity. The natural sensitive indicative aids are faded but still present in fantasmatic deixis: the mental space is always led back to a context of sensitivity. Moreover, this type of deixis refers not only to perceptual aids but also to common shared knowledge among speakers or interlocutors. In a nutshell, the fantasmatic deixis testifies Bühler's attempt to establish a connection – a collaboration between psychology and linguistics – specifically between cognitive and perceptual psychology and the theory of language.

4. The Phenomenon of Fantasmatic Deixis: From Theory to Practical Applications

In the previous paragraphs, it has been made clear that the phenomenon of fantasmatic deixis needs certain conditions to function. After understanding the theoretical fundamentals of deixis, one might wonder: How does the phenomenon of fantasmatic deixis manifest itself concretely? To answer this question, I decided to describe two examples of fantasmatic deixis: the first one concerns dramatic art, where *The mountain goes to Mohammed* (the first case of fantasmatic deixis), while the second one is attributable to the epic context, where *Mohammed goes to the mountain* (the second case of fantasmatic deixis). The first example, related to dramatic art, can be considered a paradigmatic exemplification of deixis. In detail, Bühler (1965) describes a night at a Chinese theater in San Francisco, where he attends a performance on the stage of the theater totally in line with the concept of fantasmatic deixis. It is a dramatic representation of the deictic type, full of clues. Bühler tells how a battle between two armies takes place: on the one side, the army led by the evil prince in black mask; on the other side, the army led by the shining prince of good. On the stage, there are only two long tables, not too far apart from each other, which represent the two armies. The space between the tables stands for the river. A panel in the middle represents the bridge. The removal of the panel indicates that the bridge is broken. A group of actors with tufts similar to ponytails in their hands represents the cavalry. The tufts thrown to the ground means that the knights fall off the horse. Thus, this is a game of fictions full of clues that stand for something that is actually absent in the present space. As anticipated, in this case, it is clear that

The mountain goes to Mohammed. Concerning the second example, associated to the epic context, Bühler refers to the twenty-first chant of the *Odyssey*, in which Omero describes and follows Penelope's path to the treasure room where there is the famous Ulysses' arch, which will be used in the competition of the suitors of Penelope.

*“Penelope came to the storeroom
And stepped onto the oak threshold ...
She quickly loosened the thong from the hook,
Drove home the key and shot back the bolts.
The doors bellowed like a bull in a meadow
And flew open before her. Stepping through,
She climbed onto a high platform that held chests
Filled with fragrant clothes. She reached up
And took the bow, case and all, from its peg,
Then sat down and laid the gleaming case on her knees
Her eyes welling with tears. Then she opened the case
And took out her husband's bow. When she had her fill
Of weeping, she went back to the hall
And the lordly suitors, bearing in her hands
The curved bow and the quiver loaded
With whining arrows. Two maidservants
Walked beside her, carrying a wicker chest ...
Reached the crowded hall, she stood
In the doorway flanked by her maidservants.
Then, covering her face with her shining veil,
Penelope spoke to her suitors...”.*

(Homer, *Odyssey*, XXI chant, p. 323)

The event described above consists of a series of scenes that, from time to time, allow the reader to perceptively follow Penelope in her actions and movements. The reader is “present” and can follow each movement moving the gaze within the described space. For example, he/she is transported on the high scale of the house, at the entrance to the treasure room and so on. Omero masterfully describes the movement of Penelope to the treasure room, highlighting the similarity between the epic narrative and the cinema, namely, the filmic technique. Therefore, this is an emblematic example of the second type of fantasmatic deixis, in which *Mohammed goes, moves to the mountain*. The two examples given above suggest that fantasmatic deixis can be considered a phenomenon that synthesizes perceptive and cognitive aspects, involving at the same time motion, gestures, words, and feelings, which are closely interrelated.

Summary

What is the “fantasmatic deixis”? It is a very creative and productive cognitive–linguistic operation that allows a “transfer” to other real or fantastic times, places, and “worlds”. The underlying psychological question concerns the possibility of moving and being moved with respect to something or someone who is absent (Bühler, 1965). This “fiction game” is made possible by deictic indicators (Tenchini, 2008), terms that allow motion in time and space, always considering the here–now–I system of subjective orientation. When we refer to something that can be gathered by hearing or by sight, by terms such as *here*, *there*, *I*, and *you*, the receiver can easily use natural, prelinguistic aids (e.g., gestures, voice quality, facial expressions, and body orientation) to understand what the issuer intends to communicate to him (*demonstratio ad oculos*). But what happens when we move from the study of “immediate” behavior to that of “mediate” behavior, i.e., the field of memories (retrospection) or the constructive fantasy (prospecting)? The fantasmatic deixis implies enfranchisement from the physical position of the body and requires the assumption of the listener’s current tactile body image. Thus, the receiver assumes an inner attitude to correctly interpret the indications given by the speaker, seeing and hearing through the “inner” or “mental” eye and ear (Raynaud, 2006). In this way, the listener can bring something absent in his/her *here*, *now*, and *I* or feel moved to the point where the speaker leads him/her. My paper will focus on the features and types of fantasmatic deixis, providing some examples and showing how this operation involves language, motion, and cognitive processes.

Keywords: Fantasmatic deixis, deictic words, indication field, transfer, Wegener.

Karl Bühler’s Fantasmatische Deixis zwischen Bewegung, Gesten und Sprache

Zusammenfassung

Was ist die “fantasmatische Deixis”? Es ist eine sehr kreative und produktive kognitiv-sprachliche Leistung, die einen „Transfer“ in andere reale oder fantastische Zeiten, Orte und „Welten“ ermöglicht. Die zugrunde liegende psychologische Frage betrifft die Möglichkeit, sich in Bezug auf etwas oder jemanden, der abwesend ist, zu bewegen und bewegt zu werden (Bühler, 1965). Dieses „Fiktionsspiel“ wird durch deiktische Indikatoren (Tenchini, 2008) ermöglicht. Jene sind Begriffe, die Bewegung in Zeit und Raum ermöglichen, wobei immer das Hier-Jetzt-Ich-System der subjektiven Orientierung berücksichtigt werden soll. Wenn wir uns auf etwas beziehen, das durch Hören oder Sehen erfasst werden kann, beispielsweise durch Begriffe wie hier und dort, kann der Empfänger leicht natürliche, vorsprachliche Hilfsmittel verwenden (z. B. Gesten, Sprachqualität, Mimik, Körperorientierung) um zu verstehen, was der Emittent ihm mitteilen will (*demonstratio ad oculos*). Aber was passiert, wenn wir vom Studium des „unmittelbaren“ Verhaltens zum Studium des „vermittelten“ Verhaltens übergehen, d.h. vom Feld der Erinnerungen (Rückblick) zur konstruktiven Fantasie (Prospektion)? Die fantasmatische Deixis impliziert eine Entrechtung der physischen Position des Körpers und erfordert die Annahme des aktuellen taktilen Körperbildes des Hörers. Somit nimmt der Empfänger eine innere Haltung ein, um die vom Sprecher gegebenen

Anzeigen richtig zu interpretieren und durch das „innere“ oder „mentale“ Auge und Ohr zu sehen und zu hören (Raynaud, 2006). Auf diese Weise kann der Hörer etwas Abwesendes in sein Hier, Jetzt oder Ich bringen, oder er kann sich zu dem Punkt bewegt fühlen, an den der Sprecher ihn führt. Mein Beitrag konzentriert sich auf die Merkmale und Arten der fantasmatischen Deixis, liefert einige Beispiele und zeigt, wie diese Leistung sowohl Sprache als auch Bewegung und kognitive Prozesse umfasst.

Schlüsselwörter: fantasmatische Deixis, deiktische Worte, Anzeigefeld, Transfer, Wegener.

References

- Brugmann, K. (1904). *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen. Eine Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Leipzig, Germany: Teubner. Trad. it. delle *Vorbemerkungen* di M. P. Tenchini in S. Raynaud (Ed.) (2006). *Tu, io, qui, ora. Quale semantica per gli indicativi?* Milano, Italy: Guerini.
- Bühler, K. 1965 (1934). *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer. Tr. it. di S. Cattaruzza Derossi (1983), *Teoria del linguaggio. La funzione rappresentativa del linguaggio*, Roma, Italy: Armando Armando.
- Fillmore, C. (1971). Toward a theory of deixis. *University of Hawaii working papers in linguistics*, 3, pp. 219–242.
- Homer. *Odyssey*. Trans. S. Lombardo (2000), *Homer: Odyssey*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Co.
- Raynaud, S. (2006). *Tu, io, qui, ora: quale semantica per gli indicativi?* Milano, Italy: Guerini Studio.
- Tenchini, M. P. (2008). *Aspetti funzionali e pragmatici nel pensiero linguistico di Philipp Wegener*. Brescia: La scuola.
- Wang, C. (2018, November). Deictic verbs in modern linguistics. In *International Conference on Contemporary Education, Social Sciences and Ecological Studies (CESSES 2018)*. Paris: Atlantis Press.
- Wegener, Ph. (1885). *Untersuchungen über die Grundfragen des Sprachlebens*. Halle, Germany: Niemeyer Verlag.
- Wegener, Ph. (1921). Der Wortsatz. *Indogermanische Forschungen* (Vol. 39, pp. 1–26).

Chiara De Vita, born in 1991, is a psychologist and obtained a PhD in Neural and Cognitive Sciences from the University of Trieste in 2020. Her field of research is related to cognitive, emotional, and contextual factors involved in learning processes, especially mathematical ones, in children coming from typical and deprived environments. She is also interested in the areas of intersection between cognitive psychology and linguistics.

Address: Department of Life Sciences, University of Trieste, Psychology Unit, via Weiss, 21, 34128 Trieste, Italy.

E-mail: chiaradv@hotmail.it

ORCID: 0000-0002-8486-4062