

A DIEXICAL APPROACH IN THE TEXT OF 'HAMLET'

Zainab Akram^{*}

Naheed Qasim^{**}

Hajira Masroor^{***}

1. Introduction

The word deixis is derived from Greek adjective, *deikikos*, meaning indication (Finegan, 2004, p.201). Deixis describes subjective, intentional, gestural dimensions and contextual properties of the languages. It is context dependent. Frege opines that for an accurate comprehension the knowledge of accompanying conditions is required (Angelelli, I. 1984).

The spoken language is uttered in a specific time, location, stated to an exact person by an exact speaker. The written languages are free of extra linguistic situation. A paper moves through time and place. The device that links languages with person, space and time context, are named deixis, Tanz, *Studies in the Acquisition of Deictic Terms. C.*, (Fromkin, Rodman, Huams, 2004). According to some philosophers a language without deixis is useless. If the indications are removed from spoken expression, their exclusion would be supplied with inference and contextual signs. Deixis familiarizes us with a condition without actually naming it too.

^{*} Lecturer Department of English, Sardar Bahadur Khan Women, University Quetta, Pakistan.

^{**} M.phil Scholar Department of English, Sardar Bahadur Khan Women University Quetta, Pakistan.

^{***} Lecturer, Balochistan University of Engineering and Technology Khuzdar

1.2 Diexis

The interaction between subjectivity linguistics and phenomenology of languages is called deixis. According to a collective opinion of Bühler (1934), Frei (1944), Lyons (1977), Fillmore (1997), and Levinson (2004), Diexis are that class of linguistic utterances that indicate the situational or discourse context, along with the interlocutors and the time and location of the event of speech.

The English language is replete with expressions that are called the *deictic personal pronouns* like *I, you*. Then there are *spatial adverbs* like *here* and *there*, which are followed by *temporal adverbs* like *then, now, recently, today* etc. along with demonstratives like *this* and *that*, and the motion verbs like *come* and *go*, Fillmore (1997). In addition, Levinson (1983) classes the imperatives and the vocatives as deictics.

The deictic expressions are also called indexicals, according to Peirce (1955), and are explained with a direct reference. The diexic expressions create a direct referential contact between the world and the language. According to Kaplan, the aspects of the situation of the speech determine the interpretation of diexis (1989).

1.3 Deictic expressions

In the field of literature, Levinson declares that the deictic expressions are the elements of linguistics that are built on the contextual parameters, and are required to be specified with the context of situation and discourse (2004). The content words could otherwise be interpreted by the nonlinguistic approach, like with the use of gestures, stare, eye contact, or presenting an object. Levinson asserts that any expression can be used deictically if a direct referential link between language and context exists.

Buhler opines that the behavior becomes triadic when it involves the speaker, the hearer and the entity talked about (1934). Deixis is supposed to be in our body experience. In a conversation the interlocutors make sure that the partner in conversation has a different perspective. Tomasello, asserts that the ability to adopt the perspective of other person is a unique characteristic of human cognition, which is depicted in the usage and structure of language (1999). In linguistics this ability is known as deixis.

Buhlar (1934) suggested the deictic center or the origo, which is the conceptualization of the speech situation or the situation of the speaker at the time of utterance, and deictic expressions further denote the point in time to the deictic center. For example, *here* and *there* can specify the location in relevance to origo, when *here* is included and *there* is excluded from the origo. The deictic centre and the speech situation are conceptual units and at no account could be equaled to the physical situation of the speech event. For example:

1. Here where she is
2. Here in Canada

These examples depict that the inference is made according to the speaker's body and location. It is to be remembered that the deictic centre is always changing in the conversation. Whenever the turns change between the conversationalists, so does the conception of the speech event. So the conception of here and there alter with the different speakers to various entities. The deictic expressions constantly alter with the constantly changing perspectives.

1.4 Categories of Deixis

Deixis consists of three semantic notions. Buhler (1934) divided Deixis into **three categories**, **person** like *I* and *you*, **place** like *this*, *that*, *here*, *there* and **time** like *now*, *then*, *today*, *tomorrow*.

In addition to these two more categories are introduced by Lyons (1977), Levinson (2004), Fillmore (1997), which are *discourse deixis* like *later* and *previous* and *social deixis* which is related to social relations of the interlocutors.

1.4.1 Person deixis

The pronouns I, you, we, she he, it etc. make the person deixis. It is not specifically linked with pronouns. Pronouns referring to speaker are *first-person* and ones referring to addressee are known as *second-person* pronouns. *He, she, it* refer to third-person entity. Personal deixis refer to number and gender along with social status of the referents.

1.4.2 Spatial/ Place deixis

It refers to the position of the referent at the moment of linguistic expression. Adverbs of place and demonstratives express the spatial deixis like *this, that, here there*. These display the positioning of action and states in space.

Dixon opines that the place deixis embodies expressions like *this, that, here, there* (2003). Literature describes the demonstratives as place deixis, which is not their status in the language, as Diessel (2006) expresses.

Demonstratives use pointing gestures like using the index finger, (Kita, 2003). When the first and second person pronouns are the speech participants who are actively participating, the demonstratives create a new focus of attention.

1.4.3 Temporal/ Time Deixis

It's the position of the referent in time regarding actions and events, marked through tenses or in an independent morpheme. Lacoff & Johnson treat time as a space metaphor (1980). The spatial orientation comprises three dimensions: front to back axis, up to down axis and left to right axis. But the time is uni-dimensional.

In the ego-moving symbol the viewer moves on time line into future and in the time-moving symbol, the viewer is immobile and the time is moving. The time moves ahead, so it's a front to back axis or the vertical dimension, as Radden suggests (2004). Time line is divided into three categories, past, present and future. *Now* is used for present, *then* for past and future. Time deixis measures day, week, month and year (Levinson, 1983).

If time is the motion in space, spatial deixis is used to locate the happening on time line, related to the moment of the speech event which is the deictic centre.

1.4.5 Discourse Deixis

It processes words individually at a time which are the linguistic entities referred by the speaker. It's deictic centre is located by the deictic word in the discourse, which had transferred the attention of the interlocutor to linguistic elements of word eg. *next, last, the latter*. The discourse referents are not tangible, as are not accompanied by the pointing gesture. But they do use psychological devices like demonstratives or language external reference.

1.4.6 Social Deixis

It is related to those aspects of sentences where classification of the social status of the speaker, receiver or a third person or an entity is referred to, along with the social relationships among

them. These are closely linked to person deixis. These use a multitude of linguistic expressions like personal pronouns, address forms, choice of vocabulary etc. they express social class, gender, occupation, age, kin ship, ethnic group etc.

1.5 Types of Deixis

On basis of the communicative function, deictic expressions are divided in **two types**: *Participant deixis* which is related to speech participants and *object deixis* which is associated to aspects in a situation or context of discourse.

1.5.1 Participant Deixis

It comprises of person and social deixis. In literature, the function of person deixis is to identify the participants of speech. But the speaker (S) and the hearer (H) are aware of their roles so the person deixis do not necessarily identify the speech participants in the surrounding. It indicates the semantic roles of the S and H in the event conveyed by a statement. The use of person deixis is same to that of anaphors which makes the familiar referent between the interlocutors's.

1.5.2 Object Deixis

It embraces the time, place and discourse deixis. The place deixis deals with the objects and locations around speech participants. Time deixis is related to the time of the utterance and discourse deixis indicates the discourse linguistic elements. Time and discourse are abstract and could not be pointed. But Lyons suggests that linguistics converts them to spatial terms, conceptualized and objectives (1977).

1.6 Deictic Shift Theory

Deixis is regarded as a psycholinguistic terminology. Karl Bühler, the Austrian psychologist was the first to use this term and referred to the deictic field Origo. He places three words in the circle, *here*, *now* and *I*, these words are specific to me as a moment indicator, a place indicator and a sender indicator

Bühler provided a description of language as a biotic and communal occurrence: language is grounded on blind exercise, instinct and two types of behavior which is shared by humans and animals; the expression and directing. The core indication behind the theory of deictic shift is that a reader of a narrative is expected to create a psychological archetypal of the world of the story and to envision localizing himself into this realm. Bühler did not describe the use of deictic words in literature. An extension was done by Kate Hamburger in *The Logic of Literature*, 1973.

Serge Doubrovsky, the phenomenologist opines that each time something is uttered; somebody might be uttering that, (Magliolo, 1973). In the realm of literary discourse, the meaning is opulent and condensed. The reason being that literary language can embrace the non-conceptual and conceptual. The author's intentionality makes the literary work unique, as language being the extension of author's intentional field. Magliolo asserts that through language the author interacts with the world (1973).

A certain aspect of language depending on extra linguistic and occasion specific consideration, was noticed by the linguists and philosophers, while attempting to comprehend the role of subjectivity in language and vice versa. This aspect is named as egocentric particulars by Russell, indexicals by Peirce and deictics by Bühler.

Actually deixis cannot be limited to few words. The function performed by directing could be done by using a word to describe some situation, accompanied by para linguistics.

1.7 The Deictic Projection in Literature

If the deictic centre refers to speaker's position which always changes, the deictic expression is egocentric. As proposed by Lyons (1977), the characteristic of narratives and descriptions is called, "deictic projection" (p. 579). In narrations the protagonist creates the deictic expression ex. the story which selects the *I* narrator, which are coordinated in narrator's system. *I, here* or *there* do not refer to the author but to the narrator who also creates spatial descriptions.

In Literature, the linguistic expressions are allocated into two types: matter or words and markers of grammar. Hopper &Trangott suggest that it's the content which leads to grammar expressions (2003). The demonstratives are the grammatical markers driven from lexical means.

The deictic center of the reader shifts from the real-world state to an appearance of himself at a scene inside the world of narration. The experience of the reader and his interpretation emerges from this deictic center, which moves with the unfolding of the story. The author has the power to deploy the deictic center of the reader creating some perspective of the narration.

1.8 Previous Researches in Literature on Deixis

10.1 Sophia A. Malamud (2012) produced paper on "*Impersonal Indexicals: one, you, man, and du*". In this paper an attempt is made to assert that impersonal pronouns are part of every language and 2nd person pronouns are impersonal. The methodology of the paper presented a qualified study of the elucidation of impersonal pronouns in English and German, presenting comparable signs of indexicality and impersonal and variable analysis. It also offered a unique

blend of independently-motivated type-shifting mechanisms with theory of pronominal factors by Kratzer (2009), which proposed a constructionist theory of features for personal and bound-variable pronouns. The study is focused towards diverse elements in the semantics of the items, responsible for the changing impersonal and the indexical behaviors. The paper accomplishes a step towards comprehending the methods that carry pronouns from the personal to the impersonal category, or otherwise. For future recommendations, the exploration of the second type languages is suggested. The analysis utilizes the system of rich lexical representations proposed by Pustejovsky (1995).

10.2 *'Bühler's two-field theory of pointing and naming and the deictic origins of grammatical morphemes'* is written by Holger Diessel (2012). This paper focuses on the research on semantic and conceptual practices that provoke the grammaticalization of symbolic expressions. It is argued in this paper that Bühler's two-field theory could be inferred as an alternate to the regular model of grammaticalization which embraces grammatical indicators; namely the content words. The role of Bühler and Brugmann in studying grammatical morphemes from an interactive perspective is focused. It is explored that they automatically drew their consideration to the part of deixis and pointing, in grammar evolution. The view of Bühler's two-field theory is focused and it is explored that they are deictics and symbols, as they reserve the basic pointing and naming purposes of their individual grounds. The researcher disagrees with Bühler in the opinion that the grammatical markers as symbols and deictics could be analyzed. Bühler said that deictic expressions directed the hearer's exploration for a specific referent in observation. It is argued in the paper that some grammatical indicators have entirely lost the genuine indicating or naming roles and are altered into grammatical functional morphemes. The paper concludes with

a disagreement with Bühler's theory after a detailed discussion achieved by comparing passages from Bühler and current text on the matter.

10.3 Brian P. Elliston, (2008), in his study on *Perceptual and relational deictic shift and the development of 'atmosphere' in H.P. Lovecraft's short story 'The Colour out of Space'*, investigates how deictically generated 'point of view' contributes to the development of atmosphere in the short story. It starts with reviewing earlier research in the ground and the terms used. It analyzes the narrative and the fundamental expectations of the study. A scrutiny of seven extracts is surveyed and concluded and some recommendations for future research are presented.

10.4 Adamson. Sylvia, (2006) in *Deixis and the Renaissance Art of Self Construction*, intended to understand the history of literary style and the psychology of reading. She compares art history and renaissance styles. She explores the technical means which creates the effect, with case-study method in examining essay and dramatic lyric. The analytical model chosen for this paper is modified from Gombrich's version of directed plan to explain pictorial delusion as the helpful formation of the artist and the spectator's versions. The paper argues that the literary correspondent to the geometric signs of perception is in the linguistic system of deixis and asserts that texts of renaissance displayed an original alertness of the deictic resources of the English language. An emphasis is laid on the obstacles towards reconstruction of a coherent self.

1.9 Research Methodology

The study will employ qualitative research paradigm. Patton (1990) opines that qualitative method of data collection comprises three kinds of methods. He defines the third type as, "written documents", (p.241) the analysis of quotations or passages from the accounts of a document, *Research in Education* (2005).

In this paper researcher intended to explore the use of deictic in timeless play *Hamlet* by Shakespeare. The dialogues in *Hamlet* have been analyzed in multiple methods. The options in exploration are encouraged due to the versatility of the language used by Shakespeare. Carol Thomas Neely (1991), opines that Shakespeare describes the turmoil and conflict, the ego and experience, the certainties and observations of his characters over an explicit language, than through, “physiological symptoms, stereotyped behavior or iconographic conventions”, (*William Shakespeare’s Hamlet*, 2006, p.67).

By using the theoretical frame work of Deixis Shift Theory by Buhlar, researcher have attempted to locate the dexis in the play *Hamlet* and scrutinized them in the elucidation of deixis, laid by renowned linguists, researchers and critics.

While reading the play, issues happen within our minds, than what would be running in the minds of other characters. Edwards, P. opines that it is through the speeches that the “plans and threats” (p. 16) are exposed to the readers, over and done with innumerable types of the communications (1993).

1.9.1 Theoretical frame work

The study will employ the DeixisShift Theory, proposed by Buhler as the framework for the study. The interpretation of the text with reference to the approach and deixis would be treated as the variables. The element of deixisin *Hamlet* will beexamined by separating the diexical utterances and an effort will bemade to investigate them critically. It is asserted by John Russell Brown that even in the most modest words, the actualsignificances and the inferences are to be prudentlyexamined (p. 138, 1990).

Buhler asserted that the deixis field functions in three dimensions.

1. The first *ad oculos* functions in here-now of the speakers practical environment. When the speaker indicates and says this to anything, the people in his practical environment understand what he means.
2. *Anaphora* is the second one, functions at the context of the discourse in the structured environment. So when the speaker says this, the listeners sharing the discourse with him comprehend what he is referring to.
3. The third one in the deixis field is related to memory and imagination, termed by Bühler as *phantasma*.

1.9.2 Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to only act 1, scene 1 of the play Hamlet.

1.9.2 Hamlet and Deixis

Carol Thomas Neely, (2006) suggests that the speech produced by the characters might be naught or somewhat. The sense is tried to be made by the reader himself. The speech of characters is furnished with detachment, desire, individuality, the psychosomatic stress, gloominess and purpose. A close analysis of the language creates a vivid indulgence of several obscured traits, else masked in the wide territory of words.

In language analysis, numerous tactics could be accepted for the resolution of recognizing the communal, ethnic, psychological, and matters like passionate conflicts and other envisioned significances of the statements by the speaker which need to be effectively provided and grasped by the besieged hearer/s.

Hamlet provides a firm ground to analyze the utterances in deixical context. McDonald. Russ, views that in *Hamlet* the characters mostly expose their heart with words and the forms they adopt are, “the most meaningful verbal configuration ever created” (McEachern, 2002, p.47). The language used by Shakespeare may be insufficient but the form he adopts is acceptable and fruitful. The conceptions of language of Shakespeare and his selection of inventive mediocre are corresponding to the varied opinions that he holds for his characters.

1.9.3 Rationale for using the text of *Hamlet*

The text of *Hamlet* has a lot of complication, which indeed is directed as a difficulty for the play. The play captured the interest of the critics since time immemorial, but the obscurities of the text hurdled the understanding of the philosophies and linguistic complexities. A reason suggested by the critics is that the mind of the author was limited within the premises of the text employment and theatre, which creates some kind of restrictions that are no comparison to the real life experiences and explanations. The text would be stable if the Prince was predictable. McEvoy quotes T.S. Eliot, who opined that the dexterity displayed by Hamlet, the repetition of locutions, the puns engaged by him, are not delivered on a purpose, but are categories of definitive liberation (McEvoy, 2006). Edwards, P. is of the view that while probing for remedy of the text of the play, we would be puzzled to encounter a plethora of text types, (1993).

Edwards, P. (1993) suggests that an attention needs to be given to the value of words and implications of the play. The readers and the critics have to choose whether it's the *Hamlet* they want or the *Hamlet* its author wanted.

1.10 Data Analysis:**Lines 1-10**

The opening explains and depicts the background or the context of the scene, that Francisco is at guard and Barnardo enters the spot. The darkness of the night prevents an easy recognition of the both. The inquiry in line 1 is replied with another question in line 2. *Answer me* refers to the speaker and “*yourself*” to the first speaker. *You* and *your* in line 6 assure that the conversation is still between two persons, and Francisco is addressing Barnardo. *Now* in line 7 refer to the present time of the night and “*thee*” directs to further description of reference to Francisco. In line 9 “*this*” presents the happening act of going off duty. *I am* in next line definitely points to the speaker.

Lines 11-20

“*You*” in line 11 is part of inquiry to the listener and depicts that the conversation is still between two persons. “*You*” in line 14 is directed towards Francisco, “*my*” to the speaker Barnardo and “*them*” to Horatio and Marcellus, who have still not appeared in the scene. *I* in line 17 is directed to Francisco, the speaker and “*them*” to Horatio and Marcellus. “*Who*” in line 17 gives no context of whom it would be referring to? *This* in next line refers to Denmark. “*You*” in line 20 refer to Horatio and Marcellus.

Lines 21-30

“*You*” in line 22 is directed to the listener which is Francisco and “*who*” in line 21 inquires about the person who is not present in scene as the speaker enters. “*You*” in line 23 points to Horatio and Marcellus. “*There*” in line 26 refers to the unidentified person on the other side in

the dark. The implication of *this thing* in line 29 is difficult, as the readers do not comprehend the thing being discussed to but only the characters mutually share it without uttering the name or suggesting the obvious reference. *I* in line 30 clearly describe the experience of the speaker.

Lines 31-40

“*Our*” in line 31 points to Marcellus himself and Francisco. “*Him*” in line 32 directs to the undescribed and unnamed thing with no context for the readers. “*This*” in next line refers to the *him* in the previous line and also describes the nearness of the happening to the speakers in space. “*Us*” in line 33 again refers to the joint experience of speaker and Francisco. *I* refers to the speaker and “*him*” to Horatio in line 34. “*Us*” in line 35 points to Marcellus and Barnardo and “*this night*” refers to the current time and nearness of the experience. “*That*” and “*this*” in line 36 direct to the unexplained thing which is explained thus as being the apparition. “*He*” and “*it*” explains the apparition and “*our*” refer to Horatio and Marcellus in line 37. “*It*” refers to apparition in line 38. *A while* points to the existing but shortness of the time. In line 40, “*Us*” refers to Barnardo and Marcellus and “*your*” directs to the listener who is Horatio.

Lines 41-50

“*That*” in line 41 refers to the attention and belief of Horatio who does not trust the appearance of the apparition. “*Our*” points to the joint experience of Marcellus and Barnardo. “*We*” in line 42 points to Marcellus and Barnardo. “*We*” in line 43 refers to horatio and Marcellus who are the listeners. “*This*” in line 44 refers to apparition which is still not present on the scene. “*Last night*”, line 45, refers to the previous night. “*That’s*”, line 46, is the direction towards west. “*His*” in line 48 directs towards star and *that part* mentions the far distance towards the direction

in the sky. “*Where*” in line 50 is the spot in the sky, “*now*” refers to the current time and *it* is the star.

Lines 51- 60

“*Thee*” in line 54 points to Barnardo, “*who*” had been speaking and “*it*” refers to the apparition as it appears. “*That’s*”, line 56, explains the word King which is just uttered. “*Thou*”, line 57, points to Horatio and “*it*” to the apparition. *Mark it*, line 59, suggests the truthfulness of the claim. “*It*”, line 60, directs to the apparition.

Lines 61-70

“*It*” in lines 61-2 refer to the apparition. “*Thou*”, line 63, address the apparition and “*this time*” suggests the late hour of the night. “*That fair*”, line 65, point to the appearance of the apparition. “*I*”, line 67, is the speaker Horatio and “*thee*” is the apparition. *It*, line 69-70, refers to the ghost.

Lines 71-80

“*I*” refer to the authority of the speaker Horatio and “*thee*” is directed towards the apparition in line 71. “*This gone*” explains the departure of the apparition in line 73. “*You*” line 74, is Barnardo’s inquiry for Horatio. “*It*” in line 75 refers to the experience just gained and “*you*” in line 76 is a question for Horatio by Barnardo. “*My God*”, line 77, is a personal oath of Horatio and “*this*” refers to the current experience. “*Mine own eyes*”, line 79, is again a personal pledge. “*Is it*”, line 80, is a reference towards the apparition.

Lines 81-90

“*Thou*” and “*thysself*” in line 81 are Horatio’s reference towards Marcellus. He, lines 82-5, point towards the dead king. *Before*, line 87, and “*this*” *dead hour*, refers to the occurrence of the same event in past and present. “*He*” in line 88 directs towards the apparition and “*our*” is the watch of the guards. “*I*” in line 89 and “*my*” in line 90 refer to the speaker.

Lines 91- 100

“*Our*” *state* in line 91 suggests the collective homeland of Denmark. “*He*” in line 92 refers to all the listeners present around Marcellus. “*This same*”, line 93, is the reference to the guard. “*Whose*”, line 97, directs towards the procedure of ship building. “*That*”, line 99, is the reference towards the tough time the nation is going through and “*this*” points to the present strict guard by them.

Lines 101-110

“*That*” in line 102 refers to the question asked by Marcellus, the answer of which will be given by Horatio as he utters “*I*”. *Our*, line 103, are the characters present in the scene. “*Whose*”, line 104, suggests the late King, and “*us*” again are the characters involved in the scene. “*You know*”, line 105 and “*our*”, line 107, refer to the audience of the scene. “*This side*”, line 108, refer to the northern part of the world, where Norway and Denmark are located and “*him*” is King Hamlet. “*This Fortinbras*”, line 109, is the reference to Fortinbras in line 105. “*Who*”, line 109, refers to Fortinbras.

Lines 111-120

“*His life*” and “*his lands*”, line 111, refer to Fortinbras and his country of Norway. “*He*” *stood* in next line 112, refers again to Fortinbras consistency in front of his enemy. “*Our King*”, line

114, is the King Hamlet. In line 116, “*he been*”, refers to King Hamlet. “*Now Sir*”, line 118, refers to the audience characters. “*Here and there*”, line 120, refers to the various parts of Norway.

Lines 121-130

“*That*”, line 123, refers to the food in the previous line. “*Our state*”, line 124, and of “*us*” line 125, is the country of the audience. “*Those foresaid lands*”, line 126, is the country of Norway. And “*this*”, line 127, is the conclusion of all the above related narrative of invasion of Norway. “*I*”, same line, is the speaker. “*Our preparation*”, line 128, and “*our watch*”, line 129, is the reason of the present guard by the characters in the scene.

Lines 131-140

“*This portentous*”, line 132, refers to the apparition. “*Our watch*”, line 134, are the guards. “*That was*”, line 135, is the dead King and *these wars*, are the present malicious conditions of the country.

Lines 141-150

“*Our climatures*”, line 149, refers to the prevailing curse upon the people in form of restlessness.

REFERENCES

1. Adamson, Sylvia. (2006). *Deixis and the renaissance art of Self Construction*. SEDERI Yearbook, núm. 16, 2006, pp. 5-29
<http://www.redlalyc.org/articulo.ao?id=333527602001>

2. Angelelli, I. (1984). *History of Logic and Mathematics*. Dept. of Philosophy. Uni. Of Texas. Retrieved from http://www.utexas.edu/cola/_files/iaa4774/Frege_and_abstraction.pdf on 28th Nov. 2013
3. Best, J.W. & Kahn, J.V. (2005), *Research in Education*. Pub. by Asoke K. Gosh, Prentice-hall, India Pvt.Ltd.
4. Bühler, Karl.(1934). *Sprachtheorie: Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache* . Jena: Fischer.
5. Diessel, Holger.(2006). Demonstratives, joint attention, and the emergence of grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17.
6. Diessel, H. (2012). *Bühler's two-field theory of pointing and naming and the deictic origins of grammatical morphemes*. Friedrich-Schiller-University of Jena. Retrieved from <http://www.personal.uni-jena.de/~x4diho/Buehler.pdf> On 29th Nov. 2012
7. Dixon, Robert M. W. (2003). *Demonstratives. A cross-linguistic typology*. *Studies in Language* 27.
8. Edwards, Philip. Ed. (1993). *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Elliston, B. P. (2008). *Perceptual and Relational Deictic Shift and the Development of 'Atmosphere' in H.P. Lovecraft's Short Story 'The Colour Out of Space'*. Available from www.brianpelliston.com/other-papers
10. Fillmore, Charles J. (1997). *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
11. Finegan, E. (2004). *Language, its structure and Use*, 4th ed. Publisher: Rosenberg, M., Wadsworth, Thompson corporation.
12. Frei, Henri.(1944). *Systèmes de déictiques*. *ActaLinguistica*
13. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. (2004). *An introduction to Language*, 7th ed. Uni. Of California, Los Angeles.

14. Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth C. Traugott.(2003). Grammaticalization. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. John Russell Brown, Ed. (1990).*Studying Shakespeare*. The Macmillan Press Ltd. Great Britain.
16. Kita, Sotaro.(2003). *Pointing. A foundational building block of human communication*. In: S. Kita (Ed.). *Pointing. Where Language, Culture, and Cognition Meet*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1–8.
17. Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson.(1999).*Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
18. Levinson, Stephen C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
19. Levinson, Stephen C. (1996). *Frames of reference and Molyneux' Question: Cross-linguistic evidence*. In: P. Bloom et al. (Eds.). *Language and Space*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
20. Levinson, Stephen.(2003). *Space in Language and Cognition*. Explorations in Cognitive Psychology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
21. Levinson, Stephen C. 2004. *Deixis and pragmatic*. In: L. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwel.
22. Lyons, John. (1977). *Semantics*, vol. 1–2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
23. Magliola, Robert R. (1973). *Phenomenology and Literature*.Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
24. McEachern, Claire. (2002). *Shakespearean Tragedy*. Cambridge Uni. Press
25. McEvoy, Sean.ed. (2006). *William Shakespeare's Hamlet*. Published by Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, London and NY.

26. Radden, Günter. (2004). *The metaphor time as space across languages*. In: N. Baumgarten et al. (Eds.). *Übersetzen, interkulturelle Kommunikation, Spracherwerb und Sprachvermittlung – das Leben mit mehreren Sprachen*. Bochum: AKS-Verlag
27. Sophia A. Malamud. (2012). *“Impersonal indexicals: one, you, man, and du”* on Springer Science+Business Media B.V.
28. Tomasello, Michael.(1999). *The Cultural Origins Of Human Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
29. Peirce, Charles,(1955). *Philosophical Writings of Peirce*. Edited by J. Buchler. New York: Dover Publications. Reprint of: J. Buchler, Ed. *The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings*. New York: Dover Publications.

